

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ESHELMAN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. BELL):

H.R. 7086. A bill to amend section 1130 of the Social Security Act to make inapplicable to the aged, blind, and disabled the existing provision limiting to 10 percent the portion of the total amounts paid to a State as grants for social services which may be paid with respect to individuals who are not actually recipients of or applicants for aid or assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.J. Res. 509. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged, or the incapacitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 510. Joint resolution designating the song "Keep America Free" the bicentennial song for 1976; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 511. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appointments of Supreme Court and other Federal judges be required to be reconfirmed every 10 years, to require 5 years' prior judicial experience as a qualification for appointment to the Supreme Court, and to require retirement of Federal judges at the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H. Res. 358. Resolution providing monetary allowances for toll-free telephone service for telephone calls to the district offices of Members of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. REES, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. GINN, and Mr. BRECKINRIDGE):

H. Res. 359. Resolution providing for two additional student congressional interns for Members of the House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and each Delegate to the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

143. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, relative

to the Soil Conservation Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

144. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to Federal poverty programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

145. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the Kontum hospital in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

146. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the demands of the American Indian Movement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

147. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the transfer of Red Rock Recreation lands to the Nevada park system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

148. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the renewal of broadcast licenses by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

149. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to changing the observance of Veterans Day to November 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to absenteeism in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to creation of a wildlife refuge in the Nisqually Delta; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

155. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the use of the franking privilege for federally related public assistance mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

156. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to adoption of the metric system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

157. Also, memorial of the Legislature of

the State of North Dakota, relative to tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

158. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the earnings test limitation in social security payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

159. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the proposed elimination of Longview and Astoria, Wash., of U.S. Customs ports of entry for cargo vessels on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 7087. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land in Missouri to Grace F. Sisler, the record owner of the surface thereof; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Cheong I Ryoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Korhonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

171. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to funding the Opportunities Industrialization Center in Philadelphia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

172. Also, petition of Frank R. Hackel, Chicago, Ill., and others relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

173. Also, petition of Arnold Van Dam, Muskegon, Mich., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

174. Also, petition of Dale Collie, Aberdeen, S.D., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

175. Also, petition of the council, city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to the definition of "secondary treatment" in waste disposal; to the Committee on Public Works.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

#### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, now that the 16th annual observance of National Library Week has come to a close, I wish to share with my colleagues President Nixon's statement stressing the importance of efficient and readily available library systems throughout our Nation. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Presi-

dent's White House statement launching National Library Week be printed at this point in the RECORD:

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATEMENT LAUNCHING NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK (APRIL 8-14, 1973)

The strength of our nation resides in the knowledge, wisdom and spirit of our people. As we approach the two hundredth anniversary of our national independence, it is imperative that we intensify our efforts to hasten the day when every American will have a truly equal opportunity to realize the full potential of his abilities. Nothing is more

essential toward the achievement of this goal than an efficient and readily accessible library system.

National Library Week gives appropriate focus to the great array of resources offered by our libraries to people of every age. It calls on all Americans to broaden their vision, enhance their skills and achieve their rightful places as dignified, self-reliant citizens. It calls upon every community to improve its library and thereby to promote the well-being of its people.

I ask all Americans during this special observance to share generously in the support of our libraries and to make the fullest possible use of the rich treasures they possess.

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this year the dual themes of Na-

tional Library Week, "Get Ahead—Read" and "Widen Your World," call attention to the fundamental role that libraries play in helping Americans fulfill their cultural, educational and recreational needs. I am well aware of the many efforts to expand library services which have been accomplished throughout the country as a result of legislation passed by Congress.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania alone, Federal funds have made available, through the Library Services and Construction Act, a total of 70 new or renovated library buildings which today serve a population of 2,056,500 persons. Sixteen of the forty new buildings built with LSCA funds have provided library services to almost 400,000 people who previously were without libraries. In addition, a communications network among key libraries in Pennsylvania now speeds the exchange of materials and information between libraries to better meet individual reader needs, while mail order library service has enriched the lives of rural readers and shut-ins who do not have direct access to libraries.

Finally, Federal funds have made it possible to reach out to help the handicapped, the disadvantaged, the illiterate and the institutionalized, as well as to provide books, audiovisual aids and other materials to students and teachers to create improved learning situations.

All of these services and the dedicated library staffs who provide them serve to light the way to the President's goal of achievement by all Americans of their rightful places as dignified, self-reliant citizens.

#### WHAT COURSE FOR AMERICA?

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger's timely warning that "If a society loses the capacity for great conception, it can be administered but not governed," is the essence of his recent remarks. Excerpts printed in the Washington Post of April 15, follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1973]

HENRY A. KISSINGER—WHAT COURSE FOR AMERICA?

The following is an excerpt from remarks by Dr. Kissinger, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, on receiving the Federal City Club's Award for Very Distinguished Public Service at the club's annual dinner April 13.

For years, one of the shibboleths of our political debate has been that with the end of the war in Vietnam we could restore our priorities and recover our unity. It is true that during the war debate dissolved increasingly into a sterile chant of competing liturgies. But the end of the war has produced a strange lassitude and uncertainty. Combatants have been reluctant to leave the trenches. The habits of confrontation have proved hard to overcome. We had clung to our divisions so stubbornly that we seem anchorless without them. And we have grown more conscious of what we seek to prevent than of what we should strive to achieve.

Someday—I suspect sooner than we think—the tactical debates will be forgotten or seem irrelevant. But some of the deeper

scars linger. We have been shaken by the realization of our fallibility. It has been painful to grasp that we are no longer pristine—if we ever were. Later than any nation, we have come to the recognition of our limits.

In coming to a recognition of our limits, we have achieved one of the definitions of maturity. But the danger is that we will learn that lesson too well—that instead of a mature recognition that we cannot do everything, we will fall into the dangerous and destructive illusion that we cannot do anything. Nothing is more urgent than a serious, dare I say compassionate, debate as to where we are going at home and abroad. Technicians cannot master revolutions; every great achievement was an idea before it became a reality. Cathedrals cannot be built by those who are paralyzed by doubt or consumed by cynicism. If a society loses the capacity for great conception, it can be administered but not governed.

I first saw government at a high level in the early 1960s—at a time which is now occasionally debunked as overly brash, excessively optimistic, even somewhat arrogant. Some of these criticisms are justified. But a spirit prevailed then which was quintessentially American: that problems are a challenge, not an alibi; that men are measured not only by their success but also by their striving, that it is better to aim grandly than to wallow in mediocre comfort. Above all, government and opponents thought of themselves in a common enterprise—not in a permanent, irreconcilable contest.

The world needs our idealism, our faith and our purpose. In this respect the spirit of the early 1960s was more nearly right and some of the present attitudes are dangerous. In the 1920s we were isolationists because we thought we were too good for this world. We are now in danger of withdrawing from the world because we believe we are not good enough for it. The result is the same and the disastrous consequences would be similar.

So it is time to end our civil war.

To be sure, we should leave our optimism with a sense of tragedy and temper our idealism with humility and realism. But only as we regain a sense of direction can we heal our nation's spirit and recover our unity—the unity which is the prerequisite for mastering the future and overcoming the wounds and divisions of the recent past.

#### "DELTA QUEEN"

### HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have joined the chairwoman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in cosponsoring legislation to continue the exemption for the *Delta Queen* under the safety at sea law.

Cincinnati is proud to be the home port of the *Queen* and we can now look forward to a new riverboat which will be constructed starting this summer.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post and tell some of the joys of cruising the inland rivers of America on the *Delta Queen*:

THE TURN-OF-THE-CENTURY DELIGHTS OF PADDLING DOWN "BIG MUDDY"

(By Sabin Robbins, Jr.)

(NOTE.—Robbins is assistant director for public affairs, National Trust for Historic Preservation. He lives in Washington.)

"Daddy, do they really make you go through the paddlewheel if you're bad?" asked my 10-year-old son when he first boarded the *Delta Queen*. Robbie's questions continued at near flood tide—like the Mississippi River we traveled for five days recently from New Orleans to Memphis.

When it came time to sip the last "Huck Finn" (ginger ale liberally laced with grenadine), Robbie was a confirmed steamboater. He was an expert on shipboard nomenclature, a certified callopie player, and had even helped the pilot steer for a few Walter Mittyish moments. He had gained four pounds from eating too much food, played the role of a tree in an all-student production of a riverboat melodrama, and wore his *Delta Queen* captain's hat as if born with it.

And, of course, he had learned that the job of the paddlewheel was not for discipline but to push us along at a stately (if not speedy) seven miles an hour. In short, Robbie had a super time—just like the other 30 youngsters and 90 adults who had sampled life on the Mississippi during the annual spring cruise chartered by The National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Charter cruises usually offer extra attractions tailored to the group's interest—in our case special tours and receptions at antebellum homes, gardens, and Civil War sites at St. Francisville (La.), Natchez, Vicksburg, and Greenville (Miss.). We also had on-board classes, tours, and films for the young people conducted by a historian from Colonial Williamsburg.

Charters are on the upswing, reports Betty Blake, vice president of Greene Line Steamers, Inc., owner-operator of the *Delta Queen*. A dozen organizations from symphony societies to preservation groups like the National Trust run charters every year. Some use the steamboat for fund-raising events, banquets, and floating board meetings. One couple even had their wedding and reception aboard. ("Here Comes the Bride" was tooted out on the steam callopie.) The public can choose from 50 regular cruises that range from 19-day voyages between Cincinnati and New Orleans to one-day excursions out of St. Paul. Cost per day runs \$30 and up, depending on accommodation.

Charter or regular, the special pleasures of steamboating remain pretty much the same. Although unlikely to be taken for the *Queen Mary*, the 285-foot *Delta Queen* dramatically dwarfs anything else that plies the Mississippi. Her bright red paddles churn up 40-foot plumes of the Big Muddy. The gold-plated whistles of the callopie echo five miles away. She may not have a swimming pool or sauna, but she does have lounges, reading room, library, two bars, gift shop, auditorium-dining room and plenty of deck space for strolling and snoozing.

Her 95 state rooms run from medium to minuscule. Getting dressed can sometimes count as early morning calisthenics! But in the end what really matters is the old-fashioned charm and ambience of America's last overnight steamboat. Far from the din of television, radios, telephones, and honking cars, you live in a world of churning water, gleaming brass, stained glass windows, fancy woodwork and strummin' banjos.

Each of our five days was different—yet the same. Up early for a walk around the deck—11 times equals a mile. We were surprised to see that the close-by bank was wilderness—forests of willow and rolling pastures. Not a sign of houses or people. We had forgotten that this was flood plain shoreline—chancy land for any development. Out of sight behind the levee were the farms, cities, and crowded superhighways. We heard only the twitter of invisible birds, the swish of brown water spun endlessly by the paddlewheel.

Appetites whetted, it was down to the Orleans Room for juice, melon, cereal, eggs, bacon, sausage, pancakes, French toast, grits (of course) and lots of coffee.

Classes and tours of the engine room and



pilot house filled mornings for the young. Adults had their own slide lectures and films on Southern architecture, crafts, and history. Many just watched America slide by from their deck chairs. We paddled along just fast enough to get where we were going, but slow enough to savor the journey.

Each day there were shore tours of antebellum plantations and gardens ablaze with azaleas, dogwood and wisteria.

The cry "Steamboat's a comin'!" brought townsfolk to the levees just as it did a century ago. Sometimes we pulled into the main landing. Often we just tied up to a big tree along the bank. Returning from a shore excursion, we were always welcomed "home" by rollicking tunes on the callope, played by Vic Tooker, the sternwheeler's interlocutor and master musician.

By departure time, half the town seemed to have lined the bank. Feeling like touring royalty, Robbie would wave back to envious children on shore.

After a bountiful buffet lunch, some read, wrote postcards or played cards. Others napped, watched birds, attended lectures or just chatted on the sun deck. Some flew kites over the paddlewheel. Later, passengers gathered in the Texas Lounge for a cocktail before dinner. Afterward there were old-time movies, horse-races, or musical shows by versatile Vic Tooker.

Darkness cast a special spell aboard the Delta Queen. Lights winked from passing tugboats. Crickets chirped from the bank. One night Robbie and I sat in the pilot house with veteran Howard Tate. Reading the faint rifles of Old Man River with 42 years of practice, Tate nudged the bow closer to the shadows of the bank. When he consented to speak, his voice came out in a rusty growl.

"Mark Twain never done no piloting to amount to anything," he barked. "He never stood a pilot's watch more than six months in his life." After a studied pause, he added charitably, "But I guess he could write all right."

Although our voyage hailed straight back to the days of Twain, the Delta Queen was actually built in 1926 and designed for California rivers, not the Mississippi. Decommissioned as a World War II troop carrier in 1947, she was bought by the Greene Line of Cincinnati and revamped for Mississippi trade. Every year since then she has carried passengers some 35,000 miles, calling on 110 river towns in 17 states.

When legislators passed a Safety-at-Sea Law in 1966 to protect Americans from unsafe ocean voyages, the stern-wheeler was unexpectedly condemned because her superstructure was wood not steel. Since then, Congress has voted three times to exempt the antique riverboat. They felt she did not face the same hazards as ocean-going vessels. "To knock off the Delta Queen because of a law designed for oceanliners would be like pulling down the Tower of London because it doesn't meet city fire escape regulations for public places," wrote one columnist.

In a modernization program, the owners installed more than \$1 million worth of safety and fire prevention equipment.

Her current reprieve is due to expire on Nov. 1, Rep. Leonor Sullivan (D-Mo.), chairwoman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, introduced a bill last month calling for another five-year exemption.

At the same time, Greene Line unveiled a model of a \$15.5 million riverboat scheduled for service in 1975. The new boat will carry 400 and boast such modern touches as pool, elevators, and airconditioning. But she'll still have a steam-powered paddlewheel.

"We considered propellers, gas turbines, even jet engines, but we finally decided on a paddlewheeler. It's still the most efficient, practical, and comfortable for the Mississippi," says William Muster, President of Greene Line.

Whether the old Delta Queen will be able

to compete with the new boat is anyone's guess. The Greene Line thinks there are plenty of passengers for both, assuming the Congress continues to grant reprieve for the old boat. Either way, riverboat fans are assured there will be at least one overnight steamboat in their future.

Sooner than we wished, our own steamboat experience ended beneath the bluffs of Memphis. The "whish" of the paddles slowed, then stopped, to be replaced by the honk and roar of the city. As Robbie and I said goodbye to the Delta Queen and raced to the airport, we wondered whether we had entered the real world—or left it.

#### BILL TO INCREASE CIVIL SERVICE ANNUITIES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement and Employee Benefits, I recently had the pleasure of receiving testimony from representatives of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees on the need for immediate action on H.R. 1262, a bill to increase annuities.

I have seldom been so impressed by the clear, logical, and dignified presentation of testimony as I was at this hearing.

Mr. Arthur L. Sparks, president of the association, led the witnesses in providing the subcommittee with examples of the real hardship and dignity in these times of spiraling inflation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement and Employee Benefits, I pledge that swift action will be taken on this bill at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Arthur Sparks, Mr. James Cox, and Ms. Minnie Gould so that other Members of the House may be made aware of the urgent need for this legislation.

#### STATEMENT OF ARTHUR L. SPARKS

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Subcommittee, I am Arthur L. Sparks, President of the 170,000 member National Association of Retired Federal Employees. I am proud to have with me here at the table this morning: Miss Judy Park, Legislative Assistant; Mr. James Cox, President of NARFE Chapter 3, Los Angeles, California; Miss Minnie Gould, NARFE Chapter 80, Albuquerque, New Mexico; Mr. Willard Wretman, Secretary, Illinois Federation of NARFE Chapters; Mr. Thomas Ward, President, NARFE Chapter 23, Manhattan, New York; and Mr. James Johnson, President, NARFE Chapter 751, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama; and many of our members in the audience from all over the United States who are vitally interested in the legislation we are here to discuss today.

The entire NARFE membership is indebted to you, Mr. Chairman, for the introduction of H.R. 1262 on the opening day of the 93rd Congress. We are appreciative of the courtesies extended to our organization by all members of this very important Subcommittee.

We realize, Mr. Chairman, that H.R. 1262 is not going to bring our earlier retirees up to the same level they would be if they had retired after October 20, 1969 with the salary levels and computation benefits used after that date, but it will alleviate some of the strain in which these retirees now find themselves.

The average annuitant on a fixed, limited income has had to bear the brunt of ever-increasing rents, consumer prices and serv-

ices without the benefit of any substantial annuity increase. The cost-of-living increases provided by law since December 1, 1965, have been helpful, but a 4 or 5 percent increase on a base annuity of \$100 or \$200 a month, does not bring about enough increase to realistically aid in meeting such cost-of-living increases as a \$25 rent increase, or soaring food prices.

An annuity that at one time might have allowed a retiree to maintain a decent standard of living has been eaten away to the point that he now finds himself in dire financial need, unable to afford even the basic necessities of life. Wage increases that have aided active employees in coping with the inflation have not been reflected in the pensions and annuities of retirees, and resulting price increases have simply pushed the elderly closer to or further below a poverty level existence. To put it bluntly, Mr. Chairman, these retirees are scared! They worry from month to month how they will make ends meet.

We have quoted statistics on income level before this Subcommittee in the past, and such figures can still be made available, but in the interest of time and in order to let our other witnesses speak, I shall forego reviewing these figures again this morning.

Many programs have been initiated to benefit the elderly. Only a very small portion of the vast sums appropriated for this purpose, however, has reached the people who need the help. Under H.R. 1262 every dollar voted for these elderly retirees will go directly to those who need it, without a great portion being siphoned off to "study groups", staffs, and operating overhead.

This bill carries an effective date of July 1, 1973. There will be hundreds of retirees who qualify today, but will not be here in 2 months, to receive provided benefits. The death rate in this group is extremely high due to age, and for this reason, as well as others, we urge immediate action on this bill.

President Nixon in one of his talks prior to the election stated that he would like to see every American able to hold his head up with pride. Mr. Chairman, our people whose annuities are so small that they have to go to the welfare boards to ask for help cannot hold their heads up very high. They need help, and they are looking to the Members of Congress for this help.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee this morning on behalf of the Federal retiree. I respectfully urge the Committee to expedite their action as much as possible in order that the relief provided in H.R. 1262 can reach the Federal retirees at an early date. We appreciate the Members of this Subcommittee hearing us today.

#### STATEMENT OF JAMES F. COX

Mr. Chairman, for the record, my name is James F. Cox, a retired letter carrier and post office supervisor with 37 years service from 1929 to 1966. I have been a committeeman or legislative chairman for at least 25 years. I am now President of Chapter 3 of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees in Los Angeles, California with a membership of about 1,000.

Your bill, H.R. 1262 and the Senate companion bill, S. 626, as they now read will provide a minimum annuity equal to the minimum paid under Social Security, currently \$84.50 per month. It would also increase by \$300 per year (\$25 per month) the annuities of those who retired before October 20, 1969. It would also increase a survivor's annuity by \$165 per year (\$13.75 per month), the effective date to be July 1, 1973.

This bill is an equalizer for those who retired before October 20, 1969, to bring them up to a standard corresponding to present day retirees. I retired with the loss of 2200 hours sick leave. The high or best five years instead of the best three years was used as my base, and I lost 1 percent per year for each year

I was under 60. Unused sick leave, high-3 years of pay and more liberal age qualifications are all included in the retirement laws being used for those retiring since October 20, 1969.

The increase in wages since 1969 now allow the present day employee to retiree on nearly as much as we received as base pay before 1969.

One of the primary purposes of the Older Americans Act of 1965, P.L. 89-73, is "Provide for an adequate income in retirement to correspond with the American Way of Living." The "American Way of Living" today can be wonderful, especially in retirement with more leisure time. There is much to see and do in this wonderful country of ours; so much to learn; and so many people who need help which we have the time to give. Yet thousands of Federal Retirees are financially being forced to live as second class citizens, and for financial reasons alone being forced into the ranks of those who need help. We should realize that more than 400,000 of our retirees who receive under \$200 per month would be better off to refuse their checks and go on the welfare rolls. It is a desperate situation, and while we get a lot of good sympathetic talk, we see no action to change the facts that now prevail.

Property taxes in the United States have more than doubled in the past 10 years. Medical bills for retirees are at their highest due to the age factor, yet the retiree now finds he is least able to pay for them. Of course, we all know now that the Consumer Price Index for the month of February 1973 went up higher than it had since 1951—22 years ago. While speaking of these ever increasing costs, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and this Committee for the help you did give us in successfully investigating Blue Cross-Blue Shield, finally resulting in the \$7.35 per month reduction for those with self and family coverage. I hope that the \$9.92 per month increase in Kaisers coverage can be reduced in the near future.

Why do we keep finding ourselves, as Federal retirees, the man in the middle? We in the National Association of Retired Federal Employees were pleased when Congress saw fit to increase Social Security benefits and Railroad Retirement benefits, but we were very disappointed that the same Congress did not see fit to take care of the Federal Retiree. President Nixon has submitted legislation to recompute the military retirement pay on the basis of January 1, 1971 pay scales, thus greatly liberalizing annuities of current military retirees. This money is provided for in his current budget—no such thought for Federal retirees. It was interesting to note that Senator Byrd of Virginia reports that 47 percent of the 4-star Generals who left the service in 1971 went out on "disability" even though 70 percent of them passed physicals six months before their retirement, enabling them to collect flight pay. This disability retirement is, by the way, tax free. Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits are also tax free. Last year's 20 percent increases in Social Security and Railroad Retirement amounted to \$30 on \$150—nontaxable. The provisions of H.R. 1262 will provide \$25 on \$150—taxable.

How can we feel that we are anything but the "forgotten retirees"? Everyone, Congress and the Administration, made a big shout about the benefits of H.R. 1 in the last Congress, yet when that bill came out of the Conference Committee, everything for the Federal retiree had been deleted.

We now feel that it is time our Representatives and Senators in Congress give us a fighting chance by considering bills pending in our behalf, as you are doing today. We must have lots of friends in Congress when a total of 248 sponsor bills on our behalf, but unless we can get these bills out of the Subcommittees and Committees many Members of Congress will never have a chance to vote on them. What we want now is to get these bills before Congress and the President, so

they can decide on the facts and let their true feelings be known.

Mr. Chairman, in asking for favorable action on H.R. 1262 and other bills, we do not feel we are asking for anything that is not justified by facts. The retiree has nothing to do with the rising cost of living. If everything had been frozen 8 years ago we wouldn't be paying the prices we are today. Phases I-II-III do not mean anything to the low income annuitant other than greater financial burden.

We realize the tremendous job you and your Committee are doing, and we especially appreciate the efforts put forth by this Subcommittee today. We are thankful to all those who have sponsored bills in our behalf and hope that they will soon have an opportunity to vote on them in the House and Senate chambers. We also realize that we have 86 new members of Congress to voice our needs and opinions to, and today and tomorrow we hope to be able to do just that.

Thank you, Chairman Waldie, and Subcommittee members for allowing me to appear before you today and for hearing what we have to say. It is indeed an honor and a privilege.

#### STATEMENT OF MINNIE E. GOULD

Chairman Waldie and Members of this Subcommittee, for the record I am Minnie E. Gould, a member of NARFE Chapter 80 in Albuquerque, New Mexico and former President of Chapter 80. I am delighted to be able to appear before you this morning and add my voice to our Association's urging for immediate action on H.R. 1262.

We appreciate the fact that this Subcommittee has made a thorough study of the facts available through the Civil Service Commission on the status of Civil Service annuitants. In an effort to bring you the personal interest factor that we see day by day among the retirees in our immediate localities, I have held interviews with 138 annuitants who requested them. Since time was limited, I concentrated on securing information relative to the provision of H.R. 1262, which would provide a minimum annuity of \$84.50 per month.

Of those interviewed, I found 22 persons received annuities ranging from \$12 to \$77 per month, with years of service ranging from 6 to 17 (a matter of 24 to 68 quarters). Ironically, the \$12 a month annuity was being received by a lady with 11 years of service, and a gentleman receiving \$47 per month had served 17 years. Aside from these two, the remainder ranged from \$25 to \$77 per month with years of service ranging from 6 to 16 years. The CSA numbers and monthly annuities were voluntarily given to us from official records and are available for rechecking if you so desire.

We heard some very interesting and pertinent statements from the annuitants interviewed, both those who were below the \$84.50 per month figure and the others. I should like to summarize for you some observations I made from these talks with annuitants.

1. Retirees interviewed, as a whole, were definitely not "grippers". The greater number of them came from hardy pioneer stock who were taught to make the best use of what they have, regardless of the amount. They have been extremely patient and are doing their best to look at all facets of a very real problem in this time of unparalleled spiraling costs of even the barest necessities of life.

2. It was a privilege to note that our Federal retirees have a very generous dose of hope and faith; i.e. hope for their own future and that of our country as a whole, and faith, not only in themselves, but in you as a Committee considering their needs, and in all elected representatives at all levels of government. They believe that you will do your very best to correct the glaring inequities in annuities.

3. One kind old gentleman laughingly quoted Bruce Barton, and it went something like this, "When you get to the end of your

rope, tie a knot in its tail and hang on!" That, my friends, is what I feel that the overwhelming majority of our low income annuitants are doing. I am confident that you join with me in the hope that their rope doesn't become so frayed that it will no longer hold a knot.

Thank you gentlemen, for this opportunity to appear before you. I trust that you will soon see fit to favorably report H.R. 1262.

#### CONGRESS IS THE CULPRIT

#### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add except my wholehearted endorsement to the commonsense spelled out in an editorial written by Tom Conner as appearing in the Seymour, Ind., Daily Tribune of March 30, 1973.

If the Members who assemble in this Chamber really are ready to face up to the truth about who is to blame for inflation in this Nation today, I suggest that we each read this editorial, and, if that is possible, let us be guided by its wisdom. Profligate Government spending has led this Nation to the brink of financial disaster—the time has come for this Congress to resolve that we shall bequeath to our grandchildren more than the debt which has accumulated from a binge of red ink spending. The article follows:

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Thursday night the President of the United States delivered a most unique message to the people. It dealt with the Vietnam situation, food prices and the importance of the United States in the world today. Following the talk the TV people were interested in only the Vietnam position and how this message would affect the U.S. in the world today.

In our opinion the TV critics missed the most important political first in our nation's history. Mr. Nixon's reference to increased prices directly placed the responsibility upon the federal government. He stated that the United States citizens had to make a decision of whether they wanted more services with more taxes or more inflation.

The President made it clear there was no choice. In our memory this has been the first time any political leader has stated this. Normally political figures find other scapegoats upon which to lay the blame—either business or labor—depending upon their political dependency.

Mr. Nixon, for the first time of any major political office holder, laid it on the line. What does the public want—increased taxes or increased inflation. He offered the correct alternative—sensible government spending. He has advocated this and incurred the ire of the Congress by vetoing major spending bills which will add to inflation. He has challenged Congress on this point and made it perfectly clear that the irresponsible spending of the Congress will not be tolerated.

Congress, mostly, has not seemed to have received the message. They still seem to think that we can spend, spend, spend, inflate, inflate, inflate ourselves out of any problem. They seem to refuse to accept President Nixon's idea that programs which have at least 75 cents out of every tax dollar going to administrative costs and salaries, should be eliminated.

We are proud that the United States has achieved peace with honor and did not abandon our POW's and the free people of



South Vietnam as the liberal doves of Congress urged. But we are more proud that President Nixon has called a spade a spade and has said that inflation is permanently caused by the government spending more than the government takes in. In our recollection this is the first time a President of the United States has ever correctly blamed the federal government for inflation.

With a stable dollar, high prices by manufacturers and high rates by labor will soon be eliminated by competition. We urge you to write your Congressman and Senators very demanding letters asking that a sensible federal spending program be adopted—a program which will not add to taxes or inflation. There is no other solution.

It is your choice—you, the voters of the United States. Don't scream about the price of meat, the price of homes, the price of cars to each other—scream to the men who cause it. And the men who cause and can control it are those men you elect to the House and Senate of the United States. They are the ones who overspend and are the real villains of inflation—not the carpenter, not the auto worker, not the steelworker, not the farmer, not the manufacturer, but those in Washington who still think they can buy votes for re-election by spending more than they earn. Can you do it? Ask the collection bureaus.

#### WORTHWHILE EXPENDITURE

### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, quite frequently Members of Congress are accused of being overpaid and of being the recipients of a number of unnecessary fringe benefits. I would like to take this occasion to call to my colleagues attention an opposite view—a view expressed by Mr. Bert Freireich of Sun City, Ariz., who is the editor and publisher of the News-Sun. Mr. Freireich's editorial follows:

#### WORTHWHILE EXPENDITURE

The Associated Press did some research on what we might call "the care and feeding of a congressional delegation."

The AP reported it costs an average of \$188,000 a year to keep a representative in Washington and \$390,000 for a senator. These figures include salaries for the elected officials and for his staff members.

At first glance the figures seem somewhat shocking. If anyone who saw them blinked with amazement and declared, "That's a lot of money," he wasn't alone, we're sure.

And then we think of all the stereotypes and old jokes about members of Congress, including the one that goes, "I don't know why everybody's angry at Senator Jones; he ain't done nothing." At that point it's apparent that we taxpayers have been "had" again.

But what seems apparent ain't necessarily so.

We may poke fun at our congressmen and we may become disappointed and even irate when they vote for this thing or against that. But really they get a considerable amount done and the demands we place upon them are great.

If we ask for a seed catalogue or tips on how to run a hot dog stand or a pamphlet on installing garage doors or a position paper by the State Department on fishing rights within Ecuador's proclaimed 200-mile limit, we expect it and expect it promptly. "After all," we tell ourselves "they have big staffs and we're paying for it."

Well, certainly we're paying for it, and that's why that help is available.

But even beyond the small personal favors which we—legitimately—seek, it is necessary that our representatives in Washington have staffs available to do research on vital issues. Above all, we do want our members of Congress to become fully informed on these vital issues and to cast intelligent votes. What we pay to assure that they have this backup assistance is well worth the money.

#### VEYSEY APPEALS FOR FARM LABOR ACTION BY CONGRESS

### HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, California is again facing a major economic and social crisis due to turbulence in farm labor relations.

During the past several days, another "law of the jungle" settlement threatens to gut any semblance of farm labor peace which farmworkers and farmers have longed for and worked for while weathering the past 12 years of violence and disruption.

Today, we are on the brink of the 1973 grape harvest in the Coachella Valley where some 4,000 to 5,000 farmworkers are counting on this crop for their livelihood.

Meanwhile, the farmers there are counting on those same farmworkers to harvest this crop, and in so doing, sustain a major part of the economic base of our 43d Congressional District.

Sadly, we are in danger of losing a great part of this agricultural production—and with it, the jobs and livelihoods of thousands of residents. The threat of another grape boycott casts a dismal spectre and flashes bitter memories of the recent past, when boycotters forced thousands of acres of grapes back into barren desertlands.

The most recent turmoil comes because the contracts which growers signed with Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers Union to stop their boycott 3 years ago have now expired in the Coachella Valley.

And with these contract expirations, other union interests are seeking to bargain with the growers and workers for contracts on the same ranches and in the same vineyards.

The Teamsters Union, which for years has represented farmworkers of many kinds, especially those in packing and assembly line operations, now represents most of California's lettuce industry workers as well. With more experience in labor relations, the Teamsters have been better able to handle the job of supplying competent workers on a professional basis, than has the UFWU. The grape industry has watched this development while often wrestling with their own UFWU contracts. Because of this, many grape growers who previously held UFWU contracts, as well as many workers, are now opting for Teamster affiliation.

Accordingly, Chavez is faced with the loss of many, of not most of his grape

contracts in the Coachella Valley—and almost as certainly, in the San Joaquin Valley. And with that, he has promised another strike and boycott.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is unthinkable that we, the Nation's legislative arm, allow this "rule by ruin" situation to prevail any longer. There is no law to govern farm labor relations—no law to guide those seeking to represent farmworkers—no law to protect workers from exploitation—and no law to assure farmers that their crops and livelihoods will not be destroyed by labor warfare.

National legislation is critically necessary to bring order to farm labor relations. I appeal to my colleagues to give this matter immediate and serious attention, before it is too late for worker and farmer alike. It is a matter for each of us to take seriously, for the consumer stands to be the ultimate loser.

#### EXTEND THE WEST FRONT NOW

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, extension of the west front of the Capitol is a must. Congress should make the necessary appropriations without further delay. Restoration would be a pure waste of millions of dollars.

The Capitol is a national historical shrine. It is also Congress' workshop as the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday well points out:

[From the Sunday Star, April 15, 1973]

#### THE WEST FRONT BATTLE

Ten days ago, the House Appropriations Committee voted to free \$58 million to finance an immediate extension of the Capitol's west front. In a crucial action this week, the full House will have the opportunity to affirm that decision, and it should not hesitate to do so.

While the House cannot alone settle this controversy, its approval is vital to a final showdown this year in the Senate. A substantial vote, furthermore, assuredly could help end, once and for all, a war of words that has dragged on for well over a decade.

The merits of the extension project are clear. The old sandstone walls of the west front are by now so severely eroded that quick corrective action is vital, and if that were the only factor involved, perhaps a patch-up job of renovation would be acceptable. But it isn't the only factor. Besides meeting this need, an extension of the building that will reproduce precisely the architectural features of the worn-out west front also affords the rare chance to provide a lot of space for facilities the Capitol lacks.

The uses of new space are not, as some critics have charged, frivolous. They will serve purposes largely related to the legislative chambers of the House and Senate, and for that reason ought to be near them. These are not merely our conclusions, nor, indeed, only those of the House and Senate leaders who unanimously support the project. They are the firm conclusions as well of the Capitol's distinguished architect, George M. White, who maintained an open mind on the issue until he was sure of the best approach.

One other point deserves emphasis. The Capitol is not, as our lovely memorials are,

a fixed, unchanging monument. It is Congress's workshop, and as such it has undergone constant, radical change and growth from its original design. The controversial extension of the east front a decade ago, which assuredly did no violence to the familiar beauty of that facade, was the most recent change. The west front extension is similar in concept, and the result can and should be equally as good.

#### LEGAL SERVICES

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today a letter written to the N.J. Law Journal came into my possession. The insight that the author, Mr. Saul M. Mann, shows in this letter, about the workings of OEO indicates to me that he has a better perception of the problems encountered with this agency than do many members of this body. And, I might add, more than Federal Judge William B. Jones, who yesterday ordered the halt to the dismemberment of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I will not get into that ruling Mr. Speaker at this time but do want to share Mr. Mann's letter with my colleagues, and Judge Jones, should he happen to scan today's RECORD:

N.J. LAW JOURNAL,  
March 8, 1972.

Editor, New Jersey Law Journal:

You pushed the panic button hysterically in your editorial of February 22nd, pertaining to free legal services.

This O.E.O. project, like other panacea projects, has created a tremendous bureaucracy throughout the State, of great benefit to its professionals, and yet, at the same time, of almost equal harm to the public.

There was a time when a debtor, or defaulting tenant, upon receipt of a summons, recognized his default and either permitted a default judgment or came in person to Court asking for indulgence. Judges were (and certainly still are), decent and most often leaned backward in favor of the unrepresented litigant. Today, the O.E.O. stamps on the summons a legend telling the defendant to come enjoy the free services of a lawyer, and right or wrong, make a stand in Court. The O.E.O. attorney is often afraid of his job holding if he tells the litigant that he has no defense and that he pay or suffer the consequences. He is also apprehensive that if he justifies the opposing litigant, the volume of work of his agency will be reduced and the numbers of lawyers and agents employed may be decreased.

The result is a tremendous amount of "make litigation" in the Courts. On the other hand, your hysterical editorial is an indictment against the judiciary. From your tone, one would assume that the litigant responding to a summons in Court, without counsel, is denied a hearing, or denied the faithful attention of the Judge. Before there ever was an O.E.O., unrepresented litigants came to Court and invariably gained the ear of the Court. The wheat was separated from the chaff then and there in Court without undue delays and unnecessary expenditure of millions of dollars.

As for the other billions spent in O.E.O., Model Cities Planned Variations and Anti-Poverty projects, etc., results speak for themselves. Very little, if anything, was accomplished for the poor. A powerful bureaucracy

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

12593

was created with \$10,000-\$20,000 per annum jobs held by mostly untrained, unnecessary personnel.

Don't blame President Nixon. Get your legislative branch to come up with some sensible, practical, workable projects which will be of real help in rehabilitation needs, not in creating a plethora of "cushy jobs".

There is an old American farmers maxim: "The wheel that squeaks the loudest, gets the grease." All these new agencies have well paid public relations and press departments. The barrage is on. Most of the condemnation of the President's new policy will come from well-paid propagandists. But ask the average poor man and he will tell you that he has been untouched by all the waste of billions.

Respecting your limited space allotment I shall say no more, and catch the return flak.  
Respectfully yours,

SAUL M. MANN.

### EDWARDS BRINGS CONSTITUENT PROBLEMS TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL SERVICE

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have cataloged complaints about the postal system that my constituents have raised and have forwarded them to officials of the U.S. Postal Service. I realize it is difficult for them to respond to individual problems or to answer complaints except in very general terms of the improvements planned to bring about better mail service.

I am very pleased that the House Subcommittee on Postal Service of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has taken action to hold public hearings on the status of the postal "service" as a part of their oversight responsibility in this area.

The committee is to be commended for taking their hearings into the field to allow public comment from various geographical locations as well as from Postal Service management, employees, and consumers. I would like to submit for the RECORD my statement before this committee:

STATEMENT BY HON. DON EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, I first want to commend you on holding these hearings into the efficiency of the Postal Service and the quality of mail delivery. I believe that this oversight action by Congress is necessary to study the serious deterioration of service that has been experienced by our constituents and to determine whether, in fact, the new organization of the Postal Service is workable.

The question of "service" in the title United States Postal Service is a consumer issue that is just now gaining momentum. We have all received numerous complaints, some more serious than others, and the Postal Service is beginning to receive "bad press." I suggest that this is simply the advent of consumer reaction, and if we can help to correct the problems now we may be able to avert further dissatisfaction and disillusionment that services designed for people never quite serve the people.

In response to the need to restore quality service I have taken a number of actions. In addition to urging hearings by this Com-

mittee, I have written the General Accounting Office in support of Chairman Paul Rogers' request for an investigation of the operations and efficiency of the Postal Service. I have also written to Postmaster General Elmer Klassen, raising specific complaints of constituents over a two-week period in some detail, and have asked for his response to these problems.

I believe I am now on every mailing list for press releases and comprehensive reports that the Postal Service has. I have received notice that there was a Conference for District Managers in February. In March, a "condensed report" advised me of recent, significant developments in the Postal Service: 1) negotiation for air transportation for first class mail, 2) alcoholic recovery program for employees, 3) availability of Golden Age and Golden Eagle Passports. In April, a press release advised me of the procurement of 550 letter sorting machines, with a list of cities designated to receive this new equipment.

There are some hopeful signs here, but I fail to see any suggestion that there will be immediate improvement in mail service for our constituents which should be available on the basis of the financial base of the Postal Service.

I have some specific concerns that I believe are foremost to this Committee's consideration of postal service, and I will attach an appendix detailing the range of problems that have been brought to my attention. The effect of bad service, or lack of any service, reaches across all distinctions in our society. Business persons and individuals are affected; career postal employees and recipients are raising objections; urban and rural delivery are subject to review.

I have met personally with postal employees in my district who are disturbed about conditions within the Postal Service and are calling on me to help them straighten out the problems. Let me share some of their first-hand concerns with you.

The postal employees themselves say that morale is at an all-time low. In the grievance procedure, no precedents are permitted and successive grievances must be tried again. There is a lack of good faith on complaints on contracts. I was told that the postal workers would strike if ordered, even though it is illegal, and that morale is so low it is questionable if the Postal Service can survive.

The employees describe a Big Brother atmosphere, citing the use of stop watches, restrictions on breaks, and the telling of lies. These employees cited occasions when they were forced to work overtime even though family situations made it almost impossible.

Special delivery, they tell me, is no longer in existence. Routes are being lengthened, in violation of union contracts. Clerks used to have two days off; now, on the night shift they work split days, getting off on Tuesday morning and coming back to work on Wednesday evening.

There are shortages in personnel, among carriers and clerks. In Hayward, California, they went from 214 carriers to 191, and no replacements are being hired. Mail stays in the Fremont office many days, they say, without being postmarked, and then it is sent to Oakland to be postmarked in the central office, 15 miles away. By their own experience, it now takes a week to get mail from Berkeley to Fremont, a distance of 14 miles. One letter was postmarked Dec. 13 from Michigan and was received in Fremont on Jan. 26.

Then, of course, there is the form letter that is signed by "Your Concerned Postal Employee" decrying the deterioration of service and asking the public for help, and the many letters to editors that have appeared by postal employees who are ashamed of the "service" that isn't provided. A copy of this letter is attached.

I am also attaching a list of complaints I



have received in the past two months, illustrating the variety of postal problems experienced by my constituents.

Thank you for giving us this forum, here in Washington and in the many cities where you are holding hearings, to help bring about healthy and necessary changes in the postal system.

POSTAL CENTRAL COUNCIL,  
Richmond, Calif., March 17, 1973.

Hon. DON EDWARDS,  
Ninth Congressional District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a brochure which was prepared by the Alameda-Contra Costa Postal Central Council, explaining how we, the letter carriers, feel about the deterioration of the postal service. As we asked the public to contact you, giving their views and opinions we felt we should make you aware of the material we have published.

Much thought and gathering of ideas from our members has gone into the preparation of this brochure. Everything said can be documented by our membership if necessary. We have always been proud of delivering the mail to our patrons and to be an integral part of our community. It is difficult now to see the service deteriorate daily and feel that the public should be made aware of the situation as their letter carrier sees it.

We feel it is going to be up to Congress to step in and investigate why the postal service has taken such a downward trend since it became a quasi-public corporation. Therefore we hope that the information sent in by our patrons will aid in the investigations and will soon lead to the betterment of the service.

We would appreciate your taking the time to read how your constituents feel about the United States Postal Service. Thank you for aiding us in any way possible to provide better service to our patrons.

Yours very truly,

MARGARET BERDAN,  
Secretary.

DEAR PATRON: Are you getting what you are paying for today in the postal service? As your letter carrier, I wonder! For years our dependable postal service has been a "way of life" for everyone. The downward trend in the postal service is affecting everyone in their business as well as private life. Below are some of the reasons behind the deterioration of the service.

A. Elimination of collection boxes in the residential areas and cutbacks in collection services to existing boxes.

B. Elimination of Saturday window service in some cities, while other areas are suffering cutbacks.

C. Cutting back on the number of times a day special deliveries are made. On some days, particularly Sundays and Holidays, many areas have no special delivery service whatsoever!

D. Managing or controlling the mail flow by:

1. Starting carriers later in some cities forcing later delivery.

2. Starting earlier in some cities, (particularly business areas) delaying the mail to you since many dispatches reach the post office after the carrier has left the office for his route. This mail will not reach you until the next day.

3. Cut back in business deliveries from three to two and now to one a day, causing hardships in many cases.

4. Not meeting the time dates on some publications.

5. Having ALL mail from most cities sent to one sectional center for distribution and then returning it to the city for delivery thus causing a day or more delay in most instances right within a city.

6. Undue delay of third class mail (Special sales brochures).

7. Faulty postmarks which are unreadable to the public.

8. Elimination of all city and time identification on postmarks.

E. Exploitation of employees by:

1. Eliminating replacement of carriers retiring or leaving the service, causing reductions in work force.

2. Carriers absorbing work loads of absentee carriers forcing late delivery of mail.

3. Excessive pressures on carriers, injurious to health.

The National Association of Letter Carriers, and other postal unions have done all they can by law to prevent further deterioration of the postal service. Now we feel we must turn to you, and ask your help. I'm asking that you take a few minutes of your time to write to one or all of the following people, telling them how you feel about the deterioration of the postal service and how it has affected you.

Postmaster General E. T. Klassen, U. S. Postal Service, Washington, D.C. 20260.

Senator Alan Cranston and Senator John Tunney, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

Congressman Robert Leggett, 4th Congr. Dist., House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515.

Congressman Ron Dellums, 7th Congr. Dist., House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515.

Congressman Pete Stark, 8th Congr. Dist., House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515.

Congressman Don Edwards, 9th Cong. Dist., House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515.

Congressman Jerome Waldie, 14th Cong. Dist., House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515.

Thank you for aiding us in helping to give you the kind of service you deserve—and pay for. Please write! Now!

YOUR CONCERNED POSTAL EMPLOYEE.

#### COMPLAINTS ABOUT DELIVERY

Inquiry by Water Company whether the postal system to send out bills and notices; Airline tickets sent by Travel Agency not delivered reliably even as Special Delivery; Invitations sent in same town not received by date of event; Delivery of magazines and newspapers sent through mail which are later than the next issue or are torn beyond legibility or have parts missing, and some issues never are delivered; Delivery to businesses reduced to one per day without notice or switched from morning to afternoon in law office, making requirement of legal notice useless; unless pickups or irregular pickups, differing from hours posted on boxes; poor service from mailboxes with stars which are supposed to have more pickups; Complaints regarding all classes of mail that are routed out of the area for postmarking at a central office, as much as 30 miles out of the way, before being delivered to a nearby address; business persons saying that the inordinate delays will have businesses in chaos; reliable delivery of junk mail such as advertisements when first class mail takes four days within a city's limits; hesitancy to put anything important in the mail; parceling out of a postal route to other carriers with their own routes when a carrier is injured and off the job; first class mail taking seven days to go 25 miles; tax refunds taking 26 days to go 670 miles; difficulties imposed on banking by mail; mail received faster from Germany than from cities in a 20-mile radius, causing adverse financial effects for a land development company involved with bids; packages directed 18 miles away that were not received two weeks later; first class invitations mailed within the same city were not received by any of the 43 addressees 12 days later; two weeks for a check to be delivered three miles away; package delivery from 18-28 days to go from Fremont to

Moraga, California, when Fremont post office confirmed it should have taken only one day; a woman who went to the local post office to complain about a water bill that was mailed Jan. 23 and delivered Mar. 13 was shown a "super-huge stack of mail accumulated in the back room" and told by the clerk that they were so far behind they couldn't deliver it and would "probably just junk it."

#### OTHER COMPLAINTS

Persons inquiring about service are directed to the local Postmaster, but the postmaster is often inaccessible in spite of frequent attempts to contact him; postmasters have reportedly been discourteous and have attempted to put the blame on others by twisting around what the person says; lack of effort or attention to tracing first class deliveries; services to buy stamps and pick up packages not available outside of hours when people are working; receipt of mail in post office in early morning hours four hours before employees come in to process it; first day cover sales are too slow and too expensive as handled by individual postmasters; feeling by stamp collectors too many issues, plate numbers, and frivolous subjects are portrayed.

#### RALPH NADER HAS HIS WAY—ALMOST—AS BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS ARE CUT BACK AND REDUCED

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my committee recently concluded a series of hearings with the Bureau of Reclamation, and in a recent study and announcement, Ralph Nader has proposed the abolition of the Bureau of Reclamation on the false basis that the Bureau had outlived its usefulness.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations, I have been made aware of the great accomplishments, achievements and much progress and benefits brought about by the great work of the Bureau of Reclamation. However, the proposed budget indicates that the Bureau is being subjected to slowdown, stretchout treatment that regrettably indicates that Ralph Nader is having his way to some extent.

It is interesting to note that the proposed budget for 1974 provides for only three small loan projects for irrigation throughout the 17 Reclamation States of the West.

These projects were previously funded by the Congress and were simply delayed and added by OMB this year to the proposed budget for 1974—a year's delay on these loans.

Although a \$5.9 billion backlog of needed projects exists, there are no new construction projects proposed by the administration in the budget for the Bureau for 1974.

It is also interesting to note that the budget request reflects a cut and reduction of more than \$133 million—\$133,474,000, to be exact—below the 1973 budget.

In this connection a breakdown of the Bureau of Reclamation budget for fiscal year 1974 follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

COMPARISON OF FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET REQUEST TO FISCAL YEAR 1973 APPROPRIATION

	Fiscal year 1973 approp- riation	Fiscal year 1974 approp- riation request	General investi- gations	Advance engineering and design	Advance land acquisition	Construction	Major rehabil- itation	Operation and maintenance	Total
Pacific Northwest region.....	\$111,278,000	\$72,758,000	-\$760,000	+\$475,000		-\$38,076,000	-\$300,000	+\$141,000	+\$38,520,000
Mid-Pacific region.....	145,569,000	86,513,000	-494,000	-300,000		-61,143,000	+500,000	+2,381,000	-59,056,000
Lower Colorado region.....	90,911,000	76,263,000	-358,000	-200,000		-14,311,000	+21,000	+200,000	-14,648,000
Upper Colorado region.....	50,760,000	28,249,000	-304,000	-1,775,000	-750,000	-19,573,000	-80,000	-29,000	-22,511,000
Southwest region.....	24,762,000	23,690,000	-54,000			-1,280,000	+190,000	+72,000	-1,072,000
Upper Missouri region.....	40,555,000	40,918,000	-187,000			-411,000	-25,000	+936,000	+363,000
Lower Missouri region.....	55,525,000	46,620,000	+42,000	-100,000	-250,000	-9,375,000		+778,000	-8,905,000
Subtotal.....	519,360,000	375,011,000	-2,115,000	-1,900,000	-1,000,000	-144,169,000	+356,000	+4,479,000	-144,349,000
Remaining items (not by regions).....	29,617,000	26,298,000	-4,695,000					+21,000	-3,319,000
Difference in savings and slippage.....	-28,160,000	-13,966,000	-1,717,000			+15,911,000			+14,194,000
Total.....	520,817,000	387,343,000	-8,527,000	-1,900,000	-1,000,000	-128,258,000	+356,000	+4,500,000	-133,474,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes an increase of \$1,000,000 for Emergency Funds and \$355,000 for General Administration Expenses. Note: Total appropriation fiscal year 1973, \$520,817,000; total request, fiscal year 1974, \$387,343,000.

TAX REFORM IS NEEDED NOW

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is fairly common knowledge that in 1971 the Shell Oil Co. made \$300 million in profits, but was taxed only 15 percent, despite the fact that the corporate income tax rate is 48 percent.

This type of situation is not unique nor is it unknown to the general public. On the contrary, I doubt if there is a taxpaying citizen in this country who is unaware of the fact that there are numerous tax loopholes in our present tax structure and that these loopholes are taken advantage of by virtually every giant corporation and wealthy businessman in America. This same hard working citizen also knows that he is not eligible for these tax breaks.

Since big business and wealthy individuals are permitted to avoid paying their fair share of taxes, the lower- and middle-class American is forced to carry the burden. With the high taxes that the average American now pays, it is of little wonder that there is an attitude of cynicism toward our supposedly progressive tax structure.

However, I know from my conversations with lower- and middle-income Americans that they do not object to paying taxes—they merely object to paying more than their fair share.

This country though, is not just losing the respect of the average American by not closing these loopholes. It is also losing some \$20 billion of desperately needed revenue every year.

With the problems that have been encountered with this year's budget, I do not feel it is necessary for me to list the benefits of having the added revenue that tax reform legislation would bring.

There will be extreme opposition from corporate interests and the wealthy to this needed tax reform, but Congress can no longer shirk its responsibility. The present conditions are well known to this body and to the American public. Significant reform of our Federal tax structure should be one of the most important goals of this Congress.

SMITHS CREEK, MICH., MAN SUGGESTS A NEW LOOK FOR THE PRESIDENCY

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern has been expressed—in this body and elsewhere—in recent years about the heavy burdens and responsibilities that rest on the shoulders of the man we elect to the office of President of the United States.

The Pulitzer Prize-winning historian, Barbara W. Tuchman, recently proposed that the Presidency be abolished, and that it be replaced by a directorate of six individuals, to be nominated as a slate by each party and elected as a slate for a single 6-year term. Under this arrangement, the chairmanship would rotate each year, so that each of the six directors would serve in that key position.

A resident of the 12th Congressional District of Michigan, Mr. Joseph J. Machcinski of Smiths Creek, Mich., has a different proposal—for the election of three men to share the burdens of the Nation's highest office. At the suggestion of the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), Mr. Machcinski has submitted the outlines of his proposal to me, with the request that they be inserted in the RECORD and I am taking this opportunity to share his views with my colleagues:

QUEST FOR THREE PRESIDENTS

(By Joseph J. Machcinski)

What one President should do he has not the time to do. For we, the people, are not living in ancient history where the problems were not as big and the programs were easier to handle, but in an age where the people lives are in the hands of a President.

To have three Presidents, this country would need the three very best candidates it could produce. For three heads are better than one. No one man on record has the knowledge to solve all the problems correctly in this nuclear age. Having three Presidents will not change the Constitution, the Senate, nor Congress. It will only put an amendment to the Constitution for three Presidents.

For three Presidents could intelligently discuss all the programs and laws that have

been written and programs and laws yet to be written. And insure that this nation always have a Bill of Rights to insure freedom of religion, speech, freedom of press, and the right to petition and assembly. The freedom that this country has will live with us always only if the people want freedom for themselves and everyone in this nation.

DRAMATIC EVIDENCE OF SOARING PRICES

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, concerned men and women in my district have provided me with dramatic evidence of the limits to which the cost of living has soared.

I have received a cardboard carton filled with peanut butter sandwiches mailed to me by a group of people in DeLand, Fla., who are protesting the high cost of a single item. The real culprit—as my constituents realize—is unchecked inflation.

There is no question that the price of meat has risen sharply. Every housewife who goes to the store know this.

But the arrival of a box containing 121 peanut butter sandwiches on my desk has shown me also that the other food staples and other services have risen to new heights.

For example, the cost of mailing those sandwiches has risen, not to mention the fact that it took 5 days for them to arrive. There was a time when one could mail a peanut butter sandwich for about 24 cents first class; it now costs 32 cents—a one-third increase in price for inferior service.

There was a time when one could buy a large jar of peanut butter for 65 cents. It now costs 71 cents for that same jar.

There was a time when it cost 30 cents for bread. A loaf now costs about 37 cents.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, where once it cost only 28 cents to prepare and mail a peanut butter sandwich, it now costs almost 40 cents to do it.

Any Member of this House who needs dramatic evidence of what is happening to prices need only meet with my constituents as I have done, to learn what



happened not only to meat, but to peanut butter sandwiches.

The people I serve know how to make a point.

#### HUD CORRESPONDENCE

### HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development suspended all federally subsidized housing programs, and issued strict new guidelines for urban renewal programs. In this one action, HUD stopped most urban renewal construction and clamped down on badly needed housing commitments.

Because of my concern for the housing problems of many of my constituents, on January 31, 1973, I wrote a long and detailed letter to HUD concerning cuts in housing programs, particularly those for the elderly. At that time, I requested an early indication of HUD's approach to and plans for housing and housing assistance for the elderly. Though I quickly received a brief acknowledgement that my letter had indeed been received, I received no substantive response. On March 21, 7 weeks later, and only after a telephoned inquiry from my office as to the status of my earlier request, a short letter was rushed to me indicating only that HUD was studying the matter and asking me to be assured the Department of Housing and Urban Development, too, was concerned about these problems.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has been managing HUD for 4 years now. After 4 years, however, it was apparently too much to ask that it reasonably, thoroughly, and quickly respond to an inquiry by a Member of Congress. Members may wish to read this exchange of correspondence, which is printed below.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., January 31, 1973.

HON. JAMES T. LYNN,

Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY LYNN: The President's budget for fiscal 1974 confirms earlier reports that the Administration is suspending several housing programs, including those which have provided assistance to the elderly. Even though you have only today been confirmed as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, I write to request an early indication of your views and plans regarding housing and housing assistance for the elderly.

As a member of the House Special Studies Subcommittee in the 92nd Congress, I have been deeply involved in studying and evaluating the problems of the elderly and the federal response to these problems. Our committee activity included numerous field hearings and on-site inspections throughout the United States. For example, in conjunction with the hearings held in my own 18th Congressional District in Pennsylvania, the subcommittee toured several of the facilities available for senior citizens in Allegheny County. This tour included the incorporated Corbett House Apartments for the elderly in Ross Township, and Rachel

Carson Hall Apartments in Tarentum, both just recently constructed.

In our investigations, my committee colleagues and I unanimously found proud and self-sufficient older citizens living in accommodations that were both of good quality and well-maintained. On the other hand, our hearings proved housing available to our elderly citizens was totally insufficient to meet even a small portion of the heavy demand. For example, of the 175,530 senior citizens residing in Allegheny County, approximately 55,000, or nearly one-third, are poor according to Labor Department standards. Yet, the Executive Director of Allegheny County Public Housing Authority, James Knox, testified that the county had only 838 units of low-rent public housing exclusively for senior citizens. The county has pending with HUD, applications for 2,000 more units of low-rent housing, 1,810 units of which would be housing for the elderly. These applications were not approved prior to the January 5, 1973 suspensions of HUD housing programs.

Mr. Knox further states that the number of active applications for such housing for the elderly exceeded 7,000. He concluded that the situation has reached a near-crisis: "Even in an emergency there are no units available . . . That is why I believe the situation today borders on being a crisis . . ."

Because of this crisis in housing for the elderly, I am particularly concerned about the impact of the announced housing program cuts and suspensions. No one can deny the responsibility of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to propose changes in existing programs or to suggest new directions for public policy when these programs can be improved. But it is not in the public interest for the executive branch to unilaterally kill those programs providing better housing and a dignified environment for low- and moderate-income elderly. Moreover, this action is not in the public interest because it is shutting down major programs without offering alternatives to them. It entails taking negative steps in a situation which requires bold, affirmative actions.

I believe that our domestic policy on housing for the elderly must enjoy a high national priority. Availability of housing in great variety is imperative. Such housing should respond to the health and income needs and provide a choice of living arrangements. It must provide not only shelter for our elderly citizens in need but also services that insure their retirement years will be lived in decency, dignity and safety. And this should become an actuality at the earliest possible time.

I look forward to working with you and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the months ahead in attacking housing problems, particularly the housing problems of the elderly. I am hopeful that we in Congress can work in a spirit of harmony and cooperation with the Administration.

Let me take this opportunity to express my congratulations on the unanimous approval by the Senate of your nomination as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. I think the President has made a wise choice. Undoubtedly you welcome the challenge, and I wish you every success as you discharge the important and increased responsibilities that now rest with you.

Sincerely,

H. JOHN HEINZ III,  
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, D.C., March 21, 1973.

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEINZ: This is in further reply

to your letter of January 31, 1973, concerning the hold on federally subsidized elderly housing programs.

We are currently giving special consideration to the elderly housing programs and other program commitment categories.

Please be assured that we are aware of the importance of these housing needs and will move as expeditiously as possible in our study effort.

Thank you for your good wishes on my appointment as Secretary for Housing and Urban Development.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. LYNN.

To compound this frustration with the HUD bureaucracy, today I read in the New York Times of the widespread, disastrous effects of HUD's January cutbacks. This article, also printed below, details some of the ramifications of the HUD cuts, including innocent and unsuspecting citizens victimized by now suspended HUD programs which have left their neighborhoods desolate and decaying.

If the slow and totally inadequate response to my January 31 letter is any indication of what we can expect from HUD, then America's current serious housing problems may indeed become a disastrous crisis.

In view of the current shortage of housing for not only the elderly but for the entire population, I recommend this article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1973]

MORATORIUM ON HOUSING SUBSIDY SPELLS  
HARDSHIP FOR THOUSANDS

(By Agis Salpukas)

DETROIT, April 15.—James Nicholson and his wife Katie stood on the porch of their two-story frame house surrounded by a neat lawn and cyclone fence and looked across to a row of houses wrecked by vandals and fires. "Just two, three years ago," he said, "this was a beautiful, beautiful neighborhood. But they've torn the place up. We'd like to sell our house and move out of Detroit."

But he can't. No private buyers are interested because of the surrounding deterioration. And his last hope of having the city buy the house to clear the site for urban renewal has been held up by new guidelines issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Thousands of poor urban householders like the Nicholsons are the unintended victims of successive Federal attempts to deal with the nation's housing crisis. The Government's first efforts to improve their neighborhoods led to greater desolation: now the Government's efforts to reform its first efforts are again aggravating their problems.

Last January and in the following two months, citing widespread waste and corruption, HUD suspended all subsidized housing programs and issued strict new guidelines for urban renewal. The effect was to slow programs in many cities.

The Administration and HUD maintain Administration's position that the suspensions and the new guidelines will be temporary. The moratorium, they argue, is needed to draft new housing programs and to shift the funding and decisionmaking process from Washington bureaucrats to local governments through the special revenue sharing program which is due to go into effect in July, 1974.

They also argue that there is enough money already committed for housing to enable construction of subsidized housing to continue at the rate of about 250,000 units a year, a rate slightly down from a year ago.

And President Nixon pledged last March 8 that new policy recommendations on sub-

dized housing would be submitted to Congress within six months and that under his plan to place urban renewal projects under the revenue sharing program no city would receive less money.

Under the Administration's plan, therefore, the transition should be smooth and have no major adverse effects.

But interviews with local officials in eight major cities indicate that the new policies are already having adverse effects in some of them. And many of the officials feared that the period of transition would interrupt housing programs now geared up for rapid expansion.

Robert C. Embroy, Jr., the young commissioner of Baltimore's Department of Housing and Community Development said that his agency was ready to undertake major construction when the new policies went into effect.

#### ABOUT 10,000 MAY HAVE TO WAIT

"We bought the land and cleared it," he said. "People moved out expecting new housing. Now we have to say there is no money."

He estimated that about 10,000 people, many of whom live in substandard housing, would have to wait longer for housing because of the new policies.

The effect of the new policies varies from city to city. Local officials in New York, Detroit, Baltimore and Los Angeles said that there was an immediate impact while in Washington, Houston, Chicago and Philadelphia officials were worried about the future.

In Philadelphia, for example, there is enough money already committed for the effect on housing and urban renewal not to be felt for about a year.

David Anderson, assistant director of housing for the planning commission said, however, that the moratorium "has scared off some investors."

"There is going to be a two-to three-year gap between the new programs and the end of the old ones," he said. "It will take a year or so after 1974—if the new money actually comes then—to get plans into action. After all, the 1968 Housing Act didn't produce housing until 1971."

#### MAIN LOCAL CONCERNS

But other officials said that it was hard to estimate how long the gap might be. Larry Dale, assistant to the director of the HUD office in Washington, said that generally the freeze on subsidized programs would not have an impact for a year or so.

"We won't see any effect for quite some period of time," he explained. "If the Administration comes through with an alternate housing proposal in a timely manner, then there should be no real setback."

The main concerns of local officials who were not so optimistic can be summed up as follows:

While funding for urban renewal is being continued, many cities are unwilling to risk putting up the money for further land acquisition and clearance. If local city agencies do not meet the new deadlines under the new HUD guidelines they will not be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

Although part of the impact of the suspension of the Federal housing programs will be offset by projects already approved, there is great concern that the momentum in building low-income housing will be lost just as many housing agencies are preparing to expand construction.

There is also concern that special revenue sharing may be a mixed blessing. Although most officials favor more local control, some said that the best organized local pressure groups would get most of the money for their areas and that the poorer areas that needed it the most might not have the political clout to get their share.

The Administration's decision last Jan. 5 to halt Federal subsidies for housing affected three main programs:

The public housing programs started in 1937, under which the Federal Government paid all the development costs and subsidized the rents and deficits to projects run by local housing authorities.

Section 235 of the Federal Housing Act of 1968, under which low-income families could buy individual houses through Government-subsidized mortgages that brought interest rates of about 7 per cent down to as low as 1 per cent.

Section 236 of the same act, under which builders could put up multiple dwelling units getting a similar subsidy on the interest of the mortgage.

In the four years since the 1968 housing law went into effect, the three subsidy programs accounted for the start of about 1.5-million housing units, including 300,000 last year.

The goal of the act was to build 6-million housing units for low-income people by 1978, but various factors slowed down the programs.

Congress and the Administration often cut severely into the money requests. High interest rates limited the amount of mortgage money that was available. Court decisions and guidelines by H.U.D. required that new housing not be concentrated in black inner city areas but be dispersed into suburbs as well, delaying many projects.

#### STRICTER HUD GUIDELINES

Scandals in some of the programs, particularly the Federal Housing Administration program under which the urban poor could purchase houses with low downpayments and interest rates, led to stricter guidelines from H.U.D.

The agency issued regulations, for example, stating that it would not insure housing in neighborhoods for any more than the property values prevailing in each neighborhood. This led to a decline in construction in the inner cities because of the bigger risks to developers.

"Actually, the moratorium on housing has been going on for over a year," a local housing official said in Philadelphia.

So when the programs were suspended last January, there had already been a general slowing down of construction nationally.

In Chicago, Judge Richard B. Austin of the Federal District Court, ordered in 1969 that 1,300 of the first 1,500 units of family housing had to be built in white neighborhoods that did not want them. The effect of the order was to slow construction from 513 units in 1969 to none in 1972.

The slowing down of the programs and the tendency among local officials to take the most optimistic estimate of the housing they planned to construct in the coming year, makes it difficult to assess the impact of the Administration's moratorium with any precision.

In New York, Andrew Kerr, the city's Housing Development Administrator, estimated that the city could lose up to 23,000 units because of the Administration's freeze.

About 6,000 of these units are already in various stages of construction under a state program designed in anticipation of Federal subsidies that would bring down the rents so that low-income people could afford the housing.

H.U.D. has reviewed the project and recently decided that the subsidies would be available if the housing met criteria for soundness, economy and nondiscrimination.

Mr. Kerr also estimated that there were 17,000 more units of new and rehabilitated housing scheduled for the coming year whose future was now uncertain.

"The freeze," Mr. Kerr said recently, "quite simply is a massive breach of faith."

Joseph Monticciolo, deputy director of H.U.D. for the New York area, said that there was a good chance that 2,000 units scheduled for rehabilitation would be funded despite

the freeze and that 3,500 more units of housing under other programs would be built.

But despite the relaxation of the moratorium for some projects, many local housing officials said that the new policies would mean that the poor and the elderly would have to wait longer for housing.

Dave Griffin, who works at the custodial staff for City College in Manhattan, has been on a waiting list for a long time for new housing to be constructed by the Upper Park Avenue Community Association. The project may now be delayed.

He lives at 114 East 112th Street, where the hall is strewn with plaster and a burner from the stove provides heat for a three-room apartment that he shares with another adult and four children.

"I think it's wrong for people to have to live like this," he said. "I don't know what can be done. I guess we just have to wait."

Mrs. Mary Lemma, head of the association, a community agency that in four years has built 375 units, says that it is now uncertain whether the agency can meet its goal of providing housing for 12,000 people.

#### EFFECTS IN DETROIT

"We must have subsidies," she said. "Because the only place the money could come from is the Government. The advisers to the President know this, especially the black ones, and I'm sure they have told him."

The effects of the suspensions and the new guidelines on urban renewal can already be seen in Detroit, a city that bore the brunt of the recent F.H.A. housing scandal.

Both its Urban Renewal and Neighborhood Development Program have been affected by the guidelines set down Jan. 11 by H.U.D. The guidelines held that cities must now put up the money to acquire land and must complete within one year the whole process of buying the properties, relocating the people there, clearing the site, making public improvements and selling the land to a developer or not be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

The rationale of the guidelines is to prevent local governments from committing themselves to major projects in the period of transition to July, 1974.

As a result in Detroit, three major urban renewal areas—Virginia Park, Jefferson Chalmers and Forest Park—will probably be unable to spend \$4.7-million in already appropriated Federal funds for acquiring property. The city does not think that the guidelines can be met and it has good reasons.

In Jefferson Chalmers, for example, the rate of acquisition has been very slow. Since June, 1971, the city had hoped to acquire 208 properties in two years. But it has acquired only 35 so far because of problems in relocating people and challenges in the courts by absentee landlords.

Sam Smith, administrator of the Citizens District Council, which runs the urban renewal program, said that even considering the slow rate in the past the new guidelines would have a severe effect.

The Jefferson Chalmers area on the Detroit River just outside affluent Grosse Pointe has 23,000 residents who live in homes that range from small mansions through large two-story brick homes to old crumbling wooden frame houses built for the auto workers in the nineteen-thirties.

#### HARD HIT BY SCANDAL

Like many other neighborhoods in Detroit, the area was hard hit by the F.H.A. housing scandal in which speculators ruined a Federal program under which the inner city poor were given the opportunity through Federal subsidies to buy private, single-family houses.

Often speculators made only cosmetic repairs, and soon the houses began to fall apart. The buyers, unable to afford repairs, abandoned them.



In Jefferson Chalmers, which has 4,500 dwelling units, 296 F.H.A.-subsidized homes have reverted back to H.U.D. Many of these were vandalized so quickly that H.U.D. had to bulldoze them down. About 93 have been bulldozed so far with 120 more scheduled for demolition.

#### MANAGES A LAUNDROMAT

The bulldozing has left large debris-filled gaps in the neighborhood, and this has led to the deterioration of nearby housing, increasing the need for urban renewal.

Mr. Nicolson, who is 76 years old, and his wife Katie, 73, live in the midst of such an area. In the last year, he said, his house has been broken into three times. Now they keep a loaded shotgun ready for intruders.

Despite his age he still has a regular job managing a laundromat and proudly says: "We've never had to take nothing from nobody."

Mr. Nicolson's neighborhood has been devastated by a combination of failed Government programs, landlords who did not keep up houses because they used them as tax shelters, and local vandals. Now, the Administration's policies are hastening the process.

The freeze, for example, has cut off a program under which home owners could apply for grants and loans to repair their homes, a key program for a community where the aim is to preserve existing housing.

Mr. Nicolson has no alternative but to wait or to abandon his house.

In some cities, community leaders are preparing protests. C. Alex Morrissey, the head of a tenants rights organization in Philadelphia, and that his group had been meeting to develop tactics.

"We're talking about squatting," he said. "Just moving onto the construction sites and into the projects until some of the things the poor deserve are taken care of."

From the Administration's point of view, it is the poor who have so far been the chief victims of the abuses and failures of the programs it wants to revamp.

Kenneth R. Cole Jr., the director of the Domestic Council of the President, in a recent letter to Senator John Sparkman, Democrat of Alabama, wrote: "This is the cruellest aspect of the present system—it does not serve the intended beneficiaries, the poor."

#### THE WEST FRONT

### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I received a notice from you, and the majority and minority leaders urging my support for the extension of the west front of the Capitol.

As you know, this extension is opposed by the American Institute of Architects and by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. I do support the restoration of the west front, since it is the only remaining exterior portion of the original Capitol, and, furthermore, the restoration could be completed for half the cost of the proposed extension.

The mistake of the proposed extension would be the desecration of a building that is a keystone in our history. The Historic Site Act of 1935 in fact states that:

It is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects

of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel that it would be appropriate if the leaders of the House would stop forcing the hand of the House Members by constantly including in the appropriations bills funds for the extension of the west front when the Members repeatedly vote against it.

From an economic, esthetic and pragmatic point of view, the proposal for an extension should be voted down.

#### THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

### HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton addressed a letter to the editor of the Washington Post in response to Joseph Kraft's recent column on the trans-Alaska pipeline. In my mind the Secretary's letter clarifies many of the misleading arguments which have been used by a few proponents of the trans-Canada route. In an effort to bring a better perspective of this issue to my colleagues I respectfully call their attention to this letter:

#### INTERIOR SECRETARY MORTON ON THE TRANS-ALASKAN PIPELINE

In his April 5 column ("Political Route of Alaska Pipeline") Joseph Kraft makes some appalling misstatements of fact about the possibility of a trans-Canada alternative to the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline.

A trans-Canada route would not "avoid the ecological problem of oil spill;" at best it would merely move the problem of controlling such avoidable damage from coastal waters to Canada's river systems. In addition, because of its greater length, the Canadian line would cause more unavoidable ecological damage by affecting four times as much land—and thus damage more wilderness, permafrost, and fish and wildlife habitat than the Alaskan route.

The U.S. West Coast is not "practically self-sufficient" for oil. In 1972 its demand was 2.3 million barrels per day, of which 800,000 barrels per day (more than one-third) was imported; best available projections show that by 1980 it will need more oil than is available from Alaska to meet the gap between its demand and the combined amount of U.S. and Canadian oil deliverable there.

A trans-Canada route would not "provide a richer source of supply since it will tap vast new Canadian fields as well as North Slope (Alaska) deposits." There are, unfortunately, no vast new Canadian fields, and Canada recently imposed control on its oil exports because of its own tightening supply-demand squeeze.

Canada has not as Mr. Kraft implies offered to cooperate on oil matters on terms acceptable to the U.S. Canada's stated national interests hardly coincide with our own. Canadian officials have insisted on Canadian majority equity ownership of a pipeline crossing Canada (and the definition clearly does not include Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. companies); Canadian management of such a line; reservation of at least 50 per cent of pipeline capacity to move Canadian-owned

oil which may go to Canadian rather than U.S. markets; and preference to Canadian-owned and controlled groups in construction and purchase of materials for the line. All this deserves serious thought at a time when our balance of payments is causing grave concern in the U.S., and when we need the jobs that would be created by the Alaska route.

It is true that the Alaskan pipeline proposal faces legal delays. But it is also true that these same problems will confront any pipeline carrying North Slope oil to the U.S. since even a Canadian route would have to cross hundreds of miles of U.S. public lands in Alaska.

A Canadian pipeline would face many more practical delays. No one has even offered to build an oil pipeline across Canada. Canadian officials do not have an application before them, and even the precise routing is still conjectural. There are no engineering plans. No one knows where the capital will come from to build a pipeline estimated conservatively to cost \$5 billion. Environmental and engineering studies, including the drilling of thousands of core holes, are not yet complete. Compensation for the aboriginal land claims of native peoples along the route remains an unresolved Canadian issue, which the U.S. settled in Alaska by legislation in 1971 and U.S.-Canadian negotiations on building and operating a pipeline certainly would be complex and time-consuming.

Furthermore, we would receive no practical advantage from a trans-Canada line because the existing pipeline system linking our two countries will carry all the oil that Canada is able and willing to export to us.

And in the meantime the U.S. faces an ever-increasing need to import oil. Last year we imported 1.7 billion barrels at a balance of payments outflow of about \$6 billion. By 1980, without North Slope oil, it most probably will be 4 billion barrels and \$16 billion, every year, and headed further upward. The North Slope discovery was announced more than five years ago, and has proved far and away the biggest in the history of North America, yet the oil remains in the ground for lack of a system to bring it to market, while economists predict 50-cent and dollar-a-gallon gasoline.

Mr. Kraft sees the issue in terms of U.S. regional political pressures. But the problem is national, not regional. All our country needs oil. All our lives are affected by potential shortages, by the threat of excessive dependence on Middle East sources, by inexorable worldwide economic pressures.

Few things could be more tragic than sectional infighting over how to bring Alaskan oil into the U.S. market. Maximum possible delivery of this oil to the Midwest—after long and costly delays involved in a trans-Canada route—still would not reduce the price, or substantially alleviate the need of the Midwest and the East for imported oil. Our national economy, our trading position in world markets, the options open to our policy makers as they seek to meet American commitments at home and abroad—these are the key issues, and they are national issues in every sense of the word.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON,  
Secretary of the Interior.

WASHINGTON.

#### DEFENSE SPENDING

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there have been many critics of our

defense budget who argue that we are spending far too much money for defense, that we are already the most powerful nation in the world, and that the SALT agreements make unnecessary continued expenditures in this area.

These critics have, somehow, misunderstood the reality of our current situation.

Shortly after the conclusion of the first round of the SALT talks, for example, the Soviet Union tested a submarine-launched ballistic missile with a range of approximately 4,500 miles. The range of this new missile exceeds by around 1,000 miles the maximum that had been considered possible by American scientific analysts. The first strategic limitation agreement was based on the predictions of those analysts—predictions which have now proven to be inaccurate.

This recent test also is evidence of the lack of veracity on the part of Soviet negotiators. They argued that their submarine-launched ballistic missiles had a much shorter range than comparable American weapons and stressed the complex operational factors that make an increase of range almost exactly equivalent to an increase of number in the case of strategic missiles launched from submarines.

In other words, the Russians claimed that they had a right to more submarine-launched missiles than the United States. This unusual claim, made in the name of "parity," was recognized. Under the first-round agreement, the Russians are allowed to build a total of 950 submarine-launched missiles while the United States is held to a level of approximately 600. Now, the latest test indicates a coming change in the strategic balance—placing the Soviet Union dramatically ahead.

Recently, Gen. Lewis Walt, former Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, declared that:

The U.S.S.R. is decisively surpassing the U.S. in virtually all aspects of military strength. Four years ago, Russia had 550 ICBMS—today they have over 1600 including over 300 monstrous SS-9s, with 25 million ton TNT equivalent warhead explosive capability. Four years ago, the U.S. had 1054 ICBMS—today we have 1054, the largest having less than one tenth the SS-9 power.

General Walt concludes that at the present time—

Our Nation or our Armed Forces are not prepared . . . to defend our freedom. Apathy, wishful thinking, and downright carelessness have put our Nation in the most precarious position of its existence. There is no enemy who will attack us if we are strong—none will fail to attack us if we are not. Our future is not bright.

In light of our current deteriorating defense posture it is unusual to hear from critics that we are spending "too much" on defense.

The fact is that this year's proposed defense budget is at 6.2 percent of our gross national product, the lowest since pre-Korean war days and drastically below the 8.8 percent defense spending took from the gross national product in 1964, or the 9.4 percent it took in 1961.

In fiscal 1968, defense spending consumed 43.95 percent of the Federal budget. In fiscal 1974 it would take only

29.2 percent of the budget. Compare this to the 64 percent which defense took from the fiscal 1953 budget.

Critics of military spending seem not to realize that while the fiscal 1974 defense budget is only \$600 million more than it was 6 years ago—that is, due to inflation, the same—Federal spending for social and economic programs has more than doubled, from \$72.8 billion to \$153.4 billion. In fact, the national defense share of total public spending—Federal, State, and local—is at the lowest level since 1940.

In terms of constant buying power, there has been a 31-percent cutback in the national defense budget since fiscal year 1968, and military and related civil service manpower has been reduced by 1,588,000, or 32 percent, in the last 6 years.

The fact is that our defense budget may be too small, rather than too large. Any further cuts in what is, in reality, a barebones defense budget would weaken the United States still further as it enters the second round of SALT talks and the upcoming mutual balanced force reduction talks.

Those who call for further cuts in defense spending seem not to understand the realities of the world power balance and the steadily deteriorating position of our own Nation in that balance. Hopefully, the truth of our current situation will be made known before any potentially dangerous cuts are made. That course is one which our country can ill afford at this time.

A REPUBLICAN PLEA FOR VOTER REGISTRATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a somewhat misguided view, which I have heard stated often, that a reformation of our voter registration system will strictly benefit the Democratic Party cause. I do not believe this to be true.

Mr. William F. Larkin, former Commissioner of the New York City Board of Elections, presented his views on voter registration through the use of the mail in a letter to the New York Daily News. I submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, the text of Mr. Larkin's letter. Notice his party affiliation:

BOARD OF ELECTIONS,

New York, N.Y., February 7, 1973.

Editorial, Daily News, New York City.

GENTLEMEN: In response to the editorial in your February 6th edition, as a Republican Commissioner I wish to record my wholehearted agreement with our President, David N. Dinkins, in his endorsement of mail registration.

This system would vastly improve the effectiveness, efficiency and integrity of the registration process. It would eliminate mistakes and incompleteness in forms now resulting from human error in transcription of information by inspectors and registrars,

since the individual registrant would then be responsible for and attest to the sufficiency of his own form. Direct mail by registrants would not only exclude tampering but would also avoid the possibility of lost forms and delays in transmittal which are presently too often our experience.

The existing use of registrars and inspectors in this operation is needless, expensive and frequently counter-productive. Such witnesses to a voter's registration in this transcendent city have long since outlived their usefulness of verifying facts and the identity of the registrant. The bi-partisan, experienced staff of the Board of Elections can much more proficiently perform this function by the utilization of the checking procedures provided in the Election Law and in general business use. Contrary to your editorial thinking, the proposed system will eliminate, rather than encourage fraud. In addition, prompt and early receipt of the completed registration forms will facilitate efficient processing and eliminate irregularities on Election Day which arise out of present community and local registration operations.

Since the new registration form will have no validity until it is completed and received by mail at the Board of Elections, blank forms can be given the very widest dissemination without fear of impropriety being caused thereby. Accordingly, the Board intends, if this proposal is enacted into law, to utilize every conceivable media of distribution of such blank forms to make them universally accessible to every citizen.

My fellow Commissioners are in accord that mail registration has most promising potential. Our primary responsibility is to exert every effort to afford the very broadest opportunity for voter participation by our citizenry. Simplicity and ease in exercising the franchise, rather than restricting participation with useless ritual and encumbrances, is our goal. "Mail registration" makes possible that end and gives us efficient machinery to achieve.

I hope that the Daily News in its responsible position of influence reflecting public opinion in our City will consider these comments and, hopefully, re-evaluate its editorial concepts on this subject.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. LARKIN,  
Commissioner.

RISEING FOOD PRICES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week consumers across this country rebelled against rising food prices with a massive boycott. The President has refused to take any action to deal effectively with inflating food prices and he has said that housewife power is the cause and can be the cure for the inflation.

From one point of view, the boycott was a great success. Sales dropped from 20 to 40 percent in last week's boycott, and I believe this clearly shows the state of indignation among the American people. At the same time, meat prices have not fallen. There are a few selected instances of minor price falls, but nothing more. Consumers are not to blame for the inflation—the mistaken policies of the Government are to blame. And the



consumer should not and cannot bear the burden of correcting the situation—it is the responsibility of the Government, and only the Government can reverse recent trends in meat prices.

I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Boston Globe clearly showing the extent of the meat boycott in the Greater Boston area:

**MEAT BOYCOTT SALES DIPPED 20 TO 40 PERCENT**  
(By Ann-Mary Currier)

Meat sales were generally 20 to 40 percent below normal during last week's meat boycott and they are still lower than normal in some stores.

Some consumers are continuing to exert pressure through decreased purchase, but the price of meat remains high and the prices of several meat substitutes inch upwards.

Leo Kahn, president of Purity Supreme, who openly urged his customers to buy less meat, reported his sales were down about 40 percent during the formal boycott.

Harold Slawsby president of Capitol Supermarkets, Inc., reported his sales last week were off 20 percent. He also said meat sales were below normal so far this week, but "nowhere near as much" as last week.

An A & P spokesman who wished to remain unidentified, said he was "not at liberty" to release figures, but meat sales "last week were off as much as the industry."

Peter Quinn, vice president of public relations for First National Stores, said he could report only that "meat sales were significantly off" last week.

Meanwhile, a survey of three Greater Boston supermarkets showed that meat prices remained firm, while prices of eggs and cottage cheese have increased in some stores.

Lean hamburger has generally cost \$1.25 per pound according to spokesman William McCarthy. About 10 days ago, the price dropped to \$1.19. It is back to \$1.25.

Stop & Shop increased its price of a dozen extra large eggs from 73 to 75 cents on Monday, as a result of a three cent wholesale price increase between April 3 and 5, McCarthy said.

Star Market raised the price of a pound of Hood cottage cheese from 45 to 47 cents. First National increased the price of a pound of fresh green beans from 49 to 50 cents.

Alvin Del Rossi of Woburn, a cooking teacher at Boston Trade High for Girls, pointed to another factor which nearly doubles the cost of beef—shrinkage.

Most beef shrinks 35 percent in the preparation, he said. Therefore, to eat a pound of lean hamburger, one must pay about \$1.69.

Corned beef shrinks about 45 to 50 percent and turkey and roasting chickens shrink about two-thirds, Del Rossi said.

In Westbrook, Conn., shoppers have coped with the rising cost of meat and meat substitutes by buying nearly 12 sides of horsemeat from Kent Carlson's shop since Monday. Horsemeat, which costs about half as much as beef, is a common dish in Europe.

Internal Revenue investigators generally found that large Massachusetts supermarkets have complied with President Nixon's order to post ceiling prices on beef, pork and lamb, according to John Forrester, acting IRS director for Massachusetts.

Forrester said yesterday was the first day investigators were in the field. Basically, they find people are largely in compliance in larger stores, where information is readily available due to good accounting procedures," Forrester said.

The IRS is working with some smaller stores with less adequate accounting methods, he continued, but "I haven't noticed anything but a positive approach.

## DEFENSE SPENDING AND THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the defense budget is a constant topic of conversation in Congress, and my committee is presently holding hearings on the military procurement bill.

In this connection, I was fortunate to be in attendance at the luncheon of the Nation's Capital Chapter of the Air Force Association on April 5 where Lt. Gen. Duward L. Crow, Comptroller of the Air Force, was the principal speaker.

His comments on defense spending in general and the Air Force budget in particular are indeed enlightening and should be read by every Member of Congress. General Crow is most qualified to speak on this subject and his presentation certainly puts the matter in proper perspective. His remarks follow:

#### DEFENSE SPENDING AND THE AIR FORCE BUDGET

I would very briefly cover three things today: Defense spending in perspective, trends in the Air Force budget, and cost control of Air Force contracts.

First, let's get some perspective on defense spending. The public image is that it's gone up and up—when in fact—in real terms—in constant dollars and in relation to other parts of the budget—it's gone down and down. In the past ten years, total federal spending has doubled and within that spending:

Aid to education has quintupled;  
Public assistance has tripled;  
Social security has tripled; and  
Health care increased from less than one-half billion to over \$18 billion—a more than fortyfold increase.

Defense spending increased by only 58%, and in constant '74 dollars dropped from about 88 billion in '64 to 79 billion in '74.

If we take an even longer view and compare today's defense budget with that of 20 years ago, we see that in the 1954, defense spending was 60% of the federal budget. For FY 74, defense spending is estimated at 30% of the budget. We've gone from two-thirds of the budget to one-third. Twenty years ago about one-half of all taxes (federal, state and local) went for defense. Today, only one-fifth of total tax dollars are for defense.

Another popular yardstick for measuring defense spending is percentage of the gross national product. During the cold war decade prior to 1964, defense accounted for about 9% of the GNP. During the Vietnam war the percentage remained about the same—9%. In FY 74, the per cent of GNP for defense will be 6%. In other words, only 6¢ out of every dollar spent for new goods or services will be for national defense.

No matter what yardstick you use, per cent of federal budget or per cent of gross national product, defense spending is at its lowest point in real terms—people and hardware—since before Korea (FY 51).

The cuts in budget have also meant cuts in our force structure since '64. For example: Army and marine divisions have decreased from 19½ divisions to 16 divisions.

Navy attack wings from 15 to 14.

Navy carriers from 24 to 15.

Strategic bombers from over 1200 to less than 450.

Fighter interceptors from over 1400 to less than 500.

The only significant increases in our forces have been in fleet ballistic missile and attack submarines, which have doubled in number, and our strategic land and sea missiles, which have increased from about 1200 to 1700.

With fewer men, ships and aircraft than a decade ago, why is the budget higher? The answer to that question is still not fully understood by man—and there are many who don't want to understand. The answer is pay increases and price increases—in short, inflation.

We spent \$51 billion in pre-Vietnam 1964 and are forecasting \$79 billion for FY 1974. We have a \$28 billion increase in the past decade in spite of an 11% reduction in manpower—from 3.7 million to 3.3 million. You would expect that manpower cuts and the phasedown of the Vietnam war would have produced a budget cut. However, as we've been reducing our Vietnam involvement, we've had major pay increases for our military and civilian personnel plus general price inflation, which have effectively "offset any peace dividend." Of the \$28 billion increase since 1964, pay raises have been about \$22 billion and price increases about \$6 billion. If we deduct these pay and price increases, we find that the 1974 military budget of \$79 billion is less than that of a decade ago. Put another way, the budget of ten years ago computed at FY 74 pay rates and prices would be \$9 billion more than next year's budget of \$79 billion.

If we take an even broader look at defense manpower—that is, military and defense-related industry—and compare it to total U.S. employment, we find a significant trend in the past 20 years. In 1954, after the Korean war phasedown, we had about 7 million employed to support defense needs, or 11% of the total labor force of 67 million. For 1974, we estimate that only 5.1 million will be supporting defense, or 5½% of the total U.S. labor force of 92 million. Clearly, we are in more of a peacetime economy today than at any time since pre-Korea.

Now let's look at the Air Force portion of the DOD budget. The Air Force budget for 1964 was about \$20.5 billion and 40% of the DOD budget. For next year it is \$24.3 billion and only 30% of the DOD budget. So, in ten years the Air Force budget has increased about 20%. But, because of inflation, the 1964 budget actually bought more. The \$20 billion of 1964 is equal to \$33 billion in FY 74 prices. So, in the past decade the Air Force budget has been cut by 25% in terms of the people, goods and services that it buys. As with the DOD budget, the principal reason that Air Force's 1974 dollars will buy less is that the cost of people has gone up. Since 1964, military pay costs have increased by almost two-thirds, even though end strength decreased from 856,000 to 666,000—a 22% reduction. Civilian pay costs increased about as much, with end strength cut by 14%.

Now, let's review the major differences in the makeup of the Air Force budget since 1964. At that time there was greater emphasis on strategic forces. Bombers and ICBMs accounted for a third of the budget. For FY 74, only one-sixth of our funds go for strategic forces. General purpose forces—TAC Air—now take a larger portion—increasing from less than one-sixth in 1964 to over one-fourth during the height of the Vietnam war, and for FY 74 will account for a fifth of the budget.

The most significant changes in the makeup of the Air Force budget in the past decade have resulted from:

(1) The Nixon doctrine, which increases the role that our allies assume for their own defense, and

(2) The total force concept, wherein the national guard and reserve forces are being modernized and more fully integrated with the active forces. This shows up dramatically in comparing our 1964 budget with the 1974 budget.

"Support of other nations" was a relatively minor program a decade ago—it amounted to \$11 million. For FY 74, it is \$1.1 billion.

A similar comparison exists for the guard and reserve portion of the budget. That program has more than doubled in the past 10 years, from \$500 million to \$1.2 billion.

The new emphasis on the guard and reserve program, which has averaged a billion dollars a year since FY 72, has resulted in a significantly more modern force at bargain prices. Guard aircraft now include F-4s, F-105s, F-106s, C-130s—and, for FY 74, some units will convert to A-7s. The story is the same for the reserves, which now have F-105s, A-37s and C-130s in their inventory and are flying regular Air Force C-9s and C-141s as part of the "associate" program. In FY 74, the C-5 aircraft will be flown by reservists in the associate program.

Now let's take a look at the investment side of the Air Force budget. In '74, approximately \$10 billion, or 40% of the budget, is allocated to what we call investment programs—procurement, research and development, and military construction—programs for modernization. This is less than 1964 when more than half of the budget was for investment. If we compare the investment budget of 1964 to that of 1974 in constant dollars, the figures are over \$15 billion in 1964 and \$10 billion in 1974. That means that Air Force investment in real terms is down about a third in the past decade—and, consequently, we are modernizing much more slowly.

Let's look now at the hardware we'll be buying—First, aircraft. We're buying only 676 of all types. This is not a large number, but the number the Air Force is buying for its own use is much lower. Half of the 676 aircraft are for paying back the Army for helicopters we borrowed from them to turn over to the Vietnamese Air Force. Another 190 aircraft are for our allies. That leaves a net of 154 aircraft we are buying for Air Force use in the FY '74 budget. A decade ago we bought about five times that number. The number of aircraft we are now buying annually for Air Force use is the lowest since before World War II.

Specific aircraft we'll be buying are 24 F-4s and 36 C-130s, which are a partial replacement for Southeast Asia 1972 attrition and aircraft provided to the Vietnamese Air Force. If we subtract these from the total of 154, we find we will actually purchase less than 100 aircraft for modernization. Of these, 77 are the new F-15; one is an advanced airborne command post; and 16 are the CX-X for use in supporting our diplomatic missions overseas.

I'd like to say a few words about the F-15. It is looking good. We are having normal break-in problems with the engine. Five aircraft are flying, and the pilots think it is great.

For strategic missiles, we are spending far less than a decade ago when we were in the rapid buildup of our missile forces. They reached their present numbers in 1967. Since then we have been modernizing—not increasing numbers. In 1974, we have three major update actions. We will complete our procurement of the Minuteman III program and reach the currently approved level of 550 operational in FY 75. We will continue to upgrade the silos to give them more survivability, and continue to install a command data buffer to give us a rapid retargeting capability.

Now I would like to talk about a third topic, improving cost management of weapons systems development. Ten years ago the

Air Force started working on a reporting and control system which would give us a better measure of how a contractor's program was coming along relative to time schedules and predicted costs. We wanted a single data collecting and reporting system which would provide both the DOD and the contractor with an accurate appraisal of cost status—early enough to avoid large cost overruns. We wanted to avoid a contractor using one set of cost/schedule data and the services using a separate set. The concept which the Air Force developed and which was finally adopted was the cost schedule control systems criteria, or CSCSC. In simple terms, CSCSC are criteria, or "specs," which a contractor's cost/schedule reporting system must meet—much like a cockpit checklist.

There was a lot of opposition to the system, and it was not until 1969 that the first contractor was validated under CSCSC. Today there are 60 contractors whose cost/schedule reporting systems have been validated as meeting DOD "specs." The Air Force, which innovated the criteria, is the lead service with 46 of the 60. All Air Force major weapons systems contractors, such as those which have the F-15 and the B-1 airframe, engines and avionics contracts, have been validated. This is a highly significant step in increasing management effectiveness. The services and the contractors are using a single set of data for tracking development and procurement programs—and collectively we are doing a far better job than we've ever done before.

Another area where improvement and enlightenment are needed is dealing with "cost growth." Most of you know that OSD submits quarterly progress reports to Congress on 45 major weapons systems procurements. These reports are called selected acquisition reports, or more commonly, "SARs." The Air Force provides these reports on a dozen systems such as the F-15, B-1, A-10, and Minuteman III. The SARs have resulted in much improved communication between the services and the Congress; and, in my opinion, no one single thing has done as much to avoid cost overruns as the SAR system. It keeps program totals before the contractor, the system program office (SPO), the air staff, DOD and the Congress. However, the SAR financial section is too simplistic. We provide two program cost figures—the development estimate and the current estimate. It is a simple exercise for critics of defense spending to take the difference and label it "Cost Growth" or "Cost Overrun." This so-called "Cost Growth" is an inaccurate and meaningless figure; it is comparing apples and oranges in many cases with no allowance for inflation. A better system would be one where the difference between the development estimate and the current estimate would be adequately identified. For example, weapons cost increases can be traced to one of three major categories: (1) either program changes, meaning changes in quantities, changes in the capability of the system, or changes in scheduling; or (2) inflation, which has been abnormally high in recent years; or (3) those costs which can be rightfully attributed to management effectiveness. The present system automatically attributes any increase to bad management.

We hope to develop a new SAR format which will provide this breakout. Such a system would be advantageous to both the services and the Congress and should help eliminate some of the confusion about so-called "Cost Growth."

In summary, our defense forces today, both DOD in general and the Air Force specifically, cost less than a decade ago in terms of the people, goods and services taken from the economy. Over-all, our forces are leaner, tougher and more experienced than they have ever been. Further budget cuts will mean reducing force structure—fewer army

divisions, fewer carrier forces and fewer Air Force Wings.

If further cuts are made, we may well be in a position of being "Penny-Wise and Pound-Foolish." It costs far less to maintain our strength than it would cost to fall behind and have to catch up, even if that could be done.

#### TEMPLE CITY HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM SETS NEW CIF RECORD

### HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me and my constituents in paying tribute to Temple City's outstanding high school varsity football team and coaches who have set a record in southern California's Interscholastic Federation competition of 43 consecutive victories to continue a winning streak which began in 1969.

The community of Temple City is extremely proud of the coaches and teams who have brought them acclaim and recognition through their extraordinary achievements in the sport of football. In honor of the records and accomplishments of Temple City High School's brilliant varsity football coaches and the hard-driving players who have defended this championship, I include in the Record a resolution adopted by the board of education of the Temple City Unified School District to commend the 1972/Rams team and coaches; and, I also include for the Record the names of the players and coaches in each of the preceding Rams varsity teams who participated in this spectacular winning streak to set a new CIF record.

The material follows:

#### TEMPLE CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT— RESOLUTION No. 5

A Resolution by the Board of Education of the Temple City Unified School District commending the varsity football coaches and team of Temple City High School.

Whereas, the 1972 Temple City High School varsity football team has completed the season with 13 wins, no losses or ties; and

Whereas, this accomplishment extended the record of team victories to 43 without a defeat, a record for Southern California CIF competition; and

Whereas, the team won the Southern California Interscholastic Federation AA Division championship; and

Whereas, the team won the third consecutive CIF football championship, another record for Southern California CIF competition; and

Whereas, the records and accomplishments of the coaches and team have brought acclaim to the community and School District of Temple City;

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED, that coaches Robert Hitchcock, Edward Mohr, Donald Swanson, Brian Beveridge and Norm Parker—Managers Herb Cole, Bob Eley, Mike Ferrari, and others who assisted, be commended for their efforts and achievements:

And, be it further resolved that team members Kevin George, Mike Bernal, Don Sterling, Jeff Edwards, Roger Brooks, Rich Mueller, Ross Malinowski, Mitch Slagle, Dan



Hanzel, Chuck Martin, Ron Blankenbaker, John Rodriguez, Steve Wallen, Eric Arm-burst, Jeff Cimmarusti, Dennis Bennalack, Steven Froyum, Arthur Miyashita, Mike Moore, Curtis Williams, Brad Rounds, Steve Grubb, Dave McLaren, Len Strelitz, Bill Gal-lagher, Marty Cloherty, Bob Callas, Richie Johnston, Marc Biro, Mike Kokayko, Rick Brown, Bob Zamarripa, Rick Munyon, Mike Nanko, Bill Noble, Tim Abeyta, Alan Nielsen, Bob Teel, and be commended for their skill, sportsmanship, and accomplishments;

And, be it still further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be sent to each coach and team member.

TEMPLE CITY RAMS ROSTER, 1971

No.	Name	Position	Weight
11	Bob Callas	B	150
12	Bill Wilson	B	185
20	Craig Brown	B	165
21	Bob Zamarripa	B	160
22	Andy Roundtree	B	155
23	Jerry Cimmarusti	B	150
30	Mike Moore	B	190
32	Mike Nanko	B	165
33	Rick Brown	B	160
40	Bill Noble	B	160
41	Robbie Jones	B	145
42	Stan Waller	B	165
43	Bob Teel	B	145
50	Ron Lakey	C	200
51	Dave MacLaren	C	160
52	Jim Talbot	C	160
60	Mike Evans	G	170
61	Gary Lineback	G	165
62	Fred Hitchman	G	169
63	Ted Moreno	G	155
64	Mark Morimoto	G	170
65	Curtis Williams	G	160
70	Dennis O'Toole	T	180
71	John Cambianica	T	210
72	Dan Hanzel	T	155
73	Mark Pizzorno	T	195
74	Frank McInnes	T	195
75	John Rodriguez	T	155
80	Aurelio Molina	E	155
81	Kevin Bushley	E	165
82	Don Sterling	E	170
83	Bob Johnson	E	155
84	Paul Peterson	E	175
85	Jeff Wood	E	175
86	Roger Brooks	E	160

Coaches: Bob Hitchcock, Ed Mohr, Don Swanson, Brian Beveridge.

TEMPLE CITY RAMS VARSITY ROSTER, 1970

No	Name	Position	Yr	Weight
11	Jim Callas	B	12	155
12	Bill Wilson	B	11	175
20	Craig Brown	B	11	165
21	Craig Hunt	B	12	150
22	Andy Roundtree	B	11	155
23	Jerry Cimmarusti	B	11	145
30	Larry Mushinski	B	12	200
31	Steve Weddle	B	12	160
33	Dean Bennett	B	12	165
40	Joe Westfall	B	12	160
41	Robbie Jones	B	11	145
42	Stan Waller	B	12	145
43	Robert Fastlaben	B	12	145
50	Ron Lakey	C	11	195
51	Joe Gamm	C	12	180
52	Jim Talbot	C	11	140
53	Jack Thomson	C	12	150
60	Darrell Hammer	G	12	140
61	Richard Dion	G	12	150
62	Fred Hitchman	G	11	150
63	Craig Potter	G	12	175
65	Dale Shaffer	G	12	170
66	William Hurley	G	12	165
70	Dennis O'Toole	T	11	170
72	Kirk Kolar	T	12	165
73	Morris Baumgarten	T	12	200
74	Jim MacLaren	T	12	160
75	Scott Powell	T	12	165
76	Nick Torres	T	12	210
80	Aurelio Molina	E	11	150
81	Bob Vargo	E	12	180
82	Randy Carucci	E	12	170
83	Bob Johnston	E	11	150
84	Paul Peterson	E	11	160
85	Larry Franklin	E	12	155
86	Andre Flammang	E	12	160
87	Richard Cuen	E	12	170

Managers: Ken Glick, Bobby Ely, Ed Sheets.  
Coaches: Bob Hitchcock, Ed Mohr, Don Swanson, Brian Beveridge.

1st string offensive:			1st string defensive:		
81	Vargo, B.		82	Carucci, R.	
66	Hurley, W.		86	Flammang, O.	
31	Weddle, S.		75	Powell, S.	
63	Potter, C.		22	Roundtree, A.	
11	Callas, J.		50	Lakey, R.	
51	Gamm, J.		40	Westfall, J.	
30	Mushinski, L.		73	Baumgarten, M.	
61	Dion, R.		33	Bennett, D.	
20	Brown, C.		74	MacLaren, J.	
72	Kolar, K.		21	Hunt, C.	
83	Johnston, Bob		80	Molina, A.	

ELIGIBILITY LIST, CALIFORNIA INTERSCHOLASTIC FEDERATION, SOUTHERN SECTION—TEMPLE CITY HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY FOOTBALL, SEPTEMBER 1969

Names of contestants	Grade	Birth record	Number of semesters in attendance in secondary schools including this one
Alden, Henry	12	Sept. 10, 1952	7
Arthur, Paul	11	May 23, 1953	5
Baumgarten, Morris	11	Feb. 28, 1953	5
Bennett, Dean	11	June 1, 1953	5
Bergor, Clint	12	Jan. 5, 1952	7
Brigham, Mark	12	Dec. 15, 1951	7
Callas, Jim	11	Dec. 31, 1952	5
Carucci, Randy	11	Jan. 20, 1953	5
Cude, Larry	12	Nov. 10, 1952	7
Cuen, Richard	11	Apr. 19, 1953	5
Dion, Richard	11	July 11, 1953	5
Fastlaben, Robert	11	Mar. 14, 1953	5
Flammang, Andre	11	Feb. 7, 1953	5
Fradella, Rick	11	Dec. 19, 1952	5
Gamm, Joseph	11	May 31, 1953	5
Goetz, Leo	12	June 16, 1952	7
Hart, Tom	11	Aug. 18, 1953	5
Higbie, Paul	12	Apr. 25, 1952	7
Horst, Philip	11	Sept. 13, 1952	5
Hunt, Craig M.	11	July 6, 1952	5
Hurley, Bill	11	July 12, 1953	5
Kennedy, Ken	12	Sept. 24, 1952	7
Kolar, Kirk	11	Aug. 17, 1953	5
Leja, Robert	11	July 30, 1953	5
MacLaren, Jim	11	July 7, 1953	5
McDaniel, Louis	12	Dec. 10, 1951	7
McInnes, Frank	10	May 22, 1954	3
Moreno, David	12	Dec. 4, 1951	7
Mushinski, Larry	11	Sept. 1, 1953	5
Nicassio, Sam	12	Nov. 11, 1952	7
Norman, Charles	12	June 5, 1952	7
Peterson, Gregg	12	Apr. 24, 1952	7
Potter, Craig	11	May 6, 1953	5
Powell, Peter (Scol)	11	Sept. 30, 1953	5
Sherick, Todd	11	Feb. 21, 1953	5
Skelly, Peter	12	Jan. 30, 1952	7
Tolmachoff, Wayne	12	Apr. 20, 1952	7
Van DeVerre, John	12	Apr. 7, 1952	7
Vargo, Bob	11	Jan. 31, 1954	5
Weddle, Steve	11	July 13, 1952	7
Wehrly, Craig	12	May 27, 1952	7
Westfall, Joe	11	Oct. 11, 1953	5
Wilkerson, Dale	12	June 17, 1952	7
Brown, Craig	10	Feb. 26, 1954	3

Note: Contestants passed in 4 subjects in last 2 semesters.

UPGRADING ZOOS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I was startled recently to read in the April 9, 1973, edition of the Washington Post charges regarding the conditions animals must live in at the National Zoo in Washington, D.C. It was charged that the animals are not getting proper treatment, morale among zoo staff is low, animals suffer unnecessary deaths, and the public is being cheated because the animals are not representative physically and mentally of their wild counterparts. Charges of animal deaths due to for-

eign material in their food were denied by the chief veterinarian at the National Zoo, but he did admit some animals have died in recent years because of mineral and vitamin deficiencies, and because they refused to eat. Action is currently being taken, it is reported, to end the vitamin and mineral deficiencies, but the veterinarian says it may be 2 or 3 years before it is determined how important these two items are in causing animal deaths.

What a catastrophe to force animals into such an existence and what an even greater tragedy to restrict and confine the endeavors of those responsible for their keep to inadequate budgets and facilities.

Unfortunately the conditions at the National Zoo are generally representative of zoo conditions across the country. An outstanding zoo in this country is a rarity, and they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Administrators of zoos are strapped with totally insufficient funds to properly maintain facilities, let alone provide the proper living conditions for the wide variety of animal and birdlife under their care.

Zoo management and keepers, by and large, are much more enlightened regarding animal treatment than their budgets permit. Even the National Zoo director agreed with criticism of cramped cages. The lion house was termed "pitiful," and an "1890 style menagerie house."

One of the alleged values of a zoo is its use as an educational tool for children. I wonder if such conditions are creating the positive attitude toward animals, and life, that we blithely think they are.

Zoos all across the Nation need to be redesigned, revamped, changed, or expanded. Zookeepers, technicians, veterinarians, and management personnel need to be trained in the latest techniques of efficient zoo operation. All this takes money and personnel. Properly operated and carried out it could be the genesis of a revolution in zoos, and we could eliminate the terrible conditions prevalent in so many zoos across this Nation.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1266, which would provide assistance in improving zoos and aquariums by creating a National Zoological and Aquarium Corporation.

The Corporation is authorized to set standards for the accreditation of zoos and aquariums, and is further authorized to provide technical assistance and grants to meet those standards.

The funds can be used to train a professional staff, establish a pilot project for a model zoo or aquarium, insure mortgages during construction projects, carry out needed construction or modernization of the zoo or aquarium, and similar upgrading and expansion projects.

The bill provides a legislative vehicle to achieve the improvement of our zoos, and through the revolving fund established by the bill, without undue drain on the Treasury.

News items regarding zoo conditions are not infrequent. The increasing regularity of such stories in nearly all papers reflects the increased awareness of the American public concerning the conditions captive animals are enforced to endure. That is a good sign. For if man has respect for animal life, how much more for the life of his fellow man?

H.R. 1266 has been referred to the Committee on House Administration. I urge those favoring the bill to voice their support to the committee at H326 Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20515. Anyone wanting further information or a copy of the bill can write to me at 424 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

#### HOUSEWIVES ON HIGH COSTS

### HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, Mitchell, S. Dak., is a city of less than 15,000 people. It is the home of the world's only corn palace and owes its livelihood almost entirely to the residents of the smaller farming communities for many miles around. Mitchell is understandably more aware of the situation of the farmer than the average American city, and yet a group of farm housewives from Menno and Olivet, S. Dak., two of the farming communities near Mitchell, felt compelled to once again tell the story of the farmer. Their story is told in a letter to the editor of the Mitchell Daily Republic.

The letter follows:

#### THE OTHER SIDE

To the Editor:

We are a group of young farm wives who are not opposed to fighting inflation. We have to live with inflation just as much as anyone else. We feel that FIT (Fight Inflation Together) is fighting in the wrong direction. Farm prices are no higher than they were 20 years ago, while most other prices have doubled and tripled in that time.

Fresh meat is still one of our best nutritional buys, even at today's prices. Some convenience meats are sky high, but that is due to the wages paid to people who work in factories and processing plants. Meat prices "on the hoof" are about the same as they were 20 years ago. Why then are across-the-counter prices higher? It is due to high wages. Corn, wheat and other grains are priced lower than 20 years ago. Why then are bread and cereals much higher? The answer again, high wages. The farmer has sat by and watched prices paid to him go down or stay the same while prices he paid for seed, feed, machinery and everything else go up and up. How would the factory worker, businessman or teacher like to live on what he made 20 years ago and pay today's prices?

The farmer couldn't do it so all he could do was try to expand. While he didn't get as much per bushel of corn or pound of beef, if his volume was greater he could survive.

Why is FIT focusing on meat? Many other food prices have gone up more than meat. Why don't they boycott the garment industry or the automobile industry. It costs us almost twice as much to clothe our youngest children as it did to clothe our older children when they were young.

The family farm is the backbone of America, and if it is allowed or forced to die, the land will be taken over by large corporations. If this happens, food prices will be controlled by a few who will have the power to price their product. If the FIT group thinks they have high prices now, beware, they haven't seen anything yet, if this is allowed to happen.

We believe if the women protesting the high cost of meat would have an understanding of how much it costs to produce a bushel of corn or a pound of meat, they would feel differently.

We are sending you this letter in the sincere hope that you will print our side of the story.

FARM WIVES OF MENNO & OLIVET, S. DAK.

South Dakota is the most agricultural State in the United States. Still even in South Dakota only one in five persons is directly involved in farming as a farm manager or laborer. If the farmer's story must be told in Mitchell, S. Dak., it is obvious that it must be told across the country so that the 95 percent who have no direct involvement in farming may come to understand why they are so well fed on such a small percentage of their income while those who feed them must live on an average income which is a great deal less than their own.

Those who think that the farmer is getting rich on today's prices do not know the story.

#### A COMMUNITY EFFORT WORTH COPYING

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in the 4 short years since the first Earth Day observance, America has redirected its national goals to include a healthy environment for future generations. We have not yet agreed on the best way to accomplish this goal but we have committed our energies to its achievement. Since 1970, we have witnessed the growth of the environment as a viable political issue both at home and internationally.

Much of the credit for the new national awareness must go to those citizens who have recognized the urgency of the environmental issue and have made their own personal commitment to the solution of these problems. Their efforts are reflected in the passage of major legislation and landmark court decisions protecting the environment.

I am especially proud that citizens from my 34th Congressional District in New York have been particularly active in the fight against pollution. Their leadership in environmental affairs has been recognized nationally and has made the entire Rochester community vitally aware of pollution problems and their consequences.

This past Sunday, the Nation's biggest Earth Week observance was held in Rochester when area citizens "Walk for Water." An estimated 15,000 people spent their Sunday afternoons walking a 16-mile course around the city with sponsors paying anywhere from \$2 to \$50 for every mile they complete. The walk, sponsored

by the Monroe County Conservation Council grossed \$74,000 in 1971 with 5,000 participants despite a spring snowstorm. Last year, over 10,000 walkers netted pledges of \$185,000 from their community sponsors.

The degree of community involvement is not the only unique characteristic of the walk. All of the funds raised go to only one organization, Delta Laboratories, a nonprofit environmental research and testing center in Rochester. Delta was established 2 years ago with the funds raised by the first Walk for Water and organized through the efforts of the conservation council. The laboratory scientifically documents suspected pollution cases, providing the proof necessary for individuals and citizens' groups to urge abatement action and institute legal proceedings if necessary.

Recent programs have included a study of metal contamination in fish from the Great Lakes; analyses for radioactivity of water, plant, and animal life surrounding 12 nuclear power plants in New York and adjacent States, and a continuing "Atom's Garden" project, where vegetables are grown with water taken downstream from a nuclear reprocessing plant in an attempt to determine if there is significant accumulation of radioactive elements.

Although it has only a small full-time staff, Delta has made good use of the wealth of professional talent, scientific and nonscientific, in Monroe County. Medical doctors, attorneys, Ph. D.'s in many fields, engineers, geologists, limnologists, and chemists actively participate in a variety of laboratory's programs.

Tests are performed free of charge for the more than 20 member organizations of the Monroe County Conservation Council and for most county residents and citizen's groups seeking documentation of an area environmental problem. Once positive identification of a pollution source is made, pressure can be applied by citizen's organizations and legal action can be taken.

Wayne Harris, a Rochester attorney and president of Delta Labs, has directed much of Delta's efforts at obtaining protective legislation on the local, State, and Federal level. As we in this Chamber well know, reliable test results, samples, photos, statistics, and expert testimony, are absolutely necessary before legislative action can be taken at any level of government.

William Hutchinson, an officer of Delta and an area insurance executive, points out that Delta is totally independent from government or industry support and can, therefore, as a free agent in their search for evidence of pollution.

It is community commitment of the variety exhibited by the sponsors and participants in the Walk for Water and by the volunteers who direct the activities of Delta Labs who have helped make possible much of the progress that has been made in environmental improvements.

To the officers and board of directors must go an immense amount of credit, as each holds down a full-time job and yet takes many hours each week to work



with the lab and prepare for the Walk for Water. Wayne Harris, Grant Pike, William Hutchinson, and Raymond Huther serve as officers of Delta with Jack Bennett, Cornelius Murphy, Richard Parent, and Jack Battaglia as members of the board. They have made their personal commitment to the preservation of the environment and the people of Monroe County.

The story of Delta Laboratory and the citizens who run it and finance it is spreading. Just a week ago, Albany citizens sponsored their own "Walk" to raise money for Delta. A small college in Tennessee, hearing of Delta's work has organized its own fund drive for the benefit of the lab.

This citizen effort on behalf of a healthy environment is one of many instances of citizen involvement throughout the Nation. But it is unique in its size, its professional thoroughness, and the imaginative leadership which has given area residents the opportunity for a full voice in the environmental affairs of their community.

It is a community effort which deserves the scrutiny of other areas.

#### COALITION FOR HEALTH FUNDING FIGHTS BACK

### HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, it is comforting to know that we in Congress who oppose the cutbacks in health programs and medical research do not carry on our fight alone. Throughout the Nation, concerned citizens rally to this cause which may mean the difference between life and death, sickness or well-being for thousands unless Congress acts now to force the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to rollback the proposed slashes in funding.

One of the most influential and successful proponents of a well-balanced health and research budget is the Coalition for Health Funding. The coalition, which is comprised of a number of national organizations interested in adequate health care for our citizens, is chaired by Constance Holleran of the American Nurses Association and often represented on Capitol Hill by Mr. Franklin R. Silbey, an able and articulate spokesman. A quick review of their membership list indicates the depth of their concern by groups which include the American Academy of Cerebral Palsy, the American Association of College of Nursing, the American Association of Dental Schools, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the United Steelworkers of America, and other worthy organizations.

During the controversy which has raged in recent months over the question of health spending, the Coalition for Health Funding has played an invaluable role by providing Congress with the facts we need to make proper decisions on matters which could affect the health

of an entire country. We need to know exactly what programs are being cut, how much is going to be impounded, and, most importantly, what effect will this action have on our districts and the Nation as a whole. The coalition has not only been able to provide the answers, but has also our attention to the potential danger which cuts in research funding might have on future generations.

An example of the coalition's efforts to keep the facts correct is contained in a recent letter from Ms. Holleran to the Washington Post. So my colleagues may judge for themselves, I include the text of Ms. Holleran's letter in the RECORD at this point:

THE REAL MESSAGE FROM HEW: "HEALTH IS NOT A MAJOR CONCERN"

(By Connie Holleran)

On Feb. 20, Marquis Childs did an excellent column entitled "Cutbacks in the War Against Disease" detailing how the President's fiscal year 1974 budget does severe, long-term harm to health programs and health research. HEW Secretary Weinberger responded to that column (Letters, March 17) with several claims that cannot go unrefuted.

Mr. Weinberger indicates that total health expenditures will increase by some \$3 billion in FY '74. He neglects, however, to clearly point out that virtually all such increases will take the form of expansion of Medicare and Medicaid benefits enacted by Congress last year. These are, for the most part, separately financed from trust funds rather than general revenues.

Mr. Weinberger claims that the federal government is acting correctly by ending support for Community Mental Health Centers. \$636,000,000 is added into the FY '74 budget, although that amount would be spent in the years 1975-80—not for 1974 spending for phaseout of this successful program which has cut admissions to state mental institutions. Without federal aid, few localities will be able to maintain these facilities. Unfortunately, few health insurers pay yet for out-of-hospital mental health care.

It is true, as the Secretary says, the funding for heart and cancer research has been increased, but simultaneously, vitally-needed research budgets for nine of our National Institutes of Health have either been cut or barely maintained at previous levels. Inflation's bite is making existing stationary NIH research budgets meaningless in terms of real additional progress. Exciting new developments and potential breakthroughs in such areas as diabetes, blindness, tooth decay and arthritis may be indefinitely delayed because of such perniciousness.

Damage done by such short-sighted policies will affect all of us for generations. The Secretary does not seem to grasp what the President's budget cuts will do to our supply of health professionals. Our pharmacy, optometry, nursing and other health professional schools expanded enrollments to meet the severe shortages pointed out by the President himself. Support for Allied Health and Public Health Training is to be wiped out. Expecting federal aid to defray the increased costs in terms of equipment, salary and student aid, they now find the ground cut out from under them by the President's proposed ending of such assistance.

There is no money to recruit low-income students and the new student aid programs being proposed come nowhere near providing realistic scholarship aid. Instead, we shall have to continue to raid foreign nations with serious health manpower needs of their own for health professionals for this country.

All across the board, except in programs where statutory controls limit the adminis-

tration's ability to control funding, federal health programs—through fund cuts—are turning into disaster areas, as Mr. Childs aptly pointed out. Alcoholism programs will not be funded. Regional Medical Programs are being rapidly phased out. Family Planning Programs appear to be getting an increase in the budget, yet that too is the result of budget maneuvering resulting from a program transfer. Promising new experiments in emergency care and medical research are to be snubbed out and in each category we are on the verge of significant advances.

What emerges is what appears to be a lack of understanding by the Office of Management and Budget of the health needs of this country. Medical research and health programs often do not yield instant tangible dividends, yet this seems to be the criterion being applied to them. Underneath the book-keeping ledger domain claiming a "better than ever health program" from Washington is the real message: health is not a major concern.

#### TAX DAY AND AN OUTRAGED PUBLIC

### HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, on this, the deadline day for filing Federal income tax returns in the United States, I would like to take the opportunity to share with my colleagues in the House, at least one writer's view of the frustration and hostility many taxpayers feel, not only at this time of year but generally.

Of primary importance to me is that this writer, whose work is published in the Pittsburgh Press, directly reflects the feelings of many of my own constituents in the 18th District, but none of us should be deluded into thinking these expressions are limited only to western Pennsylvania.

I am certain my colleagues share my concern about the outrage our constituents feel, both on tax day and throughout the year. With that in mind, I would again remind my colleagues that I have proposed legislation, H.R. 636, the Tax Review Policy Act of 1973, which would assure careful congressional assessment of each tax preference by providing for their termination over a 3-year period.

I have long believed that tax policy can and should be used as a selective instrument of Government policy providing incentives or disincentives for various activities in the private sector. However, past congressional actions on tax bills have slowly eroded the income tax base by providing and maintaining numerous tax preferences, many of which demand critical reexamination. The time for such a reexamination has now come and my bill would provide the machinery for the determination as to which can be justified and which cannot.

These preferences serve only to escalate the tax bills of millions of hard-working Americans, already hard-put to meet the financial demands our inflated economy puts on them.

The following article, I believe, is a true reflection of how many of our con-

stituents feel on tax day and throughout the year. It is by Henry J. Taylor, and appeared in the April 16 issue of the Pittsburgh Press. The article follows:

**TAX BURDEN CREATING PUBLIC BACKLASH**  
(By Henry J. Taylor)

Tax day is gloom day. It's an invitation to a self-beheading.

All administrations in the history of our country since George Washington through World War II—which means including two world wars—taxed the people \$248 billion.

The U.S. Treasury Department officially estimates that in this single year, 1973 alone, federal taxes will approach that \$248 billion!

Every working man wants to pay his proper taxes. But he does not want to support a lot of things he has no business paying for.

For taxes can be sound, but they also can be robbery. And the Washington Robin Hoods of the red ink are robbing us deaf, dumb and blind through their boobland decisions, pork-barrel politics and other incredible wastes.

They spend, we pay. Their favorite charity is themselves.

No wonder we taxpaying peasants have a feeling of anxiety, impatience, resentment—a nagging, gnawing feeling that, after all, our sacrifices really get us nowhere.

Don't thank the politicians for anything they say they are giving us. A government is a spender, not an earner. Anything the Robin Hoods of the red ink say they are giving the people they must first take away from the people.

Thank, instead, productive America and the conscientious taxpayers who meet their personal taxes, passed-on taxes, hidden taxes, etc. Any man who can meet these and meet his family's living bills as well is a miracle man, indeed.

Taxes today are the biggest single item in the cost of living. Nothing else—food, clothes, rent or anything—is even a close second.

A Gallup Poll reports that 69 percent (seven persons in every 10) say taxes are "too high." This is 17 points higher than ever before—an all-time high in tax protesters. Gallup finds that the threat of "a taxpayers' revolt is very real."

Citizens are banding together at local and state levels to stop the slick tricks and incredible waste.

One Pennsylvania community, for example, started a short time ago with a few outraged people in its Concerned Taxpayers' League, and today has more than a thousand. The Pennsylvania Association of Tax Leagues now has 140,000 members.

A New Jersey group now has many Washington overspenders climbing up the wall.

Wisconsin tax expert Arch Ely tells me "the tax fat is in the fire out here." And so it is going—and spreading.

More power to all this. In their outrage these good folks are doing something about the great tax robbery.

Yet a nationwide Urban Coalition Council survey reveals that 65 per cent of the eligible voters do not vote regularly. Failure to vote is a cop-out on responsibility. It is, moreover, an inexcusable cop-out when you realize that our representatives vote our taxes and that our apathy is their most effective tool.

The nationwide survey shows that only 65 per cent can name both their U.S. senators. Half of them cannot name their U.S. representative. About 86 per cent cannot name any policy, including taxes, that their congressmen stand for—the very men who vote the taxes onto us.

We taxpayers are the Atlas on whose shoulders the Washington Robins perch in their lush, comfortable place on high. We are the largest single bloc in the country. It's high time this Atlas shrugged its shoulders.

If every other interest can be heard in

Washington, why can't ours? It will be—if enough messages from an outraged public—loud and clear—reach Washington.

We have only this hope—an outraged public opinion. And tax day is a perfect day to show it.

#### INDIVIDUAL WORKS TO SAVE ENVIRONMENT

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to an article that appeared a short time ago in the Los Angeles Times. This article dealt with Mrs. Joseph Le Conte and her efforts against rampant land development in the beautiful Palos Verdes Peninsula in California.

No one need be told today of the importance of preserving our natural resources. In this case Mrs. Le Conte, as cochairman of Save Our Coast—SOC—directed an action against the regional planning commission and a master plan of apartment developers. She states that their plan would have so drastically changed the peninsula that it would have completely destroyed the pastoral community.

Mrs. Le Conte's community efforts span 18 years and involve many issues. In this particular environment cause her lengthy efforts were eventually vindicated by the California Supreme Court's decision of last year holding that the principle of one man, one vote in effect barred large land developers from dominating land use patterns. Today, she is pursuing a plan to incorporate the peninsula area into a city, thus consolidating the court victory.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have enough words to praise private citizens, such as Mrs. Le Conte, who through their personal initiative, tireless perseverance, and fine work are helping to save America's environment.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the article follows:

#### INDIVIDUAL WORKS TO SAVE ENVIRONMENT (By Robert J. Allan)

ROLLING HILLS.—When Alan Lerner wrote, "On a clear day, you can see forever," he probably wasn't thinking of the view from the Joseph LeConte home—but he could have been.

The view and what it represents is the single most important part of the life of Dorothy (Mrs. Joseph) LeConte.

Standing in her expansive living room she sees a coastline panorama reaching from Malibu and the Santa Monica Bay on one side to the Orange County coast near Laguna Beach on the other. Mt. Wilson and Mt. Baldy loom on the horizon to the rear.

The slopes below the home, which is perched on a three-acre hilltop, are dotted with white-fenced corrals and trees.

#### AT WAR WITH DEVELOPERS

And while she doesn't spend much of her day drinking in the view, she does use it therapeutically—she says her home is a rest and recuperation break in her running war with developers she says are seeking to destroy the pastoral atmosphere of her Palos Verdes Peninsula.

Mrs. LeConte says her efforts against ram-

nant development of the peninsula stem from two factors: her love of her community and an abiding interest in the political process.

Her community involvement began shortly after she moved to Rolling Hills with her husband and two sons 18 years ago.

In those days the tiny walled enclave was much smaller than its current 2,100 population. Mrs. LeConte, who served as president of the Rolling Hills Women's Community Club in the mid-1950s, could know everybody in town then. Of course, there were only about 1,200 residents and street parties usually welcomed new residents.

#### I LIKE ROOTS

She describes Rolling Hills as a stable community and it is that stability that she likes.

"I like roots, I'm old-fashioned that way," she says.

But even a stable community changes and about two-thirds of the old-timers have since moved away.

Mrs. LeConte's next major involvement in her community came in the early 1960s when she served on a steering committee for school unification. Before that high school students attended schools in Redondo Beach, El Segundo and Harbor City.

Students, however, wanted to attend school near their homes and eventually the Palos Verdes Unified School District was formed with its first high school taken over from the Los Angeles district.

A Democrat, Mrs. LeConte describes herself as liberal in sentiment but moderate in politics. She admits to supporting Republicans for nonpartisan offices.

Graduated from UC Berkeley with a degree in economics, Mrs. LeConte returned to school after moving here. She obtained a degree in political science from UCLA and eventually taught political science at both UCLA and Cal State U Long Beach while studying for a doctorate.

Her next effort, one that is still going on, came in 1969 when she became co-chairman of SOC (Save Our Coastline).

SOC is an outgrowth of a former community planning committee which included members from the three independent peninsula cities, the library and school districts, county representatives, the League of Women Voters, developers and the Peninsula Advisory Council, an amalgamation of homeowners' associations.

Then, in late 1969 the county Regional Planning Commission made public its master plan for the unincorporated portion of the peninsula.

At that time the peninsula was 90% single-family residential and 10% apartments but the plan envisioned 90% apartment development and 10% for single-family use, a situation that she claims would have destroyed the natural coastline, overcrowded the schools and caused traffic problems on small peninsular roads.

Mrs. LeConte talked to Fred Hesse, then mayor of Rolling Hills and a peninsula leader, about her concern. Hesse subsequently asked her if she would serve as co-chairman of SOC along with Mrs. Helene Drown.

Many community organizations are nonpartisan but SOC, from its inception, was bipartisan. Mrs. LeConte represented the more liberal side and Mrs. Drown, a Republican, the conservative.

And SOC capitalized on the reservoir of talented people living on the peninsula and attracted those persons who could use their expertise to further the group's goals: preservation of the rural environment and protecting the coastline from uncontrolled development.

#### RESERVOIR OF TALENT

Prior to the formation of SOC, the advisory council in mid-1969 commissioned a feasibility study on creation of a fourth city out



of the unincorporated county territory, a city which could control its own destiny rather than having decision made by county supervisors 30 miles away in downtown Los Angeles.

With its forces marshalled, SOC began to make its displeasure over county plans known. And shortly after SOC was formed, the late Supervisor Burton Chace announced in January, 1970, that the master plan for the peninsula was "dead."

But fearing that it could be brought back to life, SOC persisted with its campaign to incorporate the fourth peninsula city, Rancho Palos Verdes.

In September of 1970, the organization suffered a setback when supervisors ruled that protests from large landowners were sufficient to block incorporation proceedings.

SOC, however, turned to the courts and last year the California Supreme Court ruled that one-man, one-vote doctrine should prevail in incorporation moves.

The Board of Supervisors had held that protests based on assessed valuation could be considered in deciding cityhood bids but SOC maintained, and the courts agreed, that the number of registered voters should be the deciding factor.

Now that the legalities are over the county is expected to call a cityhood election on the Rancho Palos Verdes incorporation this spring.

If cityhood wins the new municipality probably will adopt a SOC land use plan. If it loses "all our efforts will go down the tubes," says Mrs. LeConte. "Our main accomplishment will be that we have fought a delaying action."

But even if defeat is to come Mrs. LeConte sees some benefits in the fourth city campaign. "We have earned the respect of our antagonists and we have convinced a lot of people that our cause is just," she declared.

But she is optimistic that the residents of the peninsula will approve cityhood.

What will happen to SOC when the fourth city is formed? Mrs. LeConte sees the organization remaining alive to work on problems affecting all the peninsula cities.

#### POLICE AGENCY SEEN

Among those considerations would be formation of a police department to serve all four cities instead of the current independent department in Palos Verdes Estates and county sheriff and fire services contracts for the rest of the area.

In the months that the fourth city case was in the courts Mrs. LeConte did not remain idle. One of her recent interests is serving on the county's Beach Advisory Committee and she points with pride to her successful campaign to block development of condominiums and townhouses in Portuguese Bend.

Instead part of the former slide area and the neighboring Abalone Cove beach club have been purchased and will be developed as a county park.

In the future, Mrs. LeConte is looking to the day when she will step down from her SOC post. She describes her three years as cochairman as "an enjoyable opportunity that should be shared." She advocates using the pool of talent on the peninsula and letting someone else carry on SOC's work.

For herself, she plans on writing her doctoral dissertation. "I owe that to myself and all the people who have had confidence in me," she says.

She also would like to devote some time to the one son who still lives at home and to her consulting geologist husband. And she would like to take time to do some cooking. "I really am a good cook," she says.

#### STRESSES OPTIMISM

She describes herself as possessing political know-how, being able to understand the nature of problems, being tenacious and optimistic, "especially optimistic."

Her shortcomings, she says, are being too blunt, too assertive, insensitive to other people's feelings "although I don't mean to" and arbitrary in some of her attitudes and actions. Opponents have termed her "rough, ruthless and tactless."

Not oblivious to these failings, she attempts to overcome them whenever she thinks about them.

And when she isn't devoting time to her family or her outside endeavors Mrs. LeConte would like to take some time for simply enjoying the tranquility of her hillside environment.

She says she feels renewed when she returns to the peninsula from carrying on her battles.

The openness and quietness of the hills make all the fighting worthwhile she says.

### HOSPITAL SELF-HELP

#### HON. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, there a few Members of Congress who have not been approached at one time or another about additional funds for hospitals in their districts. To indicate that perhaps Federal funding is not always the only answer to health-care problems, I am including in today's RECORD an account from the Ogden Standard-Examiner. The people of Bear River Valley in northern Utah were able to completely restore their hospital, using locally raised money and over 4,000 hours of volunteer labor. This clearly is an alternative to the pleas for Federal funds, and I strongly recommend this account to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, Apr. 9, 1973]

STANDARD'S EXAMINER

(By Murray M. Moier)

TREMONTON.—If prizes are given in Utah this year for community cooperation, the top award should go to the folks of Bear River Valley.

Using good old American ingenuity with liberal applications of elbow grease—they have reopened the Bear River Valley Hospital.

It's a warm story, how they did it, one that restores our faith in the ability of people to do things for themselves without a lot of red tape. And, most important of all, without government aid.

Tremontion's hospital story goes back 45 years to 1928 when Dr. Edgar H. White built the three-story, brick structure on the bluff overlooking the Malad River on the eastern edge of town.

Dr. White, now 85, lived in an apartment in the building and was always on call to handle the needs of his neighbors.

But time took its toll.

Dr. White retired last year. And inspections by federal and state representatives showed the Valley Hospital wasn't quite up to modern standards.

So it was closed last June while city and county officials deliberated about plans—still being drawn—to build a new hospital.

Tremontion and Garland residents requiring hospitalization had to go to Brigham City, Ogden or Logan.

They didn't like it. And they did something about it, instead—as many people do—of just sitting around, wringing their hands and moaning.

A group of local residents was organized, headed by Deloris Stokes, Jay Dee Harris and Dr. George Ficklin.

They called upon authorities of the Health Services Corp., the arm of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints that operates hospitals throughout our region.

HSC agreed—for a token fee of \$1 a year—to operate the Bear River Valley Hospital on an interim basis until the new hospital could be built.

The Bear River Valley Leasing Corp. arranged a lease-purchase agreement with Dr. White, promising to pay the elderly physician \$85,000 for the facility, plus \$5,000 for its inventory of medical supplies.

In a single weekend in February, a 16-man committee collected \$36,670 to provide funds for the hospital's operation until expenses can be met from patient fees.

Chairman Stokes had an offer from one individual to underwrite the entire fund.

"But I woke up at 4 a.m. one morning and got to thinking about it," he recalls, "and decided the whole community should be involved."

It was. Most of the donations were under \$250 as residents of Tremontion, Garland and vicinity met the challenge.

That took care of the financing.

Now came the remodeling to meet requirements of health, fire safety and Medicare codes.

Fire resistant doors had to be hung in halls and on stairway openings. Old transoms above the patient rooms had to be closed with plasterboard.

A dumb waiter shaft had to be sealed. The boiler room had to have old windows bricked up. Wiring and light fixtures had to be modernized and the elevator brought up to date. A fire alarm system was needed.

And everywhere there was painting to be done and carpets to be laid.

If this was a government-operated facility there would have been feasibility studies, environmental reports, impact statements, committee reports, architect's drawings and construction contracts.

This would have taken months.

But not in Tremontion.

More than 4,000 hours of volunteer labor were donated to the cause! Rex Adams, for example, painted and carpentered from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. for 31 consecutive days "just to help."

Chairman Stokes' wife said her family didn't see him for five straight days as he worked at the hospital, hustled more help and kept up with his regular duties as chairman of the Box Elder Board of Education, director of the Bear River State Bank, a member of the LDS stake presidency and the operator of a grain and turkey farm.

Jay Dee Harris sent trucks and materials. Others on—and off—the committee did the same.

Result: First patients were received in the reopened hospital last Tuesday, following a Sunday open house attended by hundreds!

Kenneth Knapp, associate commissioner of LDS health services, is intrigued by the new Tremontion setup as a pilot demonstration of what can be done in rural health care.

Under the program worked out for Bear River, the Tremontion hospital is administered by Theron J. Godfrey, administrator of the LDS Hospital in Logan. Miss Mary Ann McArthur is director of nursing for both Logan and Bear River Valley.

R. N. Rachel Anderson was detached from the Logan LDS Hospital staff to serve as administrative nurse here. The McKay-Dee Hospital Center in Ogden provided all-electric patient beds and other specialty furniture from its reserve.

The Logan hospital does Tremontion's laundry. It also prepares the food. Meals are taken from the regular patient tray line at Logan,

flash-frozen and trucked over the hill to be thawed out and served. Kathryn Eldridge, Logan's chief dietician, wasn't sure this could be done—but it's worked, great. For everything but soft boiled eggs.

Women of the area helped in many ways—even doing much of the painting and stocking of the shelves.

They were all on this wonderful team that in two busy months refurbished Bear River Valley Hospital and got it reopened as a pride of the entire community.

IF YOU'RE BOYCOTTING BEEF,  
EAT POSSUM

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, although I personally have not participated in the boycott of beef and pork, I would like to share with my colleagues some alternatives to these dishes.

The following article by Bob Lancaster, who may have missed his calling in not writing a cooking column, discusses the pros and cons of possum, fish, blackbird, and horse meat:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Apr. 5, 1973]

THE POSSUM AS ALTERNATIVE

(By Bob Lancaster)

Some notes on alternatives to high-priced meats.

POSSUM

"You see," writes the self-described leader of the Eat More Possum movement in Arkansas County, "we had the answer to high meat prices all along. Just think what a tremendous effect it would have on beef and pork prices if everybody in Arkansas would eat possum for just a week."

Yeah. And it wouldn't hurt the highway beautification program any, either.

FISH

There was an editorial in the paper the other day that said: "Bring down the price of meat by going fishing!" It went on enthusiastically to recommend Lake Conway as the logical site to start this crusade.

Well, that's not a bad idea, but in all candor it's not a very practical one, either. That kind of romanticism can be costlier than roast beef. I know, because for years I inaugurated every fishing season with a trip to Lake Conway, and I finally had to give it up for economic reasons.

Just to see what it would cost me to join this crusade, though, I was just out pricing some equipment.

I'd have to have a new fly rod to replace the one that the kid used all winter as a practice javelin. That's \$15.98. And that's \$6.95 more. And since a new fly reel (automatic) the old tackle box was appropriated for the kids' rock collection. I'd have to have a new one, and a small one runs about \$4.98.

The fishing license is \$3.50. A life jacket (now mandatory in a boat) would be around \$4.98. Boat rental would be \$2 and a couple of boxes of bait would be \$2 more. For hooks, lines, sinkers and corks, I could get by for no more than \$1.70.

All that comes to \$42.09.

All right, now, the last time I went to Lake Conway, I went with a certain Steinmetz, and the two of us managed to catch, in a day's time, two fish. I estimated the total weight of the two fish at ½ ounces, and I figured that if we had dressed them out and taken them home, instead of throwing them back in embarrassment and disgust, we might have brought home 4 ounces of

edible meat. A quarter of a pound. Half of that—2 ounces—would have been my portion.

Suppose, now, that I sally forth to the lake tomorrow, having spent my \$42.09 in the name of fighting high meat prices, and have the same luck I had on my last trip. Two ounces of meat for \$42.09.

That is \$336.72 a pound.

And I doubt if even Earl Butz would consider that a bargain, although you can never tell about that guy.

I could dispense with all the fancy gear, of course—cut my own pole, hitchhike to the lake, and fish from the bank. Figuring expenses that way, my 2 ounces of fish would cost only \$3.70—or about \$30 a pound.

It wouldn't cost me much more than that to stay home and eat beef.

BLACKBIRD

Jessie Lanphere of Bull Shoals offers this alternative. "Fried Blackbird: Kill and dress bird. Split dressed bird down the center. Salt and pepper and roll in flour. Fry in fat until brown. Add water and cover. Let simmer until tender."

According to Miz Jessie's recipe, one blackbird makes two servings, which means that Pine Bluff could raid its one big downtown roost for enough meat to serve the entire population of Arkansas, with enough left over for Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and much of Georgia.

HORSES?

In the mall is this note from Hot Springs: "For what it's worth, the same day your paper had the story about the soaring popularity of horse meat, the longshots started coming in at Oaklawn for the first time."

PUBLIC LAW 480

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, just last week the House Agriculture Committee held hearings on Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program.

Under Public Law 480, farmers throughout the country have been aided in their fight for stable and fair farm income through exportation of farm commodities.

But the main purpose of this program is to aid the undeveloped nations of the world; namely, Bangladesh, India, Korea, Indonesia, Pakistan, and South Vietnam.

Public Law 480 has been a big plus in our foreign relations. I have always felt that food is the key to our foreign relations and trade abroad. Not guns, or ships, or planes; but food.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record the testimony of Mr. Robert N. Hampton, director of marketing and international trade for the National Council of Farm Cooperatives before the House Agriculture Committee on April 5, 1973. Mr. Hampton explains the program beautifully, and I recommend all my colleagues to read his statements.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARM  
COOPERATIVES

I am Robert N. Hampton, Director of Marketing and International Trade of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. The National Council is a nation-wide federation of farmer-owned businesses engaged in the

marketing of agricultural commodities or the purchasing of farm production supplies, and of 32 state cooperative councils. The cooperatives making up the Council are owned and controlled by farmers as their off-farm business operations.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives firmly supports extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (P.L. 480), as proposed in HR 3866. Our current policy statement "Public Law 480" includes the following recommendation.

"1. That Public Law 480 (Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954) be continued as a mechanism for aiding exports of farm commodities and that sufficient funds be provided to implement effectively the objectives of the Act;

"2. That expansion of P.L. 480 funds be based upon activities designed to expand long-run commercial sales and to aid sound economic growth of developing foreign countries. Many developing areas of the world today may be important future markets for U.S. farm products."

The National Council and its members, many of whom are involved in the commodity market development activities funded in part by P.L. 480 funds, have consistently favored this program's objectives of assisting hungry nations while encouraging long-term development of markets abroad for U.S. agricultural products.

Our need to develop and expand markets for U.S. agricultural products is as urgent today as ever before—perhaps even more so, in view of our recently growing trade balance deficit. Even though commercial sales have shown commendable growth in recent years, in many areas these markets were opened up through P.L. 480 concessional sales. There are many countries yet which must buy on attractive terms if their economies are to develop to the point where they can become long-term commercial customers.

P.L. 480 is only one of our foreign sales tools which can serve the long-term goal of more stable and fair farm incomes. Even more important, however, increased farm exports are a vital national policy issue of urgent concern because of our increasing dependence on foreign supplies of fuel and other key materials. In the issue of March 15, Forbes Magazine has presented a dramatic story of the vital role of our farmland and our farmers in maintaining national prosperity. Asking the question "Can Agriculture Save the Dollar?", the Forbes feature article says:

"The U.S. has lost, probably forever, its edge over Western Europe and Japan in manufacturing efficiency and technology. At the same time, it is burning imported oil at an evermounting rate. Question: How do you pay for the oil if you can't export enough manufactured goods?"

"That's where farming comes in. The U.S. is fast exhausting its once-plentiful natural resources. But there is one natural resource that, if cared for, never becomes exhausted: farmland. The U.S. has the acreage, the climate and the potential surplus over its own needs to become the granary of the world . . .

"The Nixon Administration is betting on agriculture to save the dollar. For if oil is essential for industrial civilization, food is necessary for life itself. Food is, potentially at least, the most priceless of all natural resources.

"The U.S. last year ran a balance-of-trade deficit of \$6.8 billion. On top of the current woeful situation, the future seems impossibly bleak: By 1980, under not overly pessimistic projections, the U.S. could be laying out \$18 billion to pay for imported oil, compared with a \$4.2 billion payout in 1972. If things were to stay the same, this would imply a potential trade deficit of \$20 billion and international bankruptcy for the U.S.



"Agricultural exports already are one of the few bright spots in the U.S. trade picture. In fiscal 1973 (the year that ends June 30), the U.S. will export \$11.1 billion worth of agricultural products. It will import, estimates the Department of Agriculture, \$6.8 billion. After subtracting \$1 billion of foreign-aid-type foodstuffs from the export total, that still leaves a healthy \$3.3 billion cash trade surplus in agriculture—largely balancing the deficit in oil. . . .

"The Japanese can manufacture as well as we can. They cannot farm as well as we can. The American farmer is not a lone man standing in the field. It would be more accurate to describe him as the human operative of a system of industry, technology, and capital that has taken the natural resource of the abundant land and made it yield a hundredfold. 'Our advantages go back 100 years,' says Carroll Brunthaver, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs. 'They center in our educational system. Our farmers are educated. The infrastructure—the roads, railroads, irrigation systems—all are there. We have an organized market and an industrial complex that supports the farmer.'

"These investments may now be at the payoff stage. Growing income over seas means meat in the diet: That is the bright hope of the U.S. balance of payments.

"Meat, that is, shipped as grain. Just as the U.S. raises more meat animals than anyone else, it also raises more of the feed grains that fatten these animals. Who can raise corn like the U.S.? For the protein supplement soybeans, the U.S. soil and climate are ideally suited, and the U.S. grows 70% of the world's supply. Wheat, which we think of as a food grain, is also a feed grain around the world, and the U.S. stands ready even now to export up to 1 billion bushels a year of it. In short, it is foodstuffs for meat animals that is the U.S.' long suit in international trade. Remember, it takes eight pounds of feed to produce one pound of beef, seven to produce one pound of pork."

Our superiority in farm production, especially of feed grains, is an advantage which we are likely to maintain for a long time. Not only do we have the outstanding farming skills and the distribution-transportation system which is so essential, but we enjoy a unique combination of large areas of fertile land with a favorable reliable combination of climate and water supply. In the world population centers, (where population is rapidly increasing) Europe and Russia are too far north, while much of Asia suffers from frequent drought, monsoons or other unpredictable weather hazards which give them frequent farm production problems.

Under these circumstances, the likelihood is that we can be exporting \$15 billion, or even \$20 billion, of farm products within a very few years. To service these markets, however, we will need not only to make concessional deals temporarily but also to show how our products should be handled and used. This and other market promotion and development supported by funds authorized by Section 104(b) (1) of P.L. 480 has and will continue to be of major assistance to farmer cooperatives and other private firms in building foreign markets for U.S. farm products. We encourage your firm support for strong continued funding of these activities.

In addition to our economic need to maintain this program, our foreign policy interests often have and can yet be served by use of P.L. 480 provisions to meet emergency and other food shortages in various parts of the world. Food is increasingly a vital instrument of policy, and we need to be prepared to assist nations in dire need but without adequate dollar reserves, as P.L. 480 will permit us to do.

I appreciate the opportunity to express our views before this committee.

## TAX DEDUCTION FOR EXPENSES OF CHILD ADOPTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity today to present oral testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means in support of H.R. 1858, legislation I have introduced to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer.

I urge our colleagues to join with me in support of this worthwhile legislation designed to combat one of the great problems confronting our society today while at the same time reaffirming our commitment to fulfill our moral duty to care for the orphan and homeless child.

I am delighted with the broad range of support for this bill. To date, 57 Members from both sides of the aisle and representing every aspect of the political philosophy within the House have joined in authoring this legislation. I am particularly pleased that the gentlemen from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON and Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CLANCY), members of the Committee on Ways and Means, are cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include a complete list of coauthors of this bill in my remarks at this point:

### LIST OF COAUTHORS

LaMar Baker, Alphonzo Bell, Tom Beville, John Breaux, George Brown, Mrs. Yvonne Burke, Goodloe Byron, Donald Clancy, Del Clawson, James Cleveland.

James Collins, Paul Cronin, George Danielson, Frank Denholm, Robert Drinan, Thaddeus Dulski, John Duncan, Joe Ewins, Hamilton Fish.

Daniel Flood, Tom Foley, Richard Fulton, Tennyson Guyer, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, Frank Horton, Robert Huber, William Hudnut, John Hunt.

Jack Kemp, William Ketchum, William Lehman, Gillis Long, Spark Matsunaga, John Melcher, Robert Michel, Carlos Moorhead, Morgan Murphy.

Otis Pike, Bert Podell, Walter Powell, Melvin Price, James Quillen, Tom Railsback, Charles Rangel, Don Reigle, Kenneth Robinson, Angelo Roncallo.

Charles Rose, Charles Thone, David Towell, John Ware, Lawrence Williams, Larry Winn, Lester Wolff, Antonio Won Pat, John Zwach.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the text of my statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

### PURPOSES OF THIS LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, as you know, existing law provides that a taxpayer may deduct medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of his adjusted gross income; therefore, under existing law, medical expenses related to natural birth may be itemized and deducted. My bill would extend this treatment to those couples who, for one reason or other, seek to provide a home and family for our orphans and otherwise homeless young; furthermore, inasmuch as expenses connected with adoption are true out-of-pocket costs and not covered by insurance, these costs, within reason, should be completely deductible.

By taking this positive action, the Con-

gress will be making a definite step toward solving one of the major social problems that confront our society. Furthermore, approval of this legislation can only reaffirm the faith that each of us has in the value of the family unit in our way of life. I can think of nothing more valuable to the development of the child in society than to be blessed with a home and parents. It is the family unit that has provided us all with the basis for our value systems. We should take action to insure that all Americans be afforded such an opportunity.

### NEED FOR THIS LEGISLATION

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the number of children adopted in America continues to rise. The Department provided the following figures indicating the number of children adopted in each year from 1966 through 1970. Mr. Chairman, I include these figures at this time:

Year	Number of Children adopted
1966	152,000
1967	158,000
1968	166,000
1969	171,000
1970	175,000

Furthermore, as Mr. Harry Freeman pointed out to you in his testimony on March 14, 1973, in behalf of Adopt a Child Today of Ohio, Inc., the Child Welfare League of America believes that there are perhaps 190,000 children in foster homes and institutions who have not been placed in permanent homes. These children do not have the benefit of a true home and family and cannot, therefore, establish any sense of roots or belonging that is so essential to life in our modern world. In addition to this, they represent a large drain on public sources of support that would be rendered unnecessary by adoption.

Finally, according to HEW figures, 88 percent of the children adopted by nonrelatives in the year 1970 were born of unwed mothers. With the increase in population and the changing mores of our youth, we can expect more and more of these children to be born and placed for adoption.

### COST

The need, then, in terms of the child is evident. We should consider, however, the actual cost of adoption, which is the problem to which this legislation is addressed. The Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that in 1971 the average cost of adoption was \$580. The Bureau pointed out, however, in a bulletin dated December 1971, that the prospective adoptive parent might expect to pay \$1,000 for an adoption arranged by a private agency, \$800 for an independent adoption, and \$450 in attorney fees for an adoption arranged by a public agency that does not charge fees. I would point out, however, that these figures are estimated averages and that the actual cost of an adoption may vary from \$100 to \$3,000. This is, of course, somewhat similar to the range of expense associated with the birth of a natural child, depending on the amount of complications involved.

These figures which I have cited represent actual costs not covered by insurance. This is, therefore, a primary consideration and stumbling block for American couples with average income to proceed with adoption. Enactment of the legislation I propose would contribute to an environment conducive to adoption by encouraging these middle-class Americans to provide home and families for our unfortunate children who, for one reason or other, do not have the benefit of natural parents.

For your information, adoption expenses consist of legal costs—attorney fees—social agency costs which may include medical care for the natural mother and infant, court

costs, and the costs of making the necessary social studies to insure that the child is placed in the correct home.

**BENEFITS OF THIS LEGISLATION**

Congressional enactment of this legislation would prove beneficial in every aspect. The value of the homeless child is clear, in that by encouraging adoption, the Congress would be reaffirming the value of home and family to the healthy growth of an individual in America. There is nothing more valuable to a child than parents who love him and will help him establish roots and a sense of belonging. The Congress should make every effort to see that each child in America is given a home. Enactment of this legislation would be a positive step toward this goal.

Society as a whole would also benefit from this legislation. First, and perhaps foremost, the value of this legislation lies in the fact that by giving the children of America homes and families, the Congress would be aiding in their development and assisting them in becoming valuable and useful citizens of tomorrow. I do not think it necessary to review here the innumerable statements by psychologists and psychiatrists concerning the value of home and family and a sense of belonging to a viable outlook on life.

Finally, society will actually benefit financially from this legislation. At the present time, those children who are in institutions or in foster homes represent a drain on society in that they must be supported through public funds or charity. Adoption would, of course, ease this burden from taxpayers, while at the same time giving inestimable value to the child and to the home in which he is placed.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would urge you and the members of the committee to give favorable consideration to this legislation for the benefit of those unfortunate children who, for some reason or other, do not have a home or family to love them and assist them in establishing roots and developing a meaningful way of life in the true American tradition. In doing this, Mr. Chairman, we will in reality be aiding ourselves and our society.

I would point out that H.R. 1858, the legislation which I have introduced, does not provide a limitation on the amount that can be deducted. I realize that our colleague (Mr. CORMAN) has introduced legislation which would establish a maximum deduction of \$1,250. I recognize there may be merit in setting a limitation on this deduction. I would point out, however, that generally speaking adoption expenses do not cover agency costs. I do not have available information concerning these costs, but I would urge the committee to accept either my proposal of total deduction allowance or set a reasonable limitation in the light of actual agency cost and related expenses. If the committee accepts the figure used by the Children's Bureau of Health, Education, and Welfare for cost of adoption in 1971, which was \$580 per child, then Mr. CORMAN's figure would be reasonable. It is, however, my understanding that this cost has risen over the past 2 years, as has virtually everything else.

The final argument that I would like to advance in support of my proposal is that the general range of adoption expenses parallels the cost of the birth of a natural child, and while medical expenses incurred in natural childbirth are generally covered by insurance, adoption expenses are not. In light of this, I believe it reasonable to adopt a position that all expenses connected with adoption should be deductible.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the great moral duty to care for the orphan. This legislation would be a reaffirmation of our com-

mitment to fulfill this responsibility to the homeless child in America.

Mr. Chairman, information which was not available to me when I prepared my statement indicates that 23 States have laws providing subsidies to low income families who other than for financial reasons would qualify as an adoptive home. I include a list of these States:

**LIST OF STATES**

California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Tennessee, Washington, Vermont.

The Congress can contribute to the creation of an environment favorable to adoption by allowing the taxpayer to deduct the initial costs of adoption.

**OF COURSE YOU ARE BROKE**

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the March 23 issue of the Los Angeles Citizen offered an excellent summation of the Nixon attitude toward the American public and the economic problems which confront us after 4 years of Nixonomics. From Nixon's own statement that the American people are like children who must be guided by all-knowing Papa Nixon, obeying his instructions without question; to a recent statement by an administration spokesman who advocated eating less as the solution to rising food prices; it is the administration view that a little discipline is all that is necessary to make things rosy again.

Jane Goodsell, in her regular "Soup to Nonsense" column in the Citizen, points out the absurdity of this view. I highly recommend her column to each of our colleagues, and I wish to enter it in the RECORD at this point for their convenience:

**BUT OF COURSE YOU'RE BROKE IF YOU SPENT ALL YOUR MONEY**  
(By Jane Goodsell)

If you are so unimaginative that you can't construct a delicious main-dish casserole out of two leftover hotdogs, a cup of pickled beets, a handful of shredded cabbages, a jar of maraschino cherries and a can of mushroom soup.

And if you are so unresourceful that you can't make yourself a stunning winter coat out of an old Indian blanket.

Or a pair of palazzo pajamas from some kitchen curtains you picked up at the Salvation Army thrift shop.

And if you are so self-indulgent that you can't get along with such fripperies as heat, electricity and running water.

And you lack the initiative to give up the family car and use roller skates for transportation.

And you are emotionally dependent on a telephone and a weekly garbage pick-up.

And you are so deficient in inner resources that, after sitting home quietly for 14 nights in a row, you become depressed and succumb to a drunken-sailor impulse to go out to dinner and a movie.

And if you have so mismanaged your heredity as to have produced children whose teeth need not only filling but straightening.

And who irresponsibly outgrow their shoes every few months.

And squander their allowances on rock records and double-dip fudge-mint-pecan ice cream cones instead of saving their money for warm winter coats and college educations.

And if you haven't acquired a few basic skills such as watch repairing, glass blowing, mechanical engineering and piano tuning but must depend on others to do it for you.

And if you throw your money away on postage when you could deliver your mail door-to-door yourself.

And if you insist on running to the doctor for every little thing like a broken arm or a ruptured appendix.

Then it's no wonder that you're having trouble making ends meet financially.

**STEEL VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it has become extremely difficult for many communities in the country to meet the high cost of providing services to their citizens without adding to the already heavy tax burden placed upon those residents. This is particularly true of small municipalities and the old, industrial community where the opportunities for expanding and strengthening their tax base is severely restricted.

Consequently, officials of such communities are constantly on the alert for other means of providing these necessary services at the lowest possible cost.

In the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, several communities have joined together to form a Steel Valley "Council of Governments"—COG—which is designed to provide a realistic approach to solving mutual problems of the member municipalities.

Mr. Raymond Siniawski, the first president of this organization, explains COG represents some 87,000 people in nine communities which cannot carry on necessary programs on an individual basis, but could meet the challenges of today as a collective, cohesive body. For example, he feels COG will be of tremendous help in establishing programs dealing with solid waste disposal, recreation and street improvements.

Although less than a month old, COG already has scheduled a meeting where the groundwork will be laid for drawing a master plan involving the nine communities. It is not inconceivable, Mr. Siniawski believes, that sometime in the future the Steel Valley area will be able to carry on its own water purification system or generate its own electrical power. He is dedicated toward attracting, and keeping young people to the area and to motivate local businesses to compete with suburban shopping centers. Shopping centers, Mr. Siniawski observes, did not just happen but were planned. "That is exactly what we must do," he emphasizes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the communities of Clairton, Duquesne, Dravosburg,



Homestead, Munhall, Whitaker, West Elizabeth, West Homestead and West Mifflin for undertaking this cooperative effort and I wish the officers of COG—Mr. Siniawski, President; Mr. Regis Ruffing, Vice President; and Mr. Michael Ivanovich, Secretary—the greatest of success in their undertaking to help the people of their communities and the Steel Valley.

#### PEYSER BRINGS SANITY TO SPORTS COMPETITION

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York (Mr. PEYSER) is to be commended on his leadership in attempting to bring sanity to international amateur athletic competition. For too many years, the dispute between the AAU and the NCAA has hampered the ability of the United States to field the best possible teams in international competition.

A recent example of this was the March 16 track and field meet between the United States and the Soviet Union held in Richmond, Va. For the first time in history, the American team lost to the Soviets on U.S. soil. Most sports observers agree that the loss could have been avoided if NCAA players and coaches had been allowed to participate.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 6525 as introduced by Congressman PEYSER, the "Federal Scholastic and Amateur Sports Act of 1973." This legislation is designed to remedy the type of situation I have just described. It would establish within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare a Federal Scholastic and Amateur Sports Commission to promulgate rules and regulations for improving the coordination of various amateur athletic organizations as they affect the ability of American amateur athletes to compete in international sporting events. Hearings have already been held on this legislation before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Special Education, and I am hopeful a bill will be reported out in the near future.

The gentleman from New York has received praise and recognition for his legislative and personal efforts and initiative from across the country. Closer to home, the Yonkers Herald Statesman in his district has recently taken editorial note of his role in forcing a compromise that will permit ULCA star Bill Walton to participate in the upcoming basketball series with the Soviet Union. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include in full the editorial from the April 11 Yonkers Herald Statesman:

#### PEYSER SCORES

One might say Congressman Peter Peyser came through with a driving layup to win a big one for basketball fans all over America.

Our 23rd district representative was instrumental in forcing a compromise that will allow UCLA's Bill Walton to play for the United States in a series of basketball games against the Russians.

And those who watched the Soviet Union beat the U.S.A. by one point in the last Olympics should especially be happy to hear the news.

Walton, UCLA's great six-foot-eleven center, was destined to miss the six-game series because of the running feud between the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Amateur Athletic Union.

But thanks to the persistence of Rep. Peyser and others, the two warring organizations have agreed to waive certain restrictions, allowing Walton to play in at least two of the games.

Since Walton is acclaimed as one of the best college basketball players in history, it's easy to see why he will be so important to the U.S. cause.

And Rep. Peyser deserves a hand, not only from his constituents, but from sports fans all over the nation.

#### PHILOSOPHY OF GEORGE FOREMAN, HEAVYWEIGHT BOXING CHAMPION OF THE WORLD—HOW THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HELPED HIM GET A NEW START

### Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Government of the United States has seen fit to its great credit to take up various roles in offering educational and employment opportunities to help those in need of specialized attention. There was a Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's, the GI bill in the 1940's and 1950's, and the late President Lyndon B. Johnson set up an Office of Economic Opportunity to deal with the whole spectrum of problems associated with the disadvantaged, one major portion of that being the Job Corps to confront the problem of the high school dropout.

All these programs have had their critics, and much of the publicity given them has covered the shortcomings rather than the successes. But they have had successes, some large, some incredible and some small, but in a success-oriented society we should applaud the successes in whatever degree we find them.

For this reason, I would like to bring to your attention the cover story in the April issue of Nation's Business. The title is "Don't Knock the American System to Me," and it is by George Foreman, boxing's current heavyweight champion of the world.

He gives full credit to an American business and the businessmen within it—Litton Industries, Inc., based in Los Angeles, Calif.—and to a program of President Johnson—the Job Corps—for being the difference between a disastrous course heading he was on, and where he stands today at the pinnacle of his profession.

He is the big success story, of course, but I happen to know that in Litton Industries, operation of the Parks Job Corps Center in northern California from April 30, 1965, to June 19, 1969, about 14,000 young men went through or started through its training programs. More than 9,000 of them were graduated

into jobs in the skills for which they were trained. Some of the others got jobs before they finished, and some, sadly, were dropouts again. Mr. Speaker, I insert the article in the RECORD as the expert testimony of a young man who not only knows what was done was right for himself and others like him, but who also can speak from the heart and from knowledge of the difference the Job Corps can make.

The article follows:

DON'T KNOCK THE AMERICAN SYSTEM TO ME!

(By George Foreman)

In my business, boxing, I know a lot about giving hard knocks, and getting them, too. That's the kind of business it is. I accept it for being that. But knocking the American system, that I can't take.

If there is give and take in life, and I know for sure there is, and some of it rough stuff, a man has to find out early in his life how much of each he has capacity for.

I found out early, though, that you don't get much of anywhere by knocking success. The really smart guy tries to find out why it works, and how he can get in that kind of action, and then tries to make it work for him.

They call me a flag-waver, and it's true. Not just that time in Mexico City in the Arena Mexicana on the night of Oct. 27, 1968. That was when I had beaten the Soviet heavyweight, Ionnis Chepulis. The referee called it a TKO, and the Olympic gold medal was mine.

There were more than 2,000 black athletes in those Olympic Games in all sports. I was afraid—even with the USA on my jersey—they might not know I was an American. And I wanted everybody to know, and to know that at that moment I was one of the happiest Americans who ever lived. So, I took the little American flag from the pocket of my robe, and waved it as I took a bow to each of the ring's four corners.

What never occurred to me then was that this little thing I did would be translated into an opposing view to the "black power" fever which was so much a part of that Olympics. It wasn't that at all. If that other way was how John Carlos and Tommy Smith felt—well, the America I came from is a free country, and they were entitled to do or say what they felt or thought. I was so proud, I was just doing what came naturally to me. It was my "thing," and thank God, it is still my "thing."

Casting about for places to put blame for the troubles a person has is an old human trait. "They" is an easier word to use than "I," when things don't go right. But in getting by an obstacle, or a trouble, or a problem, the key—and I know this because I've had them all, and still have some—is to take after it, all alone if that's the only way.

More times than not, battles have to be taken on alone. The messes a man gets into, they're the same. They didn't hunt him up; he went looking for them, whether he always knew it or not. He has to get into them himself, even if he has company at the time.

Nobody got me down in the street, for example, held my nose, and poured cheap wine down my throat when I was a kid. Not at all. I got the bottle, tipped it up, and drank it. Who would believe me if I said somebody forced me to drink that stuff? I don't force that easy. The memory of that wine is so clear to me yet that the smell of it now makes me sick to my stomach.

And when I was going about my first record-setting—which was how many windows I could break in a row without getting caught—I can't lay that idea on anybody else's doorstep. It was all my own, and I got all the way up to 200 before the Houston police thought it just might be me and looked

me up to talk about it. It was quite a record, if one just wanted to look at the size of it, but it wasn't sensible or respectable to do it.

These were things that happened when I thought I had nothing going for me, but it was mostly my own attitude toward life that made it so. There was the high school there in the bloody Fifth Ward of Houston, and I dropped out of it in the ninth grade. It was my decision, not the school's. That and the other things caused my mother—bless her for all the suffering she endured for me—to have a nervous breakdown. That was my decision, being a bad guy and causing it, not hers. I had about lost faith in everything before I was even started, I guess, but she never lost faith in me.

#### SEEING THE LIGHT

Then, like Paul on the way to Damascus in the Bible story, my vision cleared up and the time came to make a right decision. I did it.

It was in an unlikely place, a Houston pool hall, and the TV set was on.

The man on the tube was doing one of those public service spots. It's a part of America that when a man gets famous, is a celebrity, they ask him to do these commercials about all kinds of things. Some are for causes, like fighting cancer, or helping retarded kids. This guy was recruiting, and he was saying he was once a down-and-out himself.

Boy, was he on my wavelength, talking my language! I listened to him, half-like at first, and then he said he had this one skill, and finally got a chance to use it, and made it big. To anybody listening who needed a skill to get a job, he said, why not give the Job Corps a try?

So, I laid down that pool cue, and picked up hope. That's for me, I told myself, and they took me. There was some money in it, \$30 a month, and \$50 to go in the bank, and they'd send some home to my mother. Did she ever need it then!

It wasn't until then that it began to come to me what America was really all about, how there were things being done to really try to help people such as me find some way out. I was first in a Job Corps Center in Oregon, and then went to a big one, the Parks Job Corps Center, near Pleasanton in California.

It had a big company running it, Litton Industries. How come? Well, they were used to bringing people in through their employment offices and then teaching them whatever skill was needed for them to make or manufacture something. People just don't come off the street ready-made to do such work, they have to be taught. At Parks, they had courses in business machine repair, in electronics, auto mechanics, building maintenance and custodial services and how to cook. They put me in electronics, and had me putting transistor radios together.

But I was a rambunctious teenager, full of vinegar, and thought I was a pretty tough guy. Liked to fight, anywhere, anybody, the whole thing. But that wasn't the kind of place it was; it wasn't any western copy of my old Fifth Ward slum back in Houston. R. Sargent Shriver, the head of this war on poverty agency—Office of Economic Opportunity—he was telling the centers to throw the troublemakers out. I was headed out, no question about that, and to be honest about it, I didn't care all that much.

Litton Industries had put a man in there as the center director, Dr. Stephen Uslan, a fine man. When he was getting all this advice from his staff to send me packing, he said No. He said I was the kind of material the center had been set up to deal with. It wouldn't solve anything, he told them, just throwing George Foreman out. I had been thrown out of a lot of things by then, and it hadn't impressed or improved me much, was the way he put it. And then,

he said the words which really turned George Foreman around.

"If he likes to fight so much," he told those staff guys, "put him in the ring down in the rec hall, and let him get it out of his system that way."

In business, you see, they can't really stand it when something won't work. They try one way, and then another, and they keep trying until they find the combination, Litton was especially good about things never tried before, and they had the guts to give it another try, and they took another swing at the George Foreman problem.

And then I found out what a long way it is from just an idea to a real, accomplished dream. I hit a lot of people, and I was awkward. I found out if I could connect, I could jolt them. I knew that, but also that I needed a lot of honing. I must have been the dullest knife in town.

But there are professionals in everything who know how to mold people, and Litton had one of them in that rec hall. His name was, and is, Charles R. "Doc" Broadus. They hadn't just hired a man and sent him down there to work in the rec hall when they got Doc. He had been in this boxing thing for 35 years or more. If I would listen to him and follow his instructions, he said, he'd get me into Golden Gloves, and maybe on the Olympic team, and then I could turn pro. He said that he thought I could be champion one day, but that I would have to make up my mind to work for it.

Now down there in Houston in the slum I came from, there wasn't too much talk about working for anything. People got money a lot of the time from being what was called smart—or from taking advantage of somebody. People walked on both sides of the line, as far as the law was concerned. But Doc said I could get it all, everything that went with it, if I was willing to work for it.

#### A BIG FOUR-LETTER WORD

Work is such a big four-letter word. I'd known a lot of the other four-letter words and they couldn't help anybody. This one meant sweat. It meant getting banged around. It meant being more tired than I had ever been in my life. And sore in more places, too. But when I went into Golden Gloves, I found it paid off, and I won. Then there were the Olympic trials in Toledo, Ohio, and by a hair, I made the Olympic team. Litton sent Doc Broadus and one of its executives, a onetime Air Force colonel, Barney Oldfield, down to Mexico City with me.

What I didn't know then was that as early as June, 1968 (the Olympics were in October), Barney had written to several friends of his, sportswriters, people like that, telling them to interview me in Mexico City because, he said: "George Foreman will win the gold medal, and go on to be heavyweight champion of the world."

It meant a lot to me, finding out such things, and that work was getting me closer and closer to where I wanted to be in life, and that other people were believing in me, other than my mother. And because I like kids, I found the ones who lived in slums as I had, and others too, were beginning to hang around me. They wanted to talk to me and they were paying attention to what I said. The more I won, the more they tuned me in. What a difference it makes when you first have that feeling that people are looking up to you, and not down on you!

That night, after winning in Mexico City, I couldn't bear to take the gold medal from around my neck. It was my badge, my reminder. The ones around me now had been telling me the truth: Work and get with it, and you can have it all.

I had put a phone call in to my mother in Houston. She was always worrying about me getting hurt. Not the other guy, just me, her little boy, all 220 pounds of him. But I felt a desperate need to talk to her, to tell her that finally all those young boy kitchen

conversations and dreams we used to have were starting to come true.

While I was talking with her, Barney waited, and when I came back to the table, he said that if it was all right with me, he was going to call the White House in Washington. He was going to remind them that this George Foreman who won in Mexico City was a Job Corpsman.

It was a program President Lyndon B. Johnson had brought about himself, and now he would surely want to see me and tell me himself how proud he was. Imagine! "Man, you're too much," I told Barney.

On Nov. 18, 1968—just three weeks later—Charles B. "Tex" Thornton, Litton's board chairman; Eugene Allen, of the Parks Job Corps Center; Barney and myself, we were walking up to the White House on our way to visit the President of the United States!

#### A GIFT TO THE PRESIDENT

I was carrying a little plaque I wanted to give him. I didn't know whether it was the right thing to be doing or not, but almost every time I saw pictures of him, he was giving something to somebody. I felt I owed him something. I was about to learn that whatever your hearts tells you to do is always right, never wrong.

When I gave it to President Johnson, he looked so tired. The whole country kind of had him on the ropes then. To bring it back together, he'd made the big decision not to be their punching bag any more. I told him the plaque was to thank him for making the Job Corps possible—giving young Americans such as me a chance for hope, and dignity and self-respect. I saw a tear start down his cheek from his left eye. But he was sharp, too. Recovering himself, and waving the plaque at the press who were there in his Oval Office with us, he told them he was going to keep it there where they could see it every-time they came in, to let 'em know there was one person in the world who thought he had done something right!

I learned a lot about America that day: That when you're right, and do right in a big way, even the President of the United States will have you in to tell about it, and encourage you to keep on, now that you've found out what it's like. And I was standing there with him, and he had once been poor, too, and was a not-too-well-educated Texas boy who had refused many times along the way to be licked. He was going out of that White House, a man who had championed the cause of a lot of people, including me, and however bad he may have felt, I knew he could live with himself for all he had done.

Tex Thornton said he was proud of me, the way it had gone there in the White House, and he said he would always be available to me for any advice I might need, that I had only to ask. He even said he and some of his friends would put together a kind of syndicate, or association, which would back me and keep me from having to take any offers which might not be good for me in the long run. When I told him I wanted to try it alone, he respected that, and understood it, and accepted it.

Somewhere, I kept telling myself, I have to begin making my own decisions, and it might as well be now. The professional thing was on my mind, and I talked with Dick Sadler about being my manager-trainer. He had had a long string of champions, the last being Sonny Liston. I had a strong feeling, an admiration, for Sonny. He had had so far to come back when he started, from the hole he was in, and he did it. He came to a sad end, but in what he did, he showed all things were possible.

[Sonny Liston, who had many scrapes with the law during his life, was found dead in his Las Vegas, Nev., home in January, 1971. He had been dead for about a week. Drugs were at the scene, but the death was attributed officially to natural causes.]

Work! That word again. Dick Sadler told



me about how much of it I had to take on now. He said the road ahead was bumpy, and had turns in it, lots of them. There were some places we fought in where we almost had to borrow money, or hook something, to get out of town. We had trouble getting opponents. Boxing writers were saying I fought Joe Namelesses and Whozitses, and that I had to get more experience, when I couldn't get most of the ones I forgot to stand up long enough to give me any. All this was what Dick Sadler had meant by work, that it could include frustration and hopelessness and fighting off giving in to them. There was wood to split. And at 6:30 in the morning, running those three-mile exercises when other people were still all asleep. Then the gym, the bag—the little one and the big one—over and over.

#### A FINANCIAL CRISIS

I was hurting for money. I wanted to get married to Adrienne, a pretty girl I knew. A guy can't be smart enough to dodge everything. I signed some papers with some people, and I got married early in 1972 and we were very happy. Then the big chance came, and I signed for the fight with Joe Frazier for the championship in Jamaica. Right then, everything went sour in my mouth. I found that in the fight business, it's not just yourself, the guy you're fighting, and the referee in there with you—in spite of everything you try to do, you pick up partners, people who share in you, who know how to play you and your desires, and they have more to say about you than they should. When you have been living from day to day all your life, the implications of what you sign today don't look as big as they will tomorrow.

I got caught up in one of these things, not the first fighter to have it happen to him nor probably the last. But it upset me so, the only thing I could think of was quitting the ring. I meant it. The lawyers all gathered around me and begged me to go ahead; suits were filed, and finally, in a kind of desperation, they asked me if I had a friend somewhere that I trusted. They wanted to explain it all to him, they said, and then he could advise me. I remembered Litton Industries, and told them to call Barney Oldfield. It was 3 o'clock in the morning in California when he got the call from New York, and after bringing him up out of a deep sleep, they talked with him for a half hour or more.

The next day, he called me.

I told him I didn't want to fight Joe Frazier, even if I know I could beat him. So many people had gotten their hands into my money, I didn't want to be another sad story in boxing for people to write about. I said I might as well forget the whole thing.

But Barney told me: "George, the only thing I figure you can do is go knock Joe Frazier out, and then come back and show people you can take all this. If you don't go ahead with the fight, they'll all be writing you're scared or something." He said it was a legal contract, and the important thing was to win the title and then argue.

Suddenly, it all cleared up for me. I was really fighting everybody but Joe Frazier, and he was the one to beat. "They" didn't mean anything. It was just the same old "they" to blame things on again, and I was beyond that. I had to be. What I was in was a business, and I had to treat it like a business, where contracts were contracts, and if I didn't have integrity about a contract, however bad it might be, what would I have left?

It was off to Jamaica, even though my wife, Adrienne, was pregnant, and the baby was due. On Jan. 6, there in Kingston, I heard that my baby girl, Michi Helene, had been born in far off Minneapolis. On Jan. 10, I became 24 years old. On Jan. 22, after a minute and a half of the second round and when he had been knocked down six times by me, Joe Frazier—the favorite of almost every boxing writer and odds-maker in the world—had lost his heavyweight crown, and it was mine! Bad as I had felt about not

being able to be with my wife when our baby came, it was one of the things life asks of you in keeping things in focus, and I could now get home to them—a champion.

#### GIVING THANKS

In the delirium of the ring, I guess I thought of everyone—the ones who believed in me and had done things for me.

Among them was Johnny Unitas, the famous pro football quarterback, the one who had done the public service TV spot about the Job Corps which sent me off in this new direction.

I didn't know until after the fight that President Johnson had died while I was on the way to the stadium. They kept it from me. It gave me a chill to think back to that day in 1968 when, there in the White House, he had asked me when I thought I'd be heavyweight champion, and I said I didn't know. It made me sad to think he couldn't have lived one more day and read about what had happened in Jamaica that night. Without his Job Corps, I wouldn't have been there.

So, don't talk down the American system to me. I know what men go through to make it run. I also know that some of its rewards can be there for anybody, if he will make up his mind, bend his back, lean hard into his chores and refuse to allow anything to defeat him.

The first thing I did in my dressing room that night after the fight in Jamaica was close the door, with Doc Broadus and Barney Oldfield in there with me. I went down to the foot of the old training table, got down on my knees, and thanked my God—for everything, for everybody, and for the determination He gave me to see it through. Perhaps there are several who deserve as much as I do to be champion, and perhaps they, too, will have their chance, but none can feel any more fortunate than I do to hold the title while I can.

I can truly say I worked for it. I say, worship the opportunity this country grants to those who will really try, don't knock it.

I'll wave that flag in every public place I can.

#### SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON HONORED AT CANISIUS COLLEGE

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, since 1957 the Canisius College Alumni Association in Buffalo, N.Y., has periodically presented the Peter Canisius Medal to outstanding individuals who have been an inspiration to the youth of America.

At a convocation for alumni, students, faculty, and guests April 10, 1973, the Very Reverend James M. Demske, S.J., president of Canisius College, made the 10th presentation of the gold medal to our distinguished colleague, Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON of Missouri.

Senator EAGLETON was cited for his legislative leadership in attacking the problems of the environment, our cities, the aged, special education needs, civil liberties, labor, and the sick. The Alumni Association is to be commended for their selection of this year's recipient, as stated in the following citation:

CANISIUS COLLEGE CITATION FOR THE CONFERRAL OF THE PETER CANISIUS MEDAL FOR 1973 UPON THOMAS F. EAGLETON

Thomas Eagleton, we welcome you to the Canisius College Family. We welcome and

honor you as the tenth recipient of the Alumni Association's Peter Canisius Medal. You were born September 4, 1929, in St. Louis, Missouri.

You received your Bachelor of Arts Degree, cum laude, from Amherst College in 1950 and your Bachelor of Laws Degree, cum laude, from Harvard Law School in 1953.

But you were willing to interrupt your education to enlist and serve in the United States Navy in 1948 and 1949.

After completing your education, you returned to your native Missouri. In 1956, you married the former Barbara Ann Smith of St. Louis, and now the Eagleton family includes a son, Terence, and a daughter, Christin.

In 1956, at the age of 27, you also started your career of public service by being elected Circuit Attorney for St. Louis, Missouri. You were the youngest person to ever hold that office.

You were elected the youngest Attorney General in Missouri's history in 1960. You were 31 years old.

You were elected the youngest Lieutenant Governor of your home state in 1964.

In 1968, you were elected to the United States Senate. During four years as a freshman senator, you have innovated and advocated legislation on our nation's domestic problems. Labor, the environment, our cities, the aged, victims of drug abuse and the sick have all felt the beneficial effect of your role.

You have given progressive leadership as Chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, advocating home rule for the citizens of our nation's capital.

You have served on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, where you are Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Aging and the Sub-Committee on Education. You have dedicated many hours to the special education problems of the young and are primarily responsible for the proposed National Reading Improvement Act.

You are on the Senate Public Works Committee where you are Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Environmental Science and Technology and Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Air and Water Pollution. You have contributed significantly to the preservation of our environment by co-sponsoring the Clean Air Act of 1970, the Noise Control Act of 1972 and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

You have been deeply concerned with the civil liberties of Americans and have authored and introduced the News Source Protection Act.

The list of your achievements and commitments to causes for the betterment of humanity could go on almost endlessly.

Certainly, Thomas Eagleton, you are one of those rare and inspired human beings who manage to live their lives to the fullest limits of their God-given energy and talents. Your energy and your redoubtable talents are given totally to the service of your fellow man. Your accomplishments are legion, your devotion to public service unsurpassed, your patriotism unexcelled, your private and public life beyond reproach. The excellence you have shown throughout your career in government stands as a challenge and an inspiration to the American youth of today, who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

It is with pride and joy, therefore, that Canisius College and its Alumni Association present the 1973 Peter Canisius Medal to you, Senator Thomas F. Eagleton.

Presented this tenth day of April, 1973 at Buffalo, New York.

VERY REVEREND JAMES M. DEMSKE, S.J.,  
President of Canisius College.  
R. CARLOS CARRALLADA '56,  
President of Alumni Association.

Following the ceremony, the Senator addressed the gathering. His remarks are

thought-provoking and timely, and it is a pleasure to share them with you at this time.

#### SENATOR EAGLETON'S SPEECH

Some have called America a throw-away society, and there is considerable evidence to back up that claim. Automobiles grow obsolete in too few years, the lifetime of products hardly outlasts the commercials that loudly proclaim their virtues, and even politicians quickly fade into anonymity when they fail to keep up with the changing times.

Yesterday's greatest issues—the ABM . . . Haynesworth and Carswell . . . the Lockheed loan—now seem distant history.

I can't predict how long they will last, but at least today's issues appear, at first blush, to be equally diverse—American bombing in Cambodia . . . the impoundments of funds appropriated by Congress . . . the protection of White House staff members accused of illegal activity by something called "executive privilege." But despite the appearance of diversity, each of these issues really is just a facet of one of the greatest single issues ever to face our nation—the balance of power between Congress and the President.

Let me reflect for a moment on the origins of the document that gives us our fundamental law—the Constitution of the United States.

It is important to remember that the men who wrote our Constitution were victims of a strong executive. They mistrusted the kind of authoritative power exercised by English kings and colonial governors. And they eventually revolted against that power.

The somewhat radical notion that people have an inalienable right to be governed by their own consent formed the basis of the American Revolution.

And when the Founders later wrote a constitution, they institutionalized that principle by distributing the powers of government among three separate-but-equal branches.

"It is not by the consolidation, or concentration of powers, but by their distribution that good government is effected," Thomas Jefferson said.

What has happened to that Jeffersonian concept today? Let me try to examine that question by considering current points of conflict between Congress and the President.

1. *Does the President have legal authority to continue without Congressional authorization an air war over Cambodia now that all American troops have been withdrawn from Vietnam?*

The Founding Fathers gave to Congress the power to "declare war." Fresh from the experience of an omnipotent ruler George III, Madison and Hamilton were especially careful that the decision to wage war would not be made by one man alone.

No more fundamental decision can be made in a free society than the decision to commit forces to battle. And in our society that decision should be made by Congress acting with the President—not by the President acting alone.

I submit the current American air bombardment in Cambodia is without a legal or constitutional basis.

When we first took military action in Cambodia in 1970, the President justified it as being part of his Commander-in-Chief authority to protect American troops in South Vietnam. Those troops, he said, were in the process of withdrawal.

By March 30, 1973, all American troops had been withdrawn from Indochina, prompting the President to tell us on national television that the war was "ended."

With that final withdrawal, any pretext of authority to bomb in Cambodia without the authorization of Congress evaporated.

The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution has long since been repealed. The SEATO Treaty, in the State Department's own words, is inap-

licable. There is no statute authorizing American military activity in Cambodia. On the contrary, such statutes as are on the books prohibit military activity in Cambodia. Even the broadest interpretation of the President's Commander-in-Chief authority will not support the President's unilateral action.

In short, if the President wishes legally to commit America to another Indochina war, he must come to Congress. I believe Congress would join the American people in saying "no" to that request.

2. *Can the President legally impound funds appropriated by Congress?*

The Founding Fathers were greatly concerned that what Madison called the "enterprising ambition of the Executive" could encroach upon the legitimate functions of the legislative branch. He felt, however, that Congress's power of the purse would, in itself, offer a strong resistance to this threat. In *Federalist Paper # 68* Madison said:

"As the legislative department alone has access to the pockets of the people . . . and, in all, a prevailing influence over the pecuniary rewards of those who fill the other departments; a dependence is thus created in the latter, which gives still greater facility to encroachments of the former."

It is a measure of the constitutional crisis we are now experiencing that even Congress's power of the purse is under attack by the "enterprising ambition" of a President who feels he has, in his words, "a clear constitutional right" to impound appropriated funds.

The President has attempted to justify his unprecedented impoundments by charging that Congress is incapable of controlling government expenditures. Perhaps it should be pointed out that Congress appropriated \$20.2 billion less than President Nixon requested in the first four years of his Administration.

A number of pending court cases will help decide the impoundment question. In one case, a U.S. District Court judge in Kansas City ruled last year that highway trust funds appropriated for use in Missouri were being withheld improperly by the President. I joined with 21 other Senators in filing an amicus curiae brief urging that the District Court decision be upheld—which it was, in a ruling by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

In a 1969 advisory memorandum to the White House, Assistant Attorney General William H. Rhenquist wrote the following about impoundment:

"With respect to the suggestion that the President has a constitutional power to decline to spend appropriated funds, we must conclude that existence of such a broad power is supported neither by reason nor precedent."

I believe that the "strict constructionist" advice given by Mr. Rhenquist in 1969 is absolutely correct. I would hope that Mr. Justice Rhenquist will still have the appreciation for precedent he had in 1969 when the impoundment issue comes before the Supreme Court.

3. *Can the President shield his staff assistants from responding to subpoenas to testify before committees of Congress?*

There is some dispute as to whether anything called "executive privilege" exists at all. Constitutional purists say that nowhere in the Constitution is there a peg upon which to hang a privilege that allows the President and his associates to withhold information from Congress or to refuse to appear before Congressional committees. Congress, of course, has never authorized a privilege of this kind by statute.

I personally hold a somewhat more pragmatic view of Executive Privilege, as do many of my colleagues in the Senate. I believe there is an important interest to be served in stimulating the free exchange of ideas between the President and his advisors—an exchange that will flourish only if the sub-

stance of these advisory discussions can be shielded from public scrutiny.

But to say that advisory communications between the President and his staff should be immune from Congressional scrutiny is a far cry from holding that past and present associates of Presidents enjoy a blanket immunity from testifying before Congressional committees on any subject. That, regrettably, is apparently the position taken by President Nixon, who said recently:

"A member or former member of the President's staff shall follow well-established precedent and decline a request for a formal appearance before a committee of the Congress."

On that basis, President Nixon refused to allow John Dean, a White House counsel, to testify before the Congressional committee investigating the Watergate affair.

Surely it takes a certain flight of fantasy to insist that "executive privilege"—if it exists—extends to shielding wrongdoers from testifying about their part in unethical or illegal activities simply because they are (or were) White House employees. News accounts of the Watergate episode indicate that no investigation of these events will be complete until Congress has heard from ex-Attorney General John Mitchell, ex-White House aide Dwight Chapin, White House counsel Dean, and others with close connections to the White House. Congress cannot sit idly by while the Executive boldly attempts to sabotage its investigatory function under the guise of a contorted and abused "privilege."

It is my sincere hope that President Nixon will reconsider his ill-conceived refusal to allow his associates and former associates to testify before Congress. But if he does not, I believe that Congress will move forward in the way Senator Ervin has outlined—pursuing through the courts the question of whether a President can shield his staff assistants from responding to Congressional subpoenas where the information being sought does not relate to advisory communications with the President.

The Congress of the United States can rarely be as swift and decisive as the one man to whom the great powers of the Presidency are assigned. But the framers of our Constitution understood that the line between speedy action and arrogance, between decisiveness and tyranny, is a precariously thin one. They devised a deliberate, diverse, and accessible body that would subject the most important questions facing our nation to the careful scrutiny of collective judgment.

As long as we continue to hold that free persons can be governed only by their own consent . . . as long as we believe that government must derive its power from the people . . . as long as we believe in a representative form of government . . . then Congress will continue to be both necessary and useful in fulfilling the intent of our Constitution.

MYCODA

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it was not too long ago that Congress recognized a new approach was needed to combat the widespread use of dangerous drugs and narcotics among the Nation's youth. It was decided this could best be accomplished through a comprehensive educational program; however, it also was



soon apparent that one of the first steps to be taken was the training and equipping of qualified personnel if such a program was to be effective.

I am pleased to report that in a section of my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, this first step has been taken with great success through the concerted efforts of the Mon-Yough Council on Drug Abuse Inc.—MYCODA.

MYCODA, conceived by a group of area civic leaders in 1970, organized and chartered in 1971, now serves 18 communities in the area, including seven school districts with an enrollment of approximately 36,000 students. Its program has been cited by Gov. Milton Shapp's Justice Commission on Drug and Alcoholic Abuse as the potential model for drug education programs throughout the State.

Recently an evaluation of MYCODA's professional development seminars, in-service workshops to train teachers and its progress was given by a number of people closely connected with the program, including Dr. Harry R. Faulk, superintendent of McKeesport area schools; Arthur Hennings, executive director of McKeesport Hospital; and Dr. Thomas Terrill, professor of public health and administration at the University of Pittsburgh. Each of these gentlemen were high in their praise of what MYCODA has accomplished in such a brief period and were optimistic in their hopes for the future.

MYCODA also conducts regular briefings for school administrators, presentations to home/school associations and has initiated parent seminars. Its staff maintains a close contact with churches, police, social service agencies and other community organizations.

Although credit for MYCODA's success is due primarily to the interest and efforts of its members and leaders: Mr. Donald Henninger, president; Dr. Herbert McGibbeny, vice president; Mr. Charles Mikell, treasurer; and Mr. Lynn Lotecka, executive director, it took all segments of the community to make MYCODA work.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call MYCODA's achievements to the attention of my colleagues for they, too, share in its success since the organization's primary source of funding is Federal money distributed under the Safe Streets Act. I believe my colleagues will join me in extending to the officers and members of MYCODA their best wishes for continued success in the future.

#### FACTS ABOUT NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL

#### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has notified Members of Congress of its intention to close down in-patient care at its Public Health Service hospitals as of July 1, 1973.

I will strenuously oppose this proposal

and will work with other Members of Congress who share my feelings in this matter.

Because of the import of this issue, I want to enclose at this point in the RECORD a letter and fact sheet which I received from Rear Adm. Arthur A. de la Houssaye, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, which he sent to Secretary Caspar Weinberger. It is most informative.

The letter follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 6, 1973.

HON. CASPAR WEINBERGER,  
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,  
Parklawn Building, Rockville, Md.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you as one vitally interested in the welfare of my country and concerned with the proposed closing of the U.S. Public Health Hospital at New Orleans. The New Orleans press carried an article with statements allegedly made by your Under Secretary Frank C. Carlucci, in which he was reportedly to have said "the closure would achieve improved care at greater convenience to those served" and that "fewer and fewer patients have been served by Public Health Hospitals". I respectfully take exception to those statements and cite my reasons therefore in the enclosed exhibit.

I am also sending a copy of this letter with enclosures to several others concerned, as I have gone to quite some length in attempting to secure accurate information which does not seem to jibe with some other statements allegedly made by the department.

In my humble estimation, you would work a terrific hardship on this community and on Maritime Service personnel, the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Coast Guard, retired personnel of both services and their dependents who have selected New Orleans as a place to live and retire as they have been assured adequate medical care in their retirement.

This hospital is staffed with excellent and capable doctors and dedicated technicians and to destroy this facility, which is so badly needed should not be permitted to occur.

I cannot urge you too strongly to re-evaluate the situation here at New Orleans as you would create havoc were you to close this hospital, as I feel certain the present hospital facilities here could not adequately serve those personnel and civilians entitled to public health hospital care in this area.

Very Sincerely,

ARTHUR A. DE LA HOUSSEY,  
Rear Adm. U.S.N.R., retired.

#### U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH HOSPITAL AT NEW ORLEANS

1. For the fiscal year 1958 there were 74,208 out-patient visits; 1969—138,500; 1970—150,118; 1971—142,543 and 1972—135,684.

The average number of daily patients in the hospital for 1958 was 314, 1969—312; 1970—302; 1971—297 and 1972—299. You will note that the average number of patients in the hospital has slightly decreased, whereas the total number of admissions to the facilities has increased inasmuch as there were 7,637 admissions to the hospital in 1972 and in 1958 there were only 4,918, with subsequent increases each year.

2. I believe it also important to emphasize that a scrutiny of the records will show that the load has not dropped for American seamen served in 1972 as it was 41,924; Coast Guard—3,002, immigration cases—563, dependents, uniformed service—60,251, military including retired—15,711 and others not detailed herein would bring this total to 135,634. The above summary statement certainly does not support the news releases that the hospital is not being utilized.

3. The average daily in-patient load for January—1973 was 313; February—326 and March 1st to 26, 1973—was 302.

4. The American Hospital Association report of September 1971 indicated an average cost per day for hospitalization through-

out the United States was \$92.31, at which time the New Orleans Public Hospital cost was \$61.00 to \$68.00. The Community cost does not include physicians fees whereas the cost for Public Health Hospitalization does include physicians salaries, etc. The average cost, in 1973, for twelve hospitals in the Metropolitan Area of New Orleans indicates an average daily rate of \$104.09 per day—which does not include physician fees, whereas the average cost per day for the entire Public Health Service Hospital System is \$67.20. It is my understanding that the cost per day including everything at the U.S. Public Health Hospital of New Orleans is \$68.20.

5. A cost analysis for fiscal year 1970 at the New Orleans Public Health Hospital indicated the cost per out-patient prescription (including personal services) was \$1.41. The cost for the pharmacy per in-patient day for the same period was \$1.93, compared with \$8.01 in two local community hospitals. This represents a savings to the Federal Government of \$1,024,403.

6. The pathology department realized a savings of \$865,430 over contract costs. The X-ray department realized a similar savings of \$694,018 and the dental department, \$400.00.

7. The Clinical Laboratory of the Public Health Hospital at New Orleans supports hospitals at Carville, clinics in Mobile, St. Louis, Memphis, Miami, Tampa, Jacksonville, U.S. Naval Air Station at New Orleans, Naval Support Activity in Algiers, Coast Guard Dispensary in New Orleans, as well as the Coast Guard Air Station in St. Petersburg and the three Indian Hospitals in Claremore, Lawton and Tallhina. The funding to take care of these items would be considerable.

8. It is interesting to note that Rear Admiral Robert MacPherson, U.S.N., who was Commandant of the Eighth Naval District, testified in 1971 that if the Public Health Hospital in New Orleans were to close the United States Navy would have to increase its budget by over \$1,000,000.

9. Since the above statement was made, the Navy has seen fit to transfer the following commands to New Orleans:

Armed Forces Recruiting Headquarters  
Administration Space for Various Departments of Defense Agencies  
Chief of Naval Reserve Headquarters  
Fourth Marine Air Wing Headquarters  
Naval Personnel Admission and Computer Center

Armed Forces Entrance and Examination Center which will aggregate approximately 1,703 active personnel and several thousand dependents; and there are on active duty in this area over 1,025 in the U.S. Navy, with personnel of the active Coast Guard numbering 600, plus dependents and retired personnel of 3,500, plus Marine Corps, Navy Air and others, again with many thousands of dependents, with no Navy Hospital or Public Health Hospital within several hundred miles of New Orleans.

In examining the above brochure, it should be obvious to anyone that closing the U.S. Public Health Hospital in New Orleans would be false economy and very unwise action which would affect all of our military establishments, all of the retired and reserve personnel who have given many years of their lives to the service of their country. I again reiterate that this hospital should not be closed.

#### SALUTE TO A WORKHORSE

#### HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of

my colleagues an editorial which appeared this week in Aviation Week and Space Technology regarding the Lockheed C-130 airplane. For years, we in Georgia, where the C-130 is produced, have known firsthand the outstanding qualities of this plane. It is rightfully called the workhorse of our air transport fleet and has for some 20 years responded to emergencies throughout the world in a manner unexcelled by any other aircraft. I am pleased to see that the C-130 is receiving the sort of recognition it has long deserved, and I commend the article "Salute to a Workhorse" to my colleagues as follows:

**SALUTE TO A WORKHORSE**

The importance and scope of aerial logistics are expanding rapidly in both military and commercial operations. No transport has played a more versatile, rugged and dependable role in this expansion than the Lockheed C-130 Hercules series. During its 20 years of production and operations it has compiled a unique and fantastic record in the annals of air transport and is still writing new chapters every month.

More than 1,200 of these turboprops have been built on Lockheed's Marietta, Ga., production line, and they are still rolling out at the rate of three a month with no end in sight. They are in service with 29 national air forces and a dozen airlines and have contributed \$1 billion in export sales as part of the \$2.8 billion they have poured into Lockheed coffers.

They have flown more than 8 million hr. and are currently logging flying time at a rate of from 75,000 to 100,000 hr. a month all around the globe.

The C-130 began during 1951 in a tough competition with Douglas and Boeing for prototype construction to meet a General Operational Requirement (GOR) of the Air Force generated by the experience of the Korean war, where air logistics played such a key role.

The basic requirement was for an aircraft that could transport a railroad box car equivalent in cubage and tonnage to almost any part of the world where improved airfields were not available. A touch of C. L. "Kelly" Johnson's genius went into the original design work at Burbank along with the efforts of co-designers Willis Hawkins and E. C. Frank. Two prototypes were built at Burbank, but production shifted to Marietta, which has been the home of the Hercules for the past 20 years, and became one of the most substantial and lucrative achievements of Lockheed's Georgia division.

The Hercules design, despite its conventional look today, pushed the state of the art at its inception with 3,000 psi. hydraulic system, high-voltage ac. electrical system, high-pressure and high-temperature pneumatic systems for de-icing and energy transfer, machined wing skins for integral fuel tanks, single-point refueling system and externally housed landing gear to provide untrammelled cargo space inside the fuselage.

The powerplants were Allison T56 turboprops originally developed by the Navy. In the Hercules, the P-3 Orion and the airlines' Electra, they fulfilled the prediction of Adm. A. M. Pride, then chief of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics, that the turboprop would become the workhorse of the jet age. As the Hercules design grew in size, gross weight and payload, the Allison engine development kept apace until the current models deliver 4,910 eshp. for the latest model Hercules.

The C-130 evolved through 45 different versions, and the key engineers and program managers changed with the models. Among them were E. A. Peterson on the prototypes, C. H. Dallas on the production C-130A and C-130E, J. A. Jaeger on the C-130B, J. W.

Curtis on the commercial version and F. E. Gifford on the HC-130H air rescue version capable of picking up a man from the ground.

The Hercules has outstripped all its original requirements in a fantastic manner. It delivered full loads on ice in both the Arctic for DEW line support and the Antarctic where it is the standard Navy support transport. It has landed on dirt strips, grass, desert sands, aircraft carrier decks, and picked up and delivered cargo by aerial systems without ever landing at all. Because of its ability to land heavy cargo and supplies almost anywhere, it quickly became an emergency system to respond to natural disaster in all parts of the world.

Begun initially with the famed 322nd Air Div. based at Dreux and Evereux in France, the Hercules rescue work has included ice island breakups in the Arctic, tidal waves in Chile and Japan, earthquakes in Italy, Peru and Nicaragua, cholera epidemic in the Congo, polio in Japan, famine in Central Africa, locust plagues in North Africa, revolution in Santo Domingo, war refugees in the Congo, Jordan and Pakistan, blizzards in Arizona, hurricanes on the Gulf Coast and the floods of Agnes last summer in Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania.

The Hercules began early to expand beyond its transport role as an aerial mapping platform that discovered Cuba was misplaced by 1,200 ft. on then standard charts, as a mid-air recovery system for early USAF reconnaissance satellite data capsules and as a tanker.

But it was in the Southeast Asia war that the Hercules really played an incredible number of roles. As a transport, it provided the key air mobility and logistics that thwarted so many of Hanoi's offensive plans climaxing with the siege of Khe Sanh. These C-130 aerial supply missions kept the besieged Marines going until the North Vietnamese regulars were decimated by air strikes.

The pounding that the C-130s took in Vietnam would have shattered a less rugged aircraft. In supplying combat troops, the number of over-gross takeoffs, heavy weight landings and grueling short-haul climb-cruise segments each day placed an unprecedented burden on the Hercules airframe and systems. Toward the end, even this rugged workhorse was being pounded to bits and required structural beef-up modifications.

But the Hercules also played an offensive role as a gunship, pounding the Ho Chi Minh trail at night, launching reconnaissance and ECM drones in North Vietnam and refueling rescue helicopters deep in enemy territory. It also flew ECM and Elint missions and served as an aerial command post for tactical commanders.

The Hercules also blossomed as a commercial cargo transport and is now doing such diverse jobs as supplying Arctic oil fields and hauling wall-to-wall carpeting direct from Carolina mills to Pacific Coast sales centers. Delta Air Lines, which pioneered the airline Hercules six years ago, soon found it was running out of cubage before tonnage and stimulated Lockheed to add a 12-ft. fuselage plug. This has produced the L-100-30 with a payload of over 50,000 lb., which is opening a new market segment not only for airline cargo operations but also for smaller nations that need a dual role civil-military freight carrier.

Lockheed is now negotiating with a score of countries on potential Hercules sales involving over a hundred aircraft. The Air Force is already designing a replacement for the Hercules military role in the AMST prototype competition. But by the time AMST goes into service, the C-130 will have recorded at least three decades of the toughest service. Meanwhile, its commercial future will continue with the steady expansion of air cargo demand.

**DAYTON'S OIC**

**HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, often in recent years we have been told of the problems in manpower programs. Therefore, I am pleased that today I can bring to my colleagues' attention a report on a job training program that is being implemented successfully—Dayton's OIC program.

In operation since 1967, this project for the unemployed and underemployed focuses on minority groups but it is open to all regardless of race, creed, color, or previous background. Its motto is "We help ourselves."

I am sure that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD will find the following account of Dayton's OIC efforts of interest:

[From the Dayton Daily News, Feb. 11, 1973]  
TURNING DREAMS INTO JOBS—OIC "RESEARCH LAB" POLISHES SKILLS, OPENS DOORS

(By Bette Owens)

It's lunch time at the Dayton Youth Opportunities center at 1818 W. Third St. Fifteen students are sitting around, chatting about soap operas, a recent suicide, problems at home, drugs and prostitution.

Jessebelle, a welfare mother with two illegitimate children, dominates the conversation. She laughs about the suicide victim.

"When I die," she says, "I will have a vodka in one hand and some blue tips (narcotics) in my mouth. I'd never jump off a bridge."

Jabo shakes his head and mutters, "These women don't have a thing on their minds. They talk about soap operas like they lived in Peyton Place. Who cares about getting high. I want a job."

Jabo has problems. He is a former dope peddler. He can't get a job working with money because he's on parole for "hanging paper" (bad checks) and can't get a security bond, though he has a college education and is qualified to operate accounting machines.

He blames his troubles on the system. "I want to work, but they won't let me," he complains. "I'm here to get a new skill I can use without hangups."

"In high school, nobody ever took the time to prepare me for the working world. What's the sense in going to high school if you are just as dumb when you come out as when you went in?"

Jessebelle and Jabo are fictitious names, but they are real people—typical of the job-anxious residents in Dayton's black ghetto. In their desperation for jobs they enroll in job training programs around the city.

Jabo describes what has been called "systemic discrimination": "I got tired of knocking my head against the wall when employer after employer wouldn't hire me for anything but janitorial work. So I went to the streets, started pimping, pushing dope and forging checks. Got to eat somehow."

"Then I went to college in prison, came out and still can't get a job. OIC is my last hope. Something must be wrong with me. I hope this place can fix it. If not, I'll probably go back in the streets."

I was there listening to Jabo and Jessebelle because I was also a student of the OIC training program for several days. No one there knew I was a reporter. As far as they knew, I was just another person trying to learn a skill so I could get a job.



OIC stands for Opportunities Industrialization center, a self-help program started by the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan in Philadelphia in 1964 after leading a boycott against 29 big firms for not hiring blacks for skilled work and finding that few blacks were equipped to fill skilled jobs when they opened up.

The idea for the OIC program developed, Mr. Sullivan said later, because: "I could not request something from business if I could not produce. Integration without preparation is frustration, and protest without progress is empty."

The Dayton chapter of OIC and its training program for the unemployed and underemployed has been in operation since 1967. The main focus is on minority groups, but the program is open to all regardless of race, creed, color or previous background. A sign outside the building, a renovated warehouse in the heart of Dayton's black ghetto, says, "We help ourselves."

Inside, I found the atmosphere quite different from the depressing surroundings outside. The halls and walls are clean, the classrooms spacious. Almost like a college.

The receptionist was pleasant and the application form was simple. As soon as I had enrolled, I was interviewed by counselor Roy Kenion.

"Here is our student handbook," said Kenion. "Take it home, look it over and think about the skill you wish to develop. Your three-day orientation sessions begin Monday."

"On Wednesday you will take achievement tests and then your classes will begin the following Monday and last for about six months or longer. It depends on you."

"Is it that simple?" I asked.  
"Sure is," he said. "But if you don't show up Monday, I will be calling you at home. If you have problems getting to the center, let us know so we can make arrangements for you."

That's a switch, I thought. At most programs you have to take a physical, go on a waiting list, scratch and fight to get in.

OIC has a thorough orientation program that a lot of colleges would envy. The first day consisted of information on OIC's history, rap sessions and details on courses and job opportunities. Instructors later make use of attitudes revealed in the rap sessions when they give individual counseling.

There were about 15 in my orientation class. Some were jobless and untrained, others had menial jobs and wanted to acquire a skill.

Kenion, a 25-year-old college student, encouraged us to take the accounting machine course. OIC has placed several of its graduates in jobs with such machines at local banks.

The machines for the course were donated by businesses. "It is beneficial to industry to have us use their machines for training," said Kenion.

The second day in orientation was for job development and detailed description of courses. A job development counselor described the "feeder program" that prepares enrollees for job training by improving work attitudes and motivation.

It also gets into such general job-connected skills as preparing for a civil service exam, personal habits and appearance, communication, job-finding techniques, consumer education, image development and reading.

The student handbook describes orientation as "the most significant part of the OIC commitment in reaching the new trainee. The trainee is motivated to realize it is possible for him to become a productive person in the work world."

I thought the feeder program very effective. I could sense changes in the attitudes of my fellow students. But it is still only part of the program, and I could understand

why OIC balked in 1967 when the vice president of McCall Corp. wanted to support only that phase of the program.

Asked why OIC devotes three days to orientation, Kenion replied, "To prepare and retrain the body, change habits to a working climate and give an in-depth explanation of how OIC functions."

OIC offers 10 courses—clerical skills, office machines, telephone training, communication skills, key punch operation, computational skills, data processing, community development, accounting machines and auto mechanics.

I signed up for key punch operation, which I was to take along with feeder program courses.

The key punch curriculum includes typing, filing, computation and communication skills. Students work at their own pace. The instructors and counselors were very alert.

I tried to keep it from showing that I already knew how to type, but the typing teacher wasn't fooled. She alerted the job developer and, bingo! I got a job offer for \$6,500 a year from a local law firm.

That kind of thing really turns on the students. The power of positive thinking could be felt throughout the center.

The job developer told me I could continue my OIC courses and work in the job, too, but I declined the offer. He didn't even get upset when I told him I would rather work for \$8,500 a year. He tried to find me a job in that pay range.

After six days in the program, I was convinced that it is effective and has a good impact on the students and the community. I revealed my true identity as a reporter to the executive director, Thomas L. Gaston.

Gaston is clearly enthusiastic and proud of what OIC is doing. "The school system has a lot to learn from us," he said. "We get the products of the high school system. We know better than they the failings and weaknesses of high schools."

Gaston hopes OIC never becomes used as an institution. "OIC should be a research lab," he said. "Schools should use us as a center where they can test techniques we have developed."

Gaston likes to quote OIC statistics: 87 per cent have completed school through grades 10, 11 or 12, 41 per cent are 21 to 25 year old, 75 per cent have incomes below the poverty level.

What kind of people go to OIC? Ex-offenders determined to "go straight" after release from prison or jail, laid-off workers, high school dropouts, housewives bored with staying home, divorcees who need job security, Army veterans, and many others in need of knowing more about how to get and keep a good job.

"OIC paves a future," said Gaston, "for people with minority group frustrations, feelings of inadequacy and little motivations—sensitive people who have lived by 'mother wit' in a degraded environment of slums, illegitimacy, welfare, poverty and exploitations by landlords and merchants."

More than 2,000 Daytonians have taken OIC training so far. Of those placed in jobs, 86 per cent stayed there six months or longer. Current enrollment is 182.

The current unemployment rate among Dayton blacks is 25 per cent. Gaston believes OIC can keep cutting into this and keep reducing "systematic discrimination" if it can get enough money to continue operating.

OIC depends on donations of money, equipment and services from private industry and business. It gets some federal funds, but only on a matching basis, so that it must first get private donations in order to qualify for federal funds.

This makes cash donations more valuable, since donations of equipment and services do not produce equivalent federal funds.

However, recent cutbacks in federal government spending indicates there will be even less from that source from now on.

Right now according to Gaston, OIC has enough funds for operation only through July. To assure another year of life, Gaston figures OIC needs about \$350,000 in cash and \$50,000 in services—not counting plans to set up a branch in East Dayton or the \$75,000 needed to set up and run an NCR computer that was donated by a local firm.

Gaston said the computer could be used to expand OIC's program into computer programming, data processing and computer operations. But OIC has not been able to afford to install it and use it, and so it sits idle under a plastic cover.

## SEWAGE TREATMENT FARMS

### HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the 1972 Water Pollution Control Act Amendments in March last year, I had the opportunity to offer an amendment to the legislation which provided for the encouragement of sewage treatment systems that recycle nutrients in sewage through agriculture, aquaculture and/or silviculture. It was gratifying when the House responded favorably to the amendment by a 250-to-130 vote.

In the intervening year progress in the development of recycling systems has been substantial, and a considerable amount of research has turned up many more systems throughout the world that utilize recycling as a means to control the threat of water pollution.

Some of the more notable examples include a 7,500-acre sewage farm in Paris, France, that since 1883 has produced and continues to produce substantial quantities of fresh vegetables for direct human consumption, a 26,000-acre sewage farm in Melbourne, Australia, that flood irrigates raw sewage on 10,000 acres of pasture from which 270,000 head of beef cattle and 1,500,000 sheep have been marketed since 1910, and innumerable smaller systems in the United States including Tallahassee, Fla.; Lubbock, Tex.; Bakersfield and Fresno, Calif.; and Belding and Ravenna, Mich.

Many of these systems are very primitive, spreading raw sewage on the land, although public health service requirements in the United States have led to pretreatment of the sewage with the result that only treated effluent has been flood irrigated or spray irrigated on soil and crops in this country.

The Muskegon, Mich., system in my congressional district will be the largest land treatment system in the United States and will begin operations this week. It will treat raw sewage to secondary treatment standards in aerated lagoons, and then after chlorination irrigate 6,000 acres of cropland by means of center pivot spray irrigation rigs. Muskegon County is anticipating substantial income from corn and forage crops grown on its farm which will help

reduce the overall cost of sewage treatment already relatively low in a land treatment system with its simple construction and operations.

During the course of my investigations relative to recycling systems for sewage, many questions have been raised about such systems and I suppose that I have been required to dig out the answers to as many questions on the subject as anyone. Most of them have related to agriculture recycling of the nutrients in sewage because that is the approach most advanced in development and it is the approach of the Muskegon system with which I am best acquainted. Because many areas of the Nation are carefully exploring sewage treatment processes in order to construct systems to meet requirements of the 1972 Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, and because many Members become directly involved with their constituents at some point in the selection process, the following questions and answers relating to the land treatment process may be helpful.

Where can enough land be found for such a system?

Land treatment systems do require substantial amounts of land, the exact amount depending on soil type, climate—length of growing season and rainfall—topography and nutrient concentrations in the effluent. Land is needed for treatment and storage lagoons—if the ground freezes in the winter unless forest land is irrigated—as well as for irrigated cropland. On the average, about 200 acres per million gallons of sewage per day is required. Muskegon will use 10,000 acres for its 43 million gallons per day system. It is important to keep in mind that much of the land in such systems will continue to be used for agriculture and that agriculture production will not be lost in the process; rather, substantially increased crop production is most likely. Agriculture land is generally found within reasonable distances from urban areas. The important problem is how the use of land for irrigation of treated sewage effluent is acquired. Several options are available to local government, including fee ownership, leasing and easements. Payment for the right to irrigate nutrient rich effluent on a farmer's land may well be the least socially disruptive system for land use in contrast to fee ownership requiring the farmer to give up his land.

Will not land treatment systems pollute groundwater?

A properly designed land treatment system will irrigate at rates allowing maximum removal of potential pollutants by crops. Chemical reactions in the soil and other natural processes in the soil will also help preclude movement of pollutants to the ground water. In addition, one of the more serious problems associated with prolonged irrigation is the buildup of the water table to the land surface. This potential problem will not be encountered by a properly designed land treatment system because such a system includes complete underdrainage for the irrigated land.

Will not land treatment systems smell?

The odors generally associated with sewage are the result of decomposition of the sewage under anaerobic conditions—

the swamp gas effect. A properly designed land treatment system will include processes for the aerated breakdown of organic matter thus eliminating odors in this phase of the system. It is possible that treated effluent in storage lagoons may emit minimal odors during spring turnover of the water.

While 90 percent of the organic matter has been decomposed in the secondary treatment process, stratification of stored water in the winter may result in some anaerobic decomposition of the remaining organic matter. This possibility can be eliminated by aeration or the integration of powerplants or other industries into the complex that will use the stored water as an industrial water supply thereby keeping the water in circulation. However, even if such actions were not taken, such odors would occur for only a few hours, they should be quite nominal, and the buffering effect of the agriculture lands in such systems should prevent any significant problem. It is interesting to note that Paris and Melbourne have not experienced objectionable odors and they irrigate raw sewage. The treated effluent irrigated on cropland in a properly designed land treatment system will have less than 10 percent of the organic matter of raw sewage to decompose and the aerating effects of irrigation will eliminate any potential odor problems from that source.

Are not land treatment systems too expensive?

Total construction costs at Muskegon, including land, are less than \$1 per gallon of treatment capacity. Costs of a comparable size physical-chemical treatment system in Chicago are about \$1.40 and the Corps of Engineers has estimated installed costs for treatment of all of the wastewater from Chicago and the south end of Lake Michigan at 84 cents per gallon of treatment capacity for a land treatment system, \$1.26 for a physical-chemical treatment system to handle such wastes, and \$1.57 for an advanced biological treatment system. Operating costs of land treatment are conceded to be significantly less than the costs for alternative processes in addition land treatment system provide agriculture income to further reduce operating costs.

Do land treatment systems perform as well as alternatives in treating sewage?

Evidence accumulated to date indicates that the land treatment process performs better than any other sewage treatment process except distillation of water, according to the Council on Environmental Quality in its 1971 first annual report to the President. It is interesting to note that a modified form of land treatment is used in standard drinking water purification processes.

It would also be of interest to Members to note several facts related to the nutrients in sewage that are utilized for crop production in the land treatment process versus attempts to "dispose" of such nutrients in other systems. Nutrients in the 40 billion gallons of sewage produced in the Nation each day are worth about \$1,732,000 or annually \$632,000,000 at last year's fertilizer prices. Physical-chemical and advanced

biological treatment systems waste this fertilizer through incineration of the sludges they produce or the volatilization of fertilizers such as nitrogen through denitrification or breakpoint chlorination and consequent loss of that fertilizer to the atmosphere. In this day of growing scarcity of natural resources including fertilizers we can no longer view with equanimity such ostentatious waste.

As further developments occur in the field of sewage treatment processes I will attempt to provide additional information to the House of Representatives and will be pleased to answer other questions Members may wish to pose.

#### CITIZENS BAND WAS ONLY VOICE DURING AGNES FLOOD

### HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, when tropical storm Agnes swept through my district in southwestern New York last June causing catastrophic flooding, the voice of the Citizen Band operators provided the only communication link in the devastated area.

These people typified public stewardship at its highest level. Serving long hours and many times at great physical risk, they performed outstandingly sending and receiving messages during those critical days and nights in the wake of the storm. Their efforts are deserving of the highest praise.

A recent story in the Erwin Progress tells in detail the superb job done by these citizens in time of community disaster. I am inserting excerpts in the RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

#### CB COMMUNICATIONS WAS VOICE DURING DISASTER

Sometime around five in the morning, Friday, June 23, 1972, Al Rigby looked out his living room window high on Hillcrest Drive, and watched generators start to blow throughout the water logged valley.

At that point, he knew the area was without power, and that meant without communication, so he ran his trailer camper generator upstairs to his Citizens Band radio set.

That was the beginning of Corning-Printed Post's radio base control station; an operation that linked the Agnes disaster area to the outside world for the worst period of the flood.

Earlier, on Thursday night, Mr. Rigby had been talking with CB operators in the Campbell area and had received some reports that the dam at Bradford had broken. He had gone to Campbell to bring his daughter, Mrs. Judy Kennedy, into Printed Post and out of, what was then believed to be, the danger area.

(It was later determined that the Bradford Dam had not burst. According to Mr. Rigby, a caretaker ordinarily opens the gates at certain intervals. Evidently the caretaker had opened the gates, met a torrent of water and fled, leaving the gates open.)

Mr. Rigby had tried to go to sleep late Thursday night but awoke at four and went to the window to see what was happening. He didn't have his glasses, so at first he thought the valley was covered with fog.



"But what I thought was fog," he said, "was really water." And then things started happening fast. Hillcrest Drive is one of the highest elevations in the area and evacuees began arriving in droves. Mr. Rigby started directing traffic and clearing the road so people could get through to high ground.

#### HOME BASE BEGINS

Then he began calling and picking up every available mobile CB set in the area. The state police, he said, had lost their set and their emergency generator was under water so a set was installed with the police. He also went to the Painted Post Fire Department and gerry-rigged an antenna for their mobile unit.

Mobile units were quickly established at Corning Hospital, West High School, the Holiday Inn, Frank Pierce School, Watson Homestead, the Winfield Street School, the Smith School, Sullivan Park, CFA School, Corning City Hall, and Corning Community College.

And then the round-robin communication relay began.

There is a big difference between Citizen's Band and Ham Radio operators. Ham radio means shortwave; each ham operator is assigned a call name and only ham units have the range to broadcast out of the immediate area.

CB operators, on the other hand, operate only in a short range, depending on the geographical layout, of about 20 miles. Ordinarily, people take up CB radio as something of a hobby. They chat with other CB units in their neighborhoods, or use their equipment as a traveling phone in the car, or to help coordinate camping and outdoor activities.

But last June, over 25 CB operators became involved in a life and death operation that was hardly recreational.

#### SEVERAL ADVANTAGES

The Rigby household had several sound prerequisites to becoming a base control station. First, the house is situated high on Hillcrest Drive, protecting it from flood damage and freeing the station from the interference of hills. Second, the Rigby CB set is equipped with an electronic device that allows the operator, by remote-control, to position the radio antenna in seconds.

And finally, Mr. Rigby, as his daughter put it, is "something of a tinkerer." The radio tubes in CB sets are designed to last about 20 hours and at the time of the flood, needed constant attention. Eventually, Emmerly Meyers was able to set up a repair shop in the Rigby living room, supplied with electronic paraphernalia from the Rigby basement.

At first, only two Ham operators were available to relay messages to the outside; they were Jack Shammer of Elmira and Larry Carpenter.

The system worked this way: mobile units would call requests for personnel or supplies into the base station. The base station would either contact the next appropriate mobile unit, or pass the call on through a ham operator.

#### SPECIAL AMPLIFIER

Captain Halm of the National Guard had authorized the use of a linear amplifier at home base. Under ordinary circumstances, the use of such a device is prohibited by the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Rigby said people as far away as Texas and California were picking up base control broadcasts, but when they found out what was going on, they quickly and politely cleared the channel.

The first call the base station picked up was a rescue mission. Two Corning Glass Workers were stranded on the Erwin Valley plant roof.

From then on, the calls poured in and the base station set was never left vacant. Judy Kennedy, who did relief on the radio set and also took down messages in shorthand, said that doctor's orders and prescriptions were

the most difficult messages, since one misspelled word could be fatal.

#### ADDISON CONTACT

The Hillcrest Drive station also served as Addison's only outlet to the outside world. After the first week of operation, a meeting for all communication workers was held at West High School and, according to Mr. Rigby, the Addison group stressed the necessity of contact with home base.

Since the home base had the clearest idea of what was going on, and what supplies were needed where, Mr. Rigby found himself assuming an authority that, actually, no one had given him. As an example, it was learned that the Addison community had no drinking water. A group of trucks had come into Corning with fresh drinking water, and Mr. Rigby asked that one of those trucks be diverted to Addison.

Someone asked him whose authority the truck was to be rerouted under, and Mr. Rigby answered promptly, "It will have to be mine."

#### VOLUNTEER CENTER

Besides the radio base control operations, the Rigby home also became the volunteer center. Anyone who could volunteer work first came to the Rigby house, and was then placed where he could do the most good.

Literally hundreds of evacuees and volunteers passed through the Hillcrest home each day following the flood.

After the second week, the Corning Glass Works began paying personnel to keep the home base operation going. Dr. Wakeman of CGW, gave permission for Glass Works personnel to maintain their relief work, rather than returning to their jobs, Mr. Rigby said.

The Glass Works also contributed some equipment, including three typewriters, to the home base operation.

The dedication and effort of the mobile unit operators, Mr. Rigby said, was superhuman. He cited one case of a couple who manned a mobile unit in their car for well over 36 hours.

#### CB WORKERS

Although a complete list may be impossible to compile at this point, Mr. Rigby has gathered the following names of CB operators who worked in the flood relief effort.

They are: Sam and Ann Cooper, Richard Savy, Arthur Pierpont, Ernest Lewis, Arnold Brooks, Lavern Brooks, Stewart Plumbly, Robert Blencowe, Raymond Baker, Jess Faulkner, Richard Herrick, Raymond Schwartz, Ernest Marsh, Waldo Preston, Richard Prins and Harry Sumner.

Those assisting with nontechnical help were: Judy and Neil Kennedy, Burt and Ann Nolla, Laura Bruce, Edward Bush, Vern Anderson and Norman Woodhouse.

The ham operators who worked in this operation are listed separately in this paper.

Mr. Rigby submitted a detailed report of the home base activities to the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C., but to date has received no acknowledgment of this report.

He was told that the FCC monitored home base operations during one 24 hour period. Someone recently cited him a statistic that, at the most hectic period, home base was receiving a message every 20 seconds during one 24 hour period; but this statement has not been verified.

#### NEW SLANT SUGGESTED ON AMNESTY QUESTION

### HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, the Wescolite, the student newspaper at Western

Montana College in Dillon, Mont., carried an article suggesting a new slant concerning the question of amnesty. It suggests an interesting approach to the problem which I think merits publication in the RECORD. I urge its printing:

NEW SLANT SUGGESTED ON AMNESTY QUESTION

(By Dean Van De Hey)

(NOTE.—The question of "amnesty" for those young men renouncing their citizenship and leaving the United States to escape military duty, brought this suggestion from a returned veteran. It appeared in The Westcolite, Western Montana College student newspaper in Dillon, Montana. The author is a sophomore student from Missoula and a three-year veteran who served 27 months in Viet Nam with a 13-man Construction Battalion team in the Navy.)

A very important problem now is facing the nation. The question of amnesty for the men who left the United States instead of bearing arms for their nation is very controversial.

The views that I'm putting forward are my own. I think I have as much right to voice my opinion as the President or any other citizen of the United States, for I served my country and bore arms in her defense.

I, like many of the young people, did not agree fully with the war in Vietnam. But, unlike many, I fulfilled my obligation in the Armed Services.

Those who decided to leave our country to go to Canada, Sweden or Switzerland now want the United States to take them back, without any reprimand. However, Americans who have lost sons or who served in the Armed Services won't sit back and let this happen, and they should not.

Look back a few years when we, the young people, asked for the right to govern our lives. We were given the right to vote. With this we were also considered of the legal age, so now we make our own decisions. In other words, those who chose to leave this country must now live with those decisions. They made their decisions; they considered themselves adults; so now let them live with those decisions.

I also think that we can not keep these people out of the United States. Many left just because it was the thing to do. These persons have grown up now and realize what an important decision they made. But, I believe they now must prove themselves.

One way for these people to prove themselves is for us to treat them as aliens. In other words, if these people want to come back into the United States, then they must obtain their citizenship, just like anyone coming into our country to live. This is not as easy as it sounds. In fact, we take a lot for granted when we are born in this country and are given this honor of citizenship, just because we were born here. The men coming back to the United States should have to re-earn their citizenship because they denounced it once. I think they should realize how difficult it is to obtain.

For example, a man must appear before a Naturalization Court and file a petition for citizenship. At this time a preliminary examination of his character and his sincerity is made. Then after five years' residence the applicant must reappear for a final hearing. Two American citizens must also appear with the applicant to swear to his loyalty to the United States and certify his character and residence. The applicant must then take an oath to uphold the laws of the United States and to bear arms in defense of this nation. This may be one of the reasons why he left this country, but after earning his citizenship instead of having it given to him, it will mean a little more to him than before. The applicant must also swear not to engage in any subversive activities. Then a 90 day waiting period is enforced. In these 90 days

the applicant's character and actions are investigated. After which he will receive his certificate of citizenship.

I believe that after an applicant has done this, no one should hold his previous actions against him. All men make mistakes, and I believe that after regaining his citizenship, a man would have proven his loyalty to this country, for regaining citizenship is not an easy task.

This is one way by which I believe the problem of amnesty can be solved. These men can not expect to be given citizenship but if they earn it, their past records should not be held against them.

#### NEWARK'S ATTUCKS-KING MEMORIAL PARADE

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 15, in my hometown of Newark, N.J., our eighth annual Attucks-King Parade was celebrated. This year our gathering took on added significance, for "Character Building Through Sportsmanship" was selected as our theme and in addition to recalling the lives, achievements, hopes, and dreams of Crispus Attucks and Dr. Martin Luther King. We also set aside this time to reflect upon another man—the late Jackie Robinson.

Jackie Robinson—No. 42, second baseman for the Brooklyn Dodgers, Rookie of the Year in 1947, Most Valuable Player in 1949, and in 1962, the first black member elected to Baseball's Hall of Fame. And all the time, through his skill, his intelligence, his belief in himself, his determination to prove he was not only good, but the very best, he was saying, "Judge me, look at me, for my ability and my achievements, judge me for what I can do and for what I hope to attain." Jackie Robinson, who cracked the crust of bigotry in the baseball world, achieved a breakthrough which had an incalculable effect on the texture of all American life. Jackie Robinson, succeeded in breaking down the barriers that for 70 years made baseball a solely exclusive sport and made it possible for an unbroken string of black stars to enter the big leagues. Jackie Robinson—a man who remained throughout his life a tireless crusader for social and racial justice.

For this first step which Jackie Robinson took on the field of competition in 1947 demonstrated not only that the National League had room for one outstanding black man but that American society was open for all men, regardless of color or creed.

So too did Crispus Attucks, by his presence among the early American revolutionaries, demonstrate that freedom and self-determination were to be the inherent rights of all participants in American life. Crispus Attucks, tall and heavily built, carrying only a large wooden stick, stood forth as the leader for the courageous gathering of Boston citizens who defended the sentinel at the King Street Custom's House against the British that March night in 1770. Little is really known of his background and historians have been known to quibble over conflicting accounts. What is to be remembered,

however, is that Crispus Attucks just seemed to arise and act upon the feelings pounding in his heart and the hearts of all our early colonists to become one of the first martyrs to stand forth for the cause of American liberty. What is to be remembered is that in fighting for justice and freedom, all men work together as a team and are judged by their ability, their accomplishments and their success.

John Boyle O'Reilly, in dedicating a poem to Crispus Attucks, called upon all of us and asked:

Have we learned through affliction's teaching what our Crispus Attucks knew, When right is stricken, the white and the black are counted as one, not two?

And so we must come to the learning of Boston's lesson today,

The moral that Crispus Attucks taught in the old heroic way,

God made mankind to be one in blood, and one in spirit and thought;

And so great a boon, by a brave man's death, is never dearly bought.

And Dr. Martin Luther King, could not he have easily stated these words, almost two centuries later—

When right is stricken, the white and black, are counted as one, not two?

Martin Luther King stood as a symbol above color for the imperishable rights of us all. He held a dream for the black, and this same dream for the poor and the disadvantaged, and this same dream still for peace for his country for men at home and abroad.

He said—

It is the need for men, to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to violence and oppression.

Martin Luther King—whose militant nonviolence accomplished more in his short lifetime in bridging the gap of fear and misunderstanding than all the violence of the racists, black, or white. He made us aware that the better angels of our nature can dominate the struggle of the United States and her people. And the dream of true equality of rights and opportunity for all men is nearer today because in our lifetime there lived a Martin Luther King.

Thus, we can take that baseball field in which Jackie Robinson played and we can do many things to it. We can fence it in. We can build the highest of walls around it and cut it off from the outside world. We can forget to cut its grass and clean its stands and let it remain neglected in years to come. Or, we can open up its doors and build the very best of teams, with the most qualified and the most skillful of players, let us all join together and take the latter course. For I believe, in so doing, we can accomplish a great deal.

#### COMMONWEALTH AGAINST BRUNELLE

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier I inserted excerpts from the testimony in the criminal abortion trial Common-

wealth against Brunelle held in the State of Massachusetts. Today, I would like to begin inserting a commentary on this testimony previously printed in the RECORD by Dr. Herbert Ratner, M.D., public health director of Oak Park, Ill. and editor of Child and Family Quarterly. The commentary was printed in Child and Family Quarterly, volume 9, No. 2, page 159:

#### COMMONWEALTH AGAINST BRUNELLE

##### II. COMMENTARY

(By Herbert Ratner)

Whether the act of abortion constitutes homicide—the killing of a man—is critical to any legal conclusion concerning abortion. Since "who is man" and "what is fetus" are first and foremost biological questions, they must be resolved in our times, as they have been throughout the history of civil and canon law, by relying upon the best scientific knowledge of the day.

To the question, then, of "what is a fetus?" (or an embryo or a zygote), a question that pertains directly to the constitutionality of the Massachusetts law, it is understandable why the Court in *Commonwealth v. Brunelle* restricted witnesses to specialists from the fields of medicine and biology. The biologist's studies include the life cycle of the species, *Homo sapiens*. The physician, whose patients are human beings, should be able to identify the recipient of his art. Definitive answers from these specialists, were they forthcoming, would at least establish the existence or nonexistence of a victim.

The Court's restriction had an additional benefit. Medicine and biology are sciences which base their conclusions upon observation and sensory data about which there can be much agreement. They contrast to other disciplines—sociology, politics, ethics and theology—in which agreements are fewer and where hypotheses, conjecture, speculation and value judgments are multiple.

The testimony of the witnesses for the defense, because of its arbitrary deviation from standard medical and biological truths, is analyzed at length. The testimony of the Witnesses for the State of Massachusetts, because it conforms to established medical and biological knowledge, is not analyzed.

In science, even more so than in any other discourse, the function of words is to communicate concepts that correspond to objective reality. As one reads and reflects on the testimony of the defense witnesses, however, as they attempt to characterize the nature of that within the pregnant woman which establishes the pregnant state, the impression arises that these extensively educated physicians and biologists are manipulating words to confuse, and to further a desired end, rather than using words to clarify an objective reality. For instance, the repeated labelling of the fetus as a "potential human being" sounds like a previously agreed upon party-line, like a calculated ambiguity intended to obscure, instead of the precise language of the dispassionate scientist delineating an actuality. Such labelling is adroit. While not denying that the fetus is related to a human being, it denies that it is a human being.

The defense witnesses seem to be ignorant of, or to have forgotten, the admonishment of William Harvey who, in 1651, in his great classic on *Anatomical Exercises on the Generation of Animals*, stated that—

"To have recourse to new and unusual terms were less to bring a torch to lighten, than to darken things still more with a cloud: it were to attempt an explanation . . .

"By [an] unknown, and to impose a greater toil to the reader to understand the meaning of words than to comprehend the things themselves."

Here, Harvey insists that the true scientist is one who expounds reality by clarifying it,



not one who muddles it by camouflaging it with new and fuzzy terms. Recourse to the lexicon makes evident that the defense witnesses avoided standard medical terminology to circumvent established medical knowledge by using the metaphysical term, *potential*, which they misunderstand and misapply. In so doing, they ignored what even the high school student is taught from the most widely used, contemporary high school textbook on sex education: "Human life begins when the head of the sperm cell, which carries the nucleus, unites with the nucleus of the ovum, or egg cell." (Interestingly, Alan Guttmacher, President of Planned Parenthood-World Population and a foremost crusader for "abortion-on-demand," is credited as a consultant for this book.) It is as if the goal of the defense were to confuse the Court about the biological facts in the hope that the Court could be fooled or intimidated and robbed of its common sense by a chorus of witnesses harmonizing a leitmotif.

An analysis of their testimony, however, reveals discord rather than concord. The defense witnesses testified to two contrary positions neither of which, curiously, derived from their competencies as experts in the disciplines of biology or medicine. One set of witnesses (Hall and Tietze) espoused the position that the fetus does not have "the nature of a human being" but is only a "potential human being." The other set of witness (Lieberman, Hardin and Notman) took the contrary position that it is beyond the competency of the natural scientist or physician to determine who is a human being or whether the fetus is a human being, since *human being* is not a medical concept or even a scientific issue. In other words, they insisted that *human being* is a relative, variable, or arbitrary designation superimposed from outside their specialties. In effect then, the former set of witnesses claimed on medical grounds to be able to distinguish between a *potential* and an *actual* human being, whereas the latter set denied that it was within the competency of the biological and medical sciences to determine who is or is not a human being. These discordant positions deserve further analysis.

#### THE FIRST SET OF DEFENSE WITNESSES

For the former to define the fetus as a potential human being is a misleading, unscientific, and erroneous use of the term and concept, *potential*. It is misleading because it artificially separates one stage in the life of an individual, a stage that is part of the progressive sequence of stages leading to maturity, from all other stages. Thus, the fetus is arbitrarily singled out, labelled *potential* and robbed of the status it shares with *actual* human beings in all other stages of life. It is unscientific because it does not tell us what the fetus is only what it may become. It is erroneous because it imposes a philosophic concept where it does not apply. Nowhere in the medical literature, or in the science of embryology which deals specifically with the fetus, is the metaphysical concept, *potential*, ever used in this manner. In embryology, the accurate and technical terms for the process implied by the erroneously applied term, *potential*, are *growth*, and *development*, terms which equally apply to zygote, embryo, fetus, infant, child, pubescent and adolescent.

In the natural order, the phrase, *potential human being*, can only have meaning when applied to egg and sperm, which are specialized parts ordained to a new whole. Separately, each shed egg and sperm has a chromosomal number half that characteristic of the human species. Separately, each has an extremely limited life span; the egg, less than a day; the sperm, less than a week. Biologically, each has only two possible futures: death with its matter returning to the nonliving world; or transformation into a new, living, biologic whole, the zygote,

through a unitive process of the two germinal cells. This zygote—a new whole, a new individual—is no longer part of the mother's body any more than a tapeworm would be considered part of the mother, since neither is organically related.

This new whole has its own distinct, separate biological destiny—the destiny of a new human being with a life span now measured in scores of years rather than days. It not only possesses the full complement of chromosomes characteristic of a human being; but more uniquely it possesses an intrinsic, autonomous, automatic, self-activating radical power of growth and development. It has the capacity to convert *itself* into a fully developed individual, from an immature whole of one cell into a mature whole—adult man—consisting of myriad cells and numerous organic parts. Though growth and development is continuous, for convenience's sake we delineate temporal-spatial stages such as zygote, embryo, fetus, infant, child, pubescent and adolescent. To apply the phrase, *potential human being*, to any one of these stages has no scientific meaning because, whatever the stage, it is a stage of a human being already in existence. Neither in embryology in reference to zygote, embryo and fetus, nor in pediatrics in reference to infant, child, pubescent and adolescent, does one talk of a potential human being; one only talks of the growth and development of an actual human being.

That this is what biology teaches is accepted knowledge and is best explicated by Prof. J. H. Woodger of the University of London, in his modern classic, *Biological Principles*.

As preliminary and fundamental, Woodger emphasizes the distinction between cell and organism—between part and whole.

"A protozoon, a fertilized ovum, an unstrained muscle fiber, and a spermatozoon all exhibit this mode of organization [that of the cell] but they are very different entities and to confuse them is disastrous . . . By a cell therefore I shall understand a *certain type of biological organization* not a concrete entity. A protozoon is a *whole* organism which is characterized throughout its history by the cell-type of organization. A fertilized ovum is a *temporal* part of an organism which latter is *not* characterized by the cell-type of organization *throughout* its history. An unstrained muscle fiber is a *spatial* part of an organism and this part is characterized by the cell-type of organization. And the spermatozoon is a special part, characterized by the same type of organization, which has been separated 'for the purposes' of reproduction. It is as we shall see, a serious misdemeanor . . . to confuse a part with a whole." (pp. 295-6)

Woodger makes clear—  
"That the notion of organization should also embrace this fact of intrinsic serial change. It should be noted that it is incorrect to speak of an ovum developing into a frog, it is a *temporal* part of the history which is the frog. . . ." (p. 302).

Woodger, finally distinguishes embryology from genetics:

"The difference between a man and a monkey is one topic of study and belongs to genetics, but the difference between a man when he is an egg and the same man when he is twenty-one years of age is quite another topic of study and belongs to embryology." (p. 338)

"What exactly is it that develops—what persists, and what changes?"

The individual living organism is an event—a spatio-temporal happening. For human experience it is *known* as a certain perceptual object, namely a given animal or plant of every day life. And this perceptual object is a character of an event. We *know* such an event as a persisting thing, that is to say we know the event which constitutes the organism as having a certain perma-

nence of characterization of a certain type. It is of the type which requires time in which to display itself, since successive temporal parts of the event are differently characterized—it is a non-uniform object of . . . historical route . . . and we are concerned with the earlier parts during which, as it is commonly expressed, the organism exhibits a progressive increase in complexity of form, and the term development is usually only applied to this period." (p. 339)

In summary, then, following Woodger, it can be stated that when the unfertilized egg, which is a separated *part* of the mother, becomes fertilized by the sperm, which is a separated *part* of the father, a new individual, a new unique *whole*, comes into existence. In the species, *Homo sapiens*, it is a new human being. As Woodger states "to confuse a part with a whole" is "disastrous" and a "serious misdemeanor." One can argue about the rights of a human being at different stages of life, but that it is a human being throughout its intrauterine and extrauterine existence is an established fact of biology, the *science* of life, from which we derive physical proof of the presence or absence of man.

#### THE MASTERS REMAINS LILY WHITE

#### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last month I called to our colleagues' attention the fact that the prestigious Masters Golf Tournament was callously observing a subtle form of discrimination and that in the 37 years of the tournament's history a black American golf professional has never been invited to participate.

In a letter to the tournament director, 17 of our colleagues and I urged that the color barrier finally be broken and suggested that Mr. Lee Elder be extended an invitation. Regrettably, Mr. Clifford Roberts, the tournament director, rejected our petition and, once again, a black contestant was absent.

In recent days two articles have appeared in the Washington Post about the Masters' exclusion of blacks. These well-written and very perceptive articles—by sports writer George Solomon and columnist Colman McCarthy—go to the very core of the problem and discuss some of those issues which prompted me to initiate an effort, for the second time in as many years, to overcome the barrier thrown up against black professionals such as Elder, Charlie Sifford, Pete Brown and others.

I believe these two articles warrant full and careful consideration not only by our colleagues but by those who seek to achieve full equality and equal rights in athletics and other endeavors as well. I commend these articles to our colleagues' attention and present them herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1973]

#### SNOBBISHNESS OF THE MASTERS

#### TOURNAMENT

(By Colman McCarthy)

The unemployment rate for blacks is a little higher this week, due to the policies of the Augusta National Golf Club. The Masters golf tournament began Thursday and such

black professionals as Lee Elder, Charlie Sifford, Jim Dent, Pete Brown, George Johnson and Chuck Thorpe were not competing. They play in most other tournaments on the tour, from the U.S. Open—the most important event—to the Westchester Open, the richest. But unlike these tournaments and most others, entry to the Masters is not based solely on skill but on other qualifications, set out like guy wires by the captains of the Augusta ship. Attention was given the situation, when two weeks ago, 18 congressmen asked that Lee Elder, a black pro from Washington, be given special invitation.

The controversy over the Masters is not new, though the congressional interest is. An Augusta official, Clifford Roberts, a 77-year-old investment banker, rejected the petition from Congress, saying it would be "discrimination in reverse" to invite Elder because of his blackness. Thirteen categories exist for a Masters invitation. These include winning a regular tour event, being a Ryder Cup team member, being among the first 16 in the previous U.S. Open or the first eight in the PGA championship. Elder himself has said he wanted "no favors" and would either make it under the Masters rules or not at all.

That would seem to be the final putt on the issue. Yet, like the greens at Augusta, it is trickier on the second reading. Although the Masters may have ducked the charge of racism a stronger case can be made that the black professionals are victims of Masters snobbery. A racist irrationally believes somebody else is lower than he, while the snob's delusion is that he is higher than others. The snobbery of Clifford Roberts and his all-white golf club is that they play their tournament above the ruck who play in the regular PGA tournaments held 46 times in 1972. In those events, the 60 leading money winners from the previous year automatically qualify. Lee Elder is 32nd on the list, with 1972 earnings of \$70,000. Yet, this qualification, good enough to open other gates, meets only a closed door in Augusta.

Actually, the term Masters—suggesting a field of masterful players—is puffery. An argument can be made that the Masters is actually one of the weakest tournaments of the year. Besides Elder, 13 other professionals in 1972's leading money winners are not playing this week. Yet Gardner Dickinson, Don January and Bob Shaw are competing, even though none finished better than 90th in 1972 winnings; their combined earnings are less than Elder's alone. In addition to professionals of questionable mastery, the Masters sees a number of lack-luster amateurs also chopping around the course in aching futility. Then again, along with American has-beens and never-will-bees, a foreign contingent is annually invited to Augusta. Brian Barnes, an Englishman, hacked the turf 79 times in this year's first round and had an 85 in last year's. Hsieh Yung-yo had a feeble 79 in last year's first round. The irony is not lost on Elder that foreign players of limited talent compete in a tournament that bars many Americans of proven talent. About not playing last year, he said: "Yes, you could say I'm pretty disappointed. They invited the winner of the French Open and the Dutch Open. I won the Nigerian Open last fall, and it carried more money than those other two. I honestly thought this (1972) was the year I would be invited." One invitation Elder did receive, and accepted, was to play on South African courses—ones, like Augusta, where no blacks had ever played. Elder was more at home in apartheid Johannesburg than magnolia Augusta.

A second reason the Masters is an unmasterly tournament is that only about 80 players are in the field. The U.S. Open and other championships are tests with 140 or 150 entries. For most PGA events, along with the top 60 money winners, who are exempt, a qualifying round of 18 holes is held on Mondays to give the rabble a crack at the big money. In 1969, Orville Moody, an Army ser-

geant of 14 years came from such ranks to win the U.S. Open; that was in June, but he had no chance to compete in the Masters two months before.

The snobbery of the Masters will not be eliminated until a democracy of skill prevails, the way it prevails in other tournaments. Black golfers like Sifford, Brown and Johnson have won PGA tour events, where there is no stopping them from competing. What is really needed to democratize Augusta is not change of attitude in the club's membership but a change in the thinking among the white pros who play in the Masters. Why can't they band together and announce that they won't play until new qualifications are used, ones similar to the regular PGA events that blacks play in. This kind of pressure amounts to a boycott, a messiness not at home in a country club sport like golf. It apparently is too daring a social protest for a sport traditionally removed from the grime of reality. Yet something is unjust when qualified athletes like Elder are kept from their livelihood; one reason the injustice continues is because so many white players at this week's Masters look the other way.

It is hard to imagine that Jack Nicklaus, Arnold Palmer and the others are unaware of the snob priorities in Augusta. Years from now, when public pressure—small chance of player pressure—finally does open up the Masters to all comers, they may look back with regret that they did not speak out. Such regrets have been expressed by athletes in other sports. We see it in "The Boys of Summer," Roger Kahn's baseball book about the Brooklyn Dodgers; Carl Erskine, long retired from his pitching days and now back in Indiana, talks of his team when Jackie Robinson first joins it. "Now here's what bothers me. He (Robinson) wins a game. We go to the next town. We're all on the train, a team. But leaving the station, he doesn't ride on the team bus. He has to go off by himself. He can't stay in the same hotel. But I didn't say anything about it. Why? Why didn't I say, 'Something's wrong here. I'm not going to let this happen. Wherever he's going, I'm going with him.' I never did. I sat like everybody else, and I thought, 'Good. He's getting a chance to play major league ball. Isn't that great?' And that's as far as I was at that time." Apparently, that's how far are the white fellow professionals of Elder, Sifford, Brown and other black players.

The Masters is hardly a national issue, yet it illustrates—for the millionth time—a basic social reality of the civil rights movement: that snobbery or racism is often less the problem than those of broader vision who can stop it but don't. It is to allow Clifford Roberts to keep black players from his exclusive fairways while continuing to say: "The sooner a black plays in the Masters, the happier I will be. . . . Some of the more dark complected boys are not only extremely capable but also extremely popular."

And also extremely disappointed are these "dark complected boys," especially when Masters week comes around. It needs to be wondered, though, at whom the disappointment should be directed: the Masters officials for their snobbish rules or the white competitors who go along with them.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1973]

THE MASTERS: IT'S TIME FOR BLACKS  
OR A BOYCOTT

(By George Solomon)

It was no surprise Clifford Roberts, chairman of the Masters Tournament Committee, chose to ignore congressional pressures and allow the holier-than-thou golf tournament to begin play in Augusta, Ga., yesterday without the presence of Lee Elder, or any other black contestant.

For years, Roberts and his fellow committeemen who oversee America's super prestigious golf event have ignored pleas from edi-

torialists, sports writers and many citizens who want the tournament integrated.

That the Masters remains a segregated golf tournament in the year 1973 is as ridiculous as baseball excluding blacks from the World Series or the NBA excluding whites from its playoffs.

It's wrong.

Roberts languishes in his green Masters coat, behind the green hedges of Augusta National, telling how Elder or any other black man will be welcome on the first tee as soon as he meets one of the 13 Masters qualifying requirements. These requirements have been overlooked and revamped often through the years.

But when pressed this week that perhaps the Masters should reevaluate "its system," Roberts replied: "Any further conversation on the subject is like flogging a dead horse."

One need not be a sociologist to see the times have bypassed Clifford Roberts. He is plodding through life with his eyes shut. If his eyes were open, he would have invited blacks into his tournament many years ago. It would have been the right thing to do. But Roberts hasn't done the right thing, which is why in such matters no one expects more from him.

What is puzzling is the continued acceptance and participation in the Masters by the touring golf professionals. Roberts could care less about the desires of a sports columnist to correct an injustice. But if Jack Nicklaus, Arnold Palmer, Lee Trevino and Billy Casper descended en masse on Roberts and told him that unless blacks were invited to play, they would not, he would listen. He would listen hard.

Without Nicklaus, Palmer, et al, the Masters would not be as interesting this week.

Without them, CBS would not be so eager to fill the Masters' coffers with all that television money.

Without those "names," the Masters would not be a name tournament. Yesterday would have been just another day at Augusta National, where rich men play golf surrounded by azaleas and dogwoods and never worry about starting times.

Roberts might well tell the "Big Four" to scram. And if they did, another 30 or 40 big names might follow. Which means instead of spending the week at Augusta, they would be playing for a \$300,000 pot at a course in Miami Beach or Nashville or Louisville or some place.

A boycott of the Masters would not hurt the pros. But it would hurt Clifford Roberts.

Now comes the question of whether Nicklaus, Palmer, Trevino and Casper are willing to do something that must be done. The issue at hand is bigger than Clifford Roberts or The Green Coat or Lee Elder. Can we, as citizens of this country—and that includes the Big Four—allow an event as prestigious as the Masters to remain segregated?

Do these players have an obligation to the country whose people have done much to make them rich? Or does their obligation begin with Roberts, who runs a tournament sanctioned by the PGA, but not approved of by the Congress of the United States?

Possibly Nicklaus is content to spend the rest of his life smiling in an \$18 Hathaway golf shirt; maybe Palmer feels he is making a contribution to society designing golf clubs. One cannot look into their heads. Hopefully, these men go beyond their three-woods and golf shirts.

Some people believe athletes should not involve themselves in politics or anything else not directly connected with hitting a ball. Not so. The athlete is a part of society and therefore expected to react to its workings.

Nicklaus, Palmer, Trevino, Casper and all the other big names of golf have done well from this country. The time has come for them to put something back.

Either blacks play in the Masters, or boycott the tournament.



**ANDERSON AMENDMENT OFFERS  
REALISTIC APPROACH TOWARD  
BALANCED TRANSPORTATION**

**HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, with consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973 scheduled for floor action this week, I think it is important to clear up some of the misunderstandings that have arisen over the Anderson amendment to that bill.

As a Congressman from an urban area, I wholeheartedly support the Anderson provision which would allow flexibility in the use of urban system funds from the highway trust fund for either bus or rail mass transit or for highway-related purposes. However, I also realize the anxieties of many of my colleagues from more rural regions who fear that this amendment would result in a decrease of highway funding for their districts.

This is not the case. The Anderson amendment is not intended to be a raid on the highway trust fund. It is simply a realistic and responsible approach toward bringing about a more balanced transportation system in this country. It focuses attention on the areas where the need for balance is most apparent—the urban areas. It does not disturb the allocation of funds to rural areas or in any way endanger their ongoing highway programs.

For the record, I would like to submit a listing of the major points which should be emphasized when considering the Anderson amendment. I hope that this listing will help to set the record straight and to point out that the Anderson amendment is not intended to be an antihighway measure. It is intended to be a protransportation measure—one which would allow all segments of our Nation to profit by allowing them to decide their own mobility priorities.

First. No States would get less money if the Anderson amendment passes. The apportionment formulas by which the highway trust fund moneys are distributed to the States are not affected. The amendment is concerned exclusively with the uses to which the money can be directed in urban areas.

Second. The Anderson amendment merely allows flexibility in the use of urban funds. It does not mandate an urban area to use its revenues for mass transit; it simply provides local officials with the option to choose between highway or mass transit, depending upon their most compelling local needs.

Third. The highway funds available for transit are supplemental to those available through the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. UMTA money still remains as the primary source of mass transit funding; the highway money which would be provided is intended primarily as supplemental revenue.

Fourth. The level of highway funding to rural areas would not be disturbed. The Anderson amendment would allow

flexibility only in the use of urban system funds. Funds apportioned to rural regions would continue to be used exclusively for highways and would not be available for mass transit.

Fifth. The Anderson amendment would not disrupt plans for completion of the interstate system or reduce the amount of interstate financing.

Sixth. The Anderson amendment is a separate issue from pass-through of highway funds to local governments. The two are not related.

In closing, I again would like to state that the Anderson amendment is not parochial legislation. It does not dictate transportation policy. Rather, it allows urban areas the freedom to determine important issues affecting the lives of their citizens.

Rather than continuing the haphazard and piecemeal transportation pattern which has evolved in this country since colonial days, we should respond to the times and recognize that new directions and new priorities are needed. The Anderson amendment, I believe, offers the vehicle through which this change could be initiated. It is progressive and meaningful legislation, and its adoption would be a significant advancement in providing all Americans with a balanced transportation system of the future.

**DESPERATE NEED FOR VETERANS'  
BURIAL FACILITIES**

**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, another year has passed since I introduced legislation to create a new national cemetery in Port Chicago, Calif. Since that time, the President has vetoed the National Cemeteries Act of 1972, an Act which would have taken steps to alleviate the overcrowding which is facing many of our national cemeteries.

I am again introducing the legislation which will authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Port Chicago or at Camp Parks, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, all the national cemeteries in California are filled to capacity and have been designated as inactive. It is disgraceful that California, with its large veteran population, is without a single, active, national cemetery.

In the past, efforts were made to bury deceased veterans in cemeteries as close to the places where they lived and where their families continued to live. This is becoming increasingly difficult. Veterans from northern California must be buried as far away as Portland, Oreg. This is a hardship on the families of veterans both monetarily and emotionally.

One of the proposed sites, Port Chicago, is located in the eastern section of Contra Costa County. This town, acquired by the Navy in 1969, is being used as a safety buffer zone for the Naval

Weapons Depot Station in Concord. According to Rear Admiral, USN Commander, Mark Woods of the Naval Ordnance System Command—

The concurrent use of this land as a cemetery and as a safety buffer zone is feasible.

As an alternative site, my legislation proposes the consideration of Camp Parks, an inactive military facility which borders the Eighth and Ninth Congressional Districts in California.

In view of the desperate need for burial facilities for veterans in California, I would hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will take favorable action on this legislation.

**MASS TRANSIT NEEDED TO HELP  
ALLEVIATE GASOLINE SHORTAGE**

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all over the country gasoline service stations are being forced to close because of the lack of gasoline. This shortage is particularly acute in the Middle West, where distances to the supplies are greatest.

Yet, while we face an energy crisis, we continue to waste gasoline, especially in the urban areas, where automobiles—backed up for miles bumper-to-bumper—effectively utilize only 5 percent of the potential energy of this precious resource.

Studies have shown that a 25-percent reduction in automobile usage would save half a million barrels of oil per day. Thus, if we could divert the marginal highway user—the commuter—to a form of rapid transit, our savings in gasoline would be significant and perhaps we would not be witnessing the shortages that we are today.

Mr. Speaker, in the future, this crisis will become even worse unless immediate action is taken to conserve oil by utilizing it in a manner—such as mass transit—where passenger miles per gallon of gasoline are more efficient. According to the American Petroleum Institute, we will be importing over 58 percent of our oil in 1985—over twice as much as we currently import. As a result, we will be forced to rely even more on the oil-rich, but politically volatile Middle East.

To conserve gasoline so that those who really need gasoline—those in the rural areas—can have an adequate supply of gasoline at reasonable cost, I urge all of my colleagues to support our amendment to S. 502 which would permit urban areas with a population of at least 50,000 to use \$700 million of highway trust funds—funds they presently receive but may only use for urban highway construction—for mass transit purchase or construction as well as for highways.

This amendment does not affect the Interstate System nor does it affect the primary or secondary system. It merely permits a city receiving urban system funds to use those funds to buy or construct a bus or rail transit system, as well as highway construction.

If adopted, our amendment would conserve gasoline and, thus, help relieve the shortages that are currently appearing in rural America.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place an article which appeared in the Washington Post of April 16 entitled "Gasoline Runs Short Throughout the United States" in the RECORD:

**GASOLINE RUNS SHORT THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES**

(By Thomas O'Toole)

What began 10 days ago as spot scarcities of gasoline in a handful of states has now blossomed into a coast-to-coast shortage.

It is not so bad that motorists can't buy gasoline but it is serious enough to have forced the closing of hundreds of discount and off-brand gas stations whose supplies have been cut off by the major oil companies. It is also bad enough to have closed major-brand stations in states like Minnesota and Florida that are at the end of the gasoline distribution network.

"These are the states that are on the drag end of the pipeline system," said an official of Gulf Oil Corp. "Things are very tight right now in Florida, where there isn't even a refinery to help things out."

The Middle West has been hit hardest by the shortage. Metro 500 of Minneapolis has closed 21 of its 22 stations. All last week, gas stations in northern Illinois found themselves out of either regular or premium gasoline. Gas stations throughout Iowa were being rationed to between 70 and 90 per cent of what they got last year, even though demand was running 10 per cent ahead of last year's pace.

Oil jobbers (wholesale distributors) insisted it would get worse in the Middle West. Over the weekend, a refining subsidiary of Kerr-McGee Oil Co. named Triangle Petroleum closed its storage terminals in Des Moines, Kansas City, Chicago and Madison, Wis., a move that cut off independent distributors in a four-state region from a 25 million gallon gasoline supply.

"There's no question it's going to close a lot of independents," said William Deutsch, who represents all the independent marketers in Illinois. "It will even put some of the branded stations in trouble."

Things were almost as bad in New England, where an average of five stations were closed in both Connecticut and Massachusetts each day of last week.

Sure Oil Co. was forced to close 12 of the 50 stations it runs in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Sure said it had been getting 40 tank-loads of gasoline per week, was cut back to 20 two weeks ago and has been told it will be down to 10 in another two weeks.

Rural Connecticut has been hit especially hard. Sure closed three Save-Way stations selling the only discount gas in the farm country of eastern Connecticut. Several distributors of bulk gasoline in the same region of the state have been told they will get no gas next month, which means that the farmers they serve exclusively will have trouble getting gas for their tractors.

Further south, things aren't that bad but neither are they very good. The Greenbelt Consumer Services, Inc., which runs a chain of 10 stations that discount BP gasoline in the Washington area, has just been told that the 9 million gallons that BP supplies it with every year will not be forthcoming after July 9.

"They've cut us off from the only supply of gasoline we've had for the last 10 years," said Eric Waldbaum, president of Greenbelt Consumer Services. "We've gone to other

suppliers, who have all told us they don't have enough to service us or any other new customer that might come along."

One of the ironies of the sudden shortage of discount gas is that the major oil companies are getting into the discount business at the same time that the independents are being forced out of it.

Exxon is now marketing discount gas under the brand name Alert at 16 stations in four states. Gulf discounts gas under two labels, Economy and Bulko. Shell markets it under the brand name Ride, Mobil under the name Cello. Phillips Petroleum discounts Blue Goose and Red Dot gas.

The emergence of the big discounters come at a time when major oil companies are closing their unprofitable brand name stations all over the U.S.—stations that are more than 300 miles from a refinery, have only a few pumps and do auto repair.

Exxon is in the process of closing 150 of its 400 retail stations in Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Indiana. Gulf has put up for sale 3,500 stations in 21 states, from Illinois across the country to California and Washington State. BP has already pulled out of the Northeast, and Sun Oil Co has withdrawn from Tennessee and most of the upper Midwest. Cities Services, Atlantic Richfield and Phillips Petroleum are also closing stations.

The oil companies insist that the big reasons for the gas shortage are a worldwide shortage of "sweet" (low sulfur) crude oil and a nationwide shortage of refinery capacity. They claim they need five new refineries a year to keep up with demand. They point out that not one new refinery is being built in the U.S. today.

The refinery shortage is so acute that the independent refineries find themselves being courted with more fervor than at any time in memory. An aide to Rep. Robert H. Steele (R-Conn.) claims that the competition for refined products like gasoline is one reason Sure Oil has had to close some of its Connecticut stations.

"The company was about to negotiate a contract with a Canadian refinery," the aide said, "when a major oil company offered to buy the refinery product at the same prices Sure offered but won the contract when it guaranteed to supply the refinery with crude oil."

The head-to-head combat between the major oil suppliers and the independent distributors is bound to get worse as the gasoline shortage gets worse.

Greenbelt Consumer Services has filed a formal complaint with the Federal Trade Commission protesting the move by BP that will cut them off from gasoline, and in the only known court action so far a federal judge in Phoenix ordered Phillips Petroleum to restore gasoline sales to a discount chain it tried to cut off.

Meanwhile, the gasoline shortage itself promises to get worse as motorists take advantage of the improving weather. Last week, Detroit, Indianapolis and Boston reported that they did not receive a single bid for contracts to fuel city vehicles. For the first time in history, they faced the prospect of being unable to run police cars and fire trucks because of the gasoline shortage.

**GENERAL MOTORS GOES METRIC**

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the national interest in an orderly conversion of our industrial, social, and educational

systems to the metric system of weights and measures has gained great momentum since the release of the Bureau of Standards Metric Study report on July 19, 1971.

Perhaps the greatest impetus to the metric conversion program has come through the announcement on Friday, April 13, that General Motors Corp., the Nation's largest automobile manufacturer, has decided to switch to the metric system for all of its new products.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement follows by a few weeks the decision of International Harvester Co. to produce all of its Hough Co. production at Libertyville, Ill., according to metric standards.

Mr. Speaker, this voluntary action by General Motors Corp., followed by similar decisions of many American industries, should encourage the Congress to establish an official federally coordinated program of metric conversion targeted for January 1, 1984.

Mr. Speaker, this is consistent with the recommendation of the metric study report, and in accordance with H.R. 2351, which some 25 other Members of the House and I have cosponsored. It is my hope that the Committee on Science and Astronautics will recommend this or a similar measure for early action by the House of Representatives.

I am attaching the article which appeared in Friday's Wall Street Journal: GM DECIDES TO SWITCH TO THE METRIC SYSTEM FOR ALL NEW PRODUCTS

DETROIT.—General Motors Corp., the nation's largest manufacturer, said it has decided to switch to the metric system for all new products, including the Wankel rotary engine it is developing.

The giant auto maker said it will leave service parts in production unchanged. The rate of total change-over to metric measurement "will be governed by the release of new parts, metrically dimensioned, and by the normal phasing out of in-production parts," GM said.

General Motors, which buys parts, components equipment and services from nearly 40,000 other companies, said it will implement "supplier coordination" as required. It added that, during the gradual switch to total metrification, it will need to buy some capital equipment capable of measurement in both English and metric units.

The move is likely to have an especially important impact on the machine tool industry, because GM, either directly or through suppliers, commands a substantial volume of purchases from that industry.

**A MATTER OF YEARS**

A GM spokesman said a long time will be required for the total change-over, explaining "It's a matter of years; there's no way of saying how many." But the very fact that GM, which last year spent \$14 billion at outside suppliers, is moving to metric measures may well have a prodding effect on U.S. industry as a whole.

Ford Motor Co., the No. 2 U.S. auto maker, has made no formal commitments such as GM's, but sources said Ford's next new U.S.-built engine, a four-cylinder unit to be produced in Lima, Ohio, will be metric.

Ford's U.S. car-making operations have had to adjust somewhat to metric measures in recent years, because the engine and transmission of the subcompact Pinto, introduced in 1970, are imported from Europe and are metrically measured. The rest of the car is built in the U.S.

**EFFECT ON OTHERS**

Chrysler Corp. also hasn't made any such sweeping public statement, and wouldn't



comment on GM's move. But Ford, Chrysler and American Motors Corp. all may be affected by GM's move, because the giant auto-maker supplies some parts to each of its competitors; and as new versions of these items are developed by GM, they will, under the new policy, presumably be metrically measured.

In Cincinnati, Robert C. Bevis, vice president for machine tool marketing at Cincinnati Milacron Inc., said GM's switch to metric will pose few problems for his company, a supplier.

A Cincinnati Milacron spokesman added that the concern supplies GM's foreign plants from facilities both in the U.S. and abroad.

#### IN MEMORY OF FRANK D. REEVES

### Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 8, 1973, the District of Columbia and the Nation suffered the loss of an outstanding lawyer, educator, and civil rights leader. Mr. Frank D. Reeves was one of the first blacks at the forefront of the integration movement during three decades and advanced the cause of blacks in the field of politics.

My sadness over this great loss is shared by many of my colleagues and his death will truly leave a void in the leadership of this country.

In memory of Mr. Reeves, I am, today, inserting into the RECORD an article from the Washington Post which gives a little insight into the life of this distinguished man:

#### RIGHTS LAWYER FRANK D. REEVES DIES

(By Alice Bonner)

Frank D. Reeves, 57, a Washington lawyer, educator, civil rights activist and Democratic Party official, died Sunday night at Freedmen's Hospital.

Mr. Reeves, long a leader in the black community here, had been admitted to Freedmen's six weeks ago after suffering a stroke.

On Sunday afternoon, more than 200 of his friends and associates had gathered in Rankin Chapel at Howard University, where he had been associated with the law school for more than 30 years, to offer prayers.

Mr. Reeves, who once called Negro leaders of the generation before his "beneficiaries of segregation because they owe their status to the suffrage of whites," was himself both a beneficiary and an originator of the integration movement during three decades.

In an era that produced many "first blacks" in areas that previously had been exclusively white, he captured seven such "firsts."

He was the first black man to be appointed to the three-man Board of Commissioners that headed the District of Columbia until 1967, although he never took office.

He was the first black man to be elected as a Democratic national committeeman from the District of Columbia or any state.

He was the first black man to be a presidential administrative assistant, to represent a president at an inaugural, to be a presidential elector, to second the nomination of a presidential candidate and to serve as a presidential appointee to an emergency labor board.

Mr. Reeves was elected a Democratic national committeeman in May, 1960. He seconded the nomination of John F. Kennedy at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles in July of that year.

After Mr. Kennedy took office as President in January, 1961, he appointed Mr. Reeves, who had traveled with him as a minorities adviser in his campaign, to a position of special assistant. In that capacity, Mr. Reeves represented Mr. Kennedy at the inaugural of the governor of the Virgin Islands.

That same year, Mr. Kennedy nominated Mr. Reeves to fill a vacancy on the D.C. Board of Commissioners. It was a move that had been long predicted by both the press and the public.

Within seven days after the appointment, however, Mr. Reeves withdrew his name from the nomination. A Senate District Committee investigation had found information in his tax record of belated filing of federal income tax returns and several tax liens against him.

In his withdrawal statement, Mr. Reeves said: "I know the attacks upon me have been politically inspired . . . The effort to embarrass me and the administration is the handiwork of long time political foes . . ."

Mr. Kennedy's second choice, John B. Duncan, a former District recorder of deeds, because the city's first black commissioner.

Mr. Reeves continued as a Democratic national committeeman until 1964 but did not return to his White House position. His disqualification for the commissioner's office marked the beginning of the decline of a political career that began in 1948 when he headed the Citizens Committee to Re-elect Truman here.

He later supported and worked for Democratic Party presidential hopefuls Averell Harriman in 1952, Adlai Stevenson who won the nomination that year, Estes Kefauver in 1956 and Hubert Humphrey in 1960, before Mr. Kennedy won the nomination. In 1968, he was a presidential elector.

Mr. Reeves' long and brilliant legal career began when he finished law school at Howard University in 1939. A year later, he joined Thurgood Marshall as an assistant counsel to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Reeves later was one of the attorneys involved in the cases which led to the historic school desegregation order of the Supreme Court in 1954.

As Washington representative of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund from 1946 to 1961, he was involved in most of the civil rights cases handled by the NAACP and the National Conference of Black Lawyers.

In 1967, Mr. Reeves was one of the attorneys for Adam Clayton Powell when the former congressman fought for reinstatement in the House of Representatives. Mr. Reeves also helped to settle the multimillion dollar estate of the religious leader, Sweet Daddy Grace, founder of the House of Prayer for All People.

He represented the Southern Christian Leadership Conference here and its Poor Peoples Campaign in 1968. He handled many cases for Youth Pride, Inc., from 1968 to 1970 and served as personal counsel to its director, Marion Barry Jr.

"The best attorney I ever met," Barry said of him. "He was committed beyond a doubt to the advancement of black people. This city has lost a great person."

Mr. Reeves had served as Mayor Walter E. Washington's coordinator for the election, setting up a citizens board for the pilot police project in the third police district in 1970. They had been close friends for many years, Mayor Washington said.

"The passing of a long time friend and colleague leaves me with a sense of deep personal loss. He was throughout his distinguished career a dedicated and effective public servant, always willing to take on additional responsibilities to serve his city and his nation.

"His distinguished legal and academic ca-

reers and his ability to provide thoughtful intervention in complicated situations will long be remembered by those who worked with him.

"His friendship and support throughout our years in school and the years afterward in public service have been a source of strength to me. The residents of this city and his many friends were served by his untiring efforts to better the community."

Mr. Reeves had participated fully in the field of education. Last year he was appointed to the D.C. board of higher education, which is responsible for the administration of Federal City College and D.C. Teachers College. He subsequently was elected chairman of the board.

He had taught at the Howard University Law School on a full or part-time basis since 1939 and became a full professor in 1965. He was on sabbatical leave at the time of his death.

Herbert O. Reid, acting dean of the law school, said he remembered Mr. Reeves as "a dear friend and exceptional lawyer." There was "no call to public service when Frank did not respond."

As a 1960 fellow at the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Mr. Reeves helped to establish the Joint Center for Political Studies, a Cooperative between Howard University and the Research Center. He was executive director of the Joint Center for two years, resigning last year to become a senior fellow at the Research Center.

Charles Duncan, former D.C. corporation counsel and a partner with Mr. Reeves in a private law firm from 1954 to 1961, called him "a very capable and dedicated person who had the community and the little man at heart. People who knew him loved him very much."

Born in Montreal, Canada, Mr. Reeves grew up there and in New York. After coming to Washington with his family as a youth, he attended Shaw Junior High School and graduated from Dunbar High School in 1932.

After he received his law degree from Howard, he was admitted to practice before the Supreme Court, the Federal and local courts here, the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, the U.S. Tax Court and the U.S. Court of Claims.

He was a member of the National and Federal Bar Associations, the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association and the National Lawyers Club.

He was a member of the board of the United Givers Fund, the board of directors of the International African Chamber of Commerce and the board of the Continental Society of Washington.

His first marriage to Elizabeth Walker ended in divorce. They had two children, Daniel R. and Deborah E., of Washington.

He married the former Senora W. Wood in 1967. The home is at 2330 Good Hope Rd. SE.

Also surviving are his mother, Sarah Murphy, his father, Fred B. Reeves, and two stepchildren, Linda and Stephen Wood, all of Washington.

#### AFTER 27 YEARS BUFFALO WAR HERO FINALLY GETS AWARD

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago, while serving with the Army in the Philippines, Michael J. Lombardo, 102 Lindwood Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y., was injured when he went to the assistance of a seriously wounded companion soldier.

When he arrived at the hospital for treatment, the sergeant in charge of the battalion aid station immediately initiated the paperwork recommending him for a Purple Heart Award.

Since Mr. Lombardo was aware that his mother already was extremely distressed at notification of his brother's death in service and the information that another brother was missing in action, he refused to permit the paperwork to continue on his award for fear that it would further upset her.

Last week, at a ceremony in Federal Court House in Buffalo, Sgt. Michael Lombardo belatedly received the Purple Heart as a result of a search of military records initiated by the Disabled American Veterans and by my office.

The search located the records substantiating the injuries suffered by Sergeant Lombardo at Mindanao during the Philippine liberation. He was wounded by shrapnel fragments while attempting to aid another soldier and not only refused the Purple Heart, but I was informed also refused the Bronze Star Award.

At the aid station where he was taken for treatment he discovered that the papers routinely being prepared by the sergeant in charge to award him the Purple Heart would result in notification to his mother of his bravery. The sergeant asked for the papers and proceeded to tear them up so that word of his own injury would not get back home.

Now, after 27 years, Sergeant Lombardo finally has received the Purple Heart Award to which he is justly entitled.

I had planned to be present at the ceremony in Buffalo but was confined to the hospital for a recurring back ailment. However, I was able to talk to Sergeant Lombardo by telephone immediately after the presentation of the award.

I was interested to learn that Sergeant Lombardo's mother only recently was told of his bravery and said she was "very much surprised," but not upset after all these years.

One of Buffalo's American Legion posts is named for his brother, Francis, who was killed in action. His missing brother, Joseph, later turned up safe and sound and now also is living in Buffalo.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Lombardo not only was a brave soldier but also was a most considerate son. It was only through the insistence of the Disabled American Veterans that the search of military records was initiated with the help of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. I was happy to be helpful in locating key medical reports for documentation.

#### PRESIDENT PLANS FOR "GRAND TOUR" OF EUROPE IN FALL

### HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to congratulate President Nixon on his admirable performance in the area of foreign policy. As reported in the New

CXIX—797—Part 10

York Times article below, the President announced on Sunday, April 15, that he intends to make a comprehensive diplomatic tour of Europe this fall, in an effort to solidify relations with our allies there.

President Nixon demonstrated his concern for a sound foreign policy throughout his first term and labored intelligently and forcefully to construct a strong foundation for a generation of peace. His visits to the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union were bold initiatives in normalizing relations with those two nations, and the successful negotiation of the arms limitation agreements with the Soviet Union was a major step toward a sane policy of nuclear disarmament. And what's more, early this year, the President concluded American involvement in the long, arduous war in Southeast Asia.

The President indicated earlier this year that 1973 would be "The Year of Europe," a year of redirecting our attention toward our Atlantic neighbors. He is now fulfilling that pledge to concentrate on improving relations with Europe, and I heartily support his efforts.

For too long now, we have neglected Europe in our preoccupation with the internal affairs of Southeast Asia. But President Nixon wisely recognizes that our historical and cultural roots lie in Europe. Even today, much of our foreign trade is with the nations of Europe, and we are indebted to them for their support of the U.S. dollar. And most importantly, America's post-World War II security has been based upon a policy of rebuilding an economically and militarily strong Europe through the instruments of the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Immediately following the negotiated settlement of the Vietnam conflict, I expressed hope that the President would move to build durable and equitable relations among all nations. President Nixon's announced plans for a European tour indicate that he is indeed working energetically toward his goal of a generation of peace.

In achieving this goal, the President requires the support of the Congress and the Nation as a whole. Though some may disagree with the President's domestic policies, I believe the President's daring initiatives to rebuild relations with our European neighbors are vital to a stable world and a lasting peace. The President deserves our wholehearted support.

I recommend this article to my colleagues as a source of information on the President's efforts to achieve a sound foreign policy:

PRESIDENT PLANS FOR "GRAND TOUR" OF EUROPE IN FALL—HIS ITINERARY IS EXPECTED TO INCLUDE GERMANY, ITALY, FRANCE AND BRITAIN

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

WASHINGTON, April 15.—President Nixon said today that he planned to make "a grand tour" of Europe—the first foreign trip of his second term—this fall.

Speaking with newsmen after the Sunday morning worship service at the White House, Mr. Nixon also said that he intended to meet with President Pompidou before going to Europe, but that a time and place had not yet been decided upon.

Gerald L. Warren, deputy White House

press secretary, said later that Mr. Nixon would probably visit Britain, France, Italy and West Germany, all of whose leaders would have met with Mr. Nixon before then.

[Premier Giulio Andreotti of Italy, on the eve of his arrival in Washington for talks with President Nixon, says that Italy and the United States are linked by "a friendship of peoples that no event can jeopardize."

#### TRIP MENTIONED BEFORE

The exact itinerary of Mr. Nixon's European tour has not been worked out, and it was presumed that other countries other than those mentioned would be included.

Mr. Nixon said at a news conference on March 15 that he had been urged by the National Security Council to make a trip to Europe "because of our interest in NATO" as well as to visit other places such as Latin America, Africa, and Japan. He said then that there was a possibility of a trip this summer or late spring, but his conversation with newsmen today seemed to rule out foreign travel until the fall.

Administration officials have said that they expected that Leonid M. Brezhnev, the Soviet Communist party leader, to visit in June, in return for Mr. Nixon's Soviet trip last May. Details for the Brezhnev visit have not been worked out, and no announcement has been made.

Mr. Nixon, who traveled widely during the first term in office—including two trips to Western Europe—had reportedly planned to visit Europe soon after his second term began on Jan. 20, to dramatize his intention to make 1973 "The Year of Europe."

But according to Administration officials, the President changed his mind about an early visit to Europe as the result of the strong criticism from many European capitals of the American bombing of Hanoi last December.

Mr. Nixon—according to his aides—was angered at what he regarded as a lack of understanding by his allies and decided to let considerable time elapse before going to Europe.

He did decide, however, to maintain his dialogue with European leaders by inviting them, one by one, to visit him.

In February, he received Prime Minister Heath of Britain. On Tuesday and Wednesday he will meet with Premier Andreotti at the White House, and on May 1 and 2, with Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany.

On his European trip, Mr. Nixon can be expected to devote considerable attention to trade and monetary problems and to the need for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to remain united and strong in a period of improved relations with the Soviet bloc.

On Friday Mr. Nixon disclosed that he was sending Secretary of State William P. Rogers on a trip to South America soon—possibly next month.

#### OEO—AN END TO ABSURDITY

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has existed since 1964 and after nearly 9 years in operation, there have been few achievements in relation to the tax dollars expended.

Unlike the dreams of the men who began OEO, the poverty program has failed to help the poor rise out of poverty. There has been little social mobility as a result of OEO funding.



The program has done little but frustrate the poor and subsidize the poor to remain poor. It has not helped the impoverished, but rather has frustrated them, and worst of all kept them caught in the quagmire of poverty.

I submit the following article from the San Francisco Examiner to the attention of my colleagues:

A SOCIAL FAILURE—THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE WAR ON POVERTY AND WHY IT HAPPENED

(By Joel Tlumak)

Whatever happened to America's highly touted native genius—down-to-earth common sense?

What happened to this genius when this country decided a decade ago to try to eliminate poverty?

The answer is that America got carried away—and, in the process, also got theatrical.

America's War on Poverty, as a result, became in large part a living theater of the absurd.

A few years ago, someone in Governor Reagan's State Office of Economic Opportunity came up with a brainstorm. Unfortunately, he was living in the past, when common sense prevailed.

He proposed training young men in the poverty bracket as handymen, who then could do minor home repairs for homeowners who cannot afford the high prices plumbers and electricians charge for work not requiring highly specialized expertise.

The handymen, he argued, would have no trouble getting work. They would also become entrepreneurs—self-employed capitalists.

Of course, the idea never got out of the State Office of Economic Opportunity. While very practical in one sense, it was highly impractical politically.

Who could imagine unionized plumbers and electricians permitting such an idea to materialize?

Jobs were almost an afterthought in the conceptual foundation of the War on Poverty.

When the high level anti-poverty thinkers in Washington finally focused on getting the poor jobs, they started manpower training programs. Rather than fill a definite need, they trained men and women for jobs that didn't exist.

A few manpower directors across the country later got practical. First they found the jobs—then they trained people. But such a practical idea was a very late innovation in a ten-year anti-poverty program that is now on its death bed.

When the war on Poverty was first proposed and initiated, goals were put off into the near future, until the country could learn more about poverty.

Early on there was the War on Poverty's "maximum feasible participation."

With MFP, you could say that the most expensive living theater of the absurd was born.

Maximum feasible participation meant giving the poor the means (money) to map out and control their own destinies. In other words, it was left to the poor to decide how to eliminate poverty, in the absence of anything better.

MFP actually meant (as the San Francisco experience proved) giving poverty politicians the means to build their own power bases and provide them with a guaranteed annual income.

As time went by and money kept flowing from Washington, a War on Poverty was in full gear without any specific idea on how to eliminate poverty.

Politicians finally got wind of the obvious, that War on Poverty money was being used or was about to be used to overthrow them or overthrow the system. So MFP started to lose its financial backing.

The poor, however, knew what they were lacking. And their leaders, together with their poverty councils, had no trouble coming up with schemes to help the poor.

Into being came the art of program writing.

The War on Poverty proved there is a dif-

ference—quite a difference—between helping the poor and helping the poor rise up in the world.

Ten times as much money could have been spent on services for the poor—and the number of people in the poverty bracket would still be the same.

For example, you could spend money in San Francisco to help orient Chinese and Filipino immigrants into American life. But the immigrants, without jobs, would still be poor, for all the help they would get.

Millions were spent here and elsewhere on youth programs that produced few permanent jobs—but left the youth as poor and as restless (though older) as ever.

After a while, so-called poverty fighters stopped thinking about eliminating poverty. They started saying that was an impractical goal. A more proper goal was to "alleviate" poverty.

The distinctions began to be made between economic poverty and psychological poverty.

Under this concept, allowing every poor child in San Francisco a daily bubble gum allowance would, in fact, alleviate a child's economic and psychological poverty—if you want to carry the concepts to an extreme.

In this context, the idea of training poor young men to become handymen turned out to be absurd.

What makes all this even more tragic are the statements of protests against Nixon Administration cuts by big city mayors. They begin their protests by acknowledging that there has been waste in the poverty program; but, they quickly add, that's no reason for throwing the baby out with the water.

But was the baby ever put in the water? Was a baby even conceived?

More likely, you could compare the War on Poverty to a married couple who tried for ten years to have a child and then learned the pill was to prevent babies not to produce them.

For the past five years, poverty fighters have been saying you cannot eliminate poverty. President Nixon took them seriously and put an end to the absurdity.

## SENATE—Tuesday, April 17, 1973

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. DICK CLARK, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, before whom the generations rise and pass away, may this week be Holy Week not only in the memory of ancient events but in this present world. Take from us all that stains our personal lives or in any way separates us from Thee. May we experience a Passover deliverance from captivity to evil forces. May the cross remind us of the cost of sin and of the power of redemptive love. Lead us to a fresh dedication to the way of service to this Nation and all mankind.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. DICK CLARK, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. CLARK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

### WITHDRAWAL OF A NOMINATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. CLARK) laid before the Senate a message in writing from the President of the United States, withdrawing the nomination of Louis Patrick Gray III, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 398) to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill and asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. COTTER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, and Mr. WYLIE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3798. An act to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6077. An act to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees.