

for the elderly; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7843. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and Medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation program or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7844. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the full deduction of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals of 65 years of age and over, without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7845. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income taxes or payments from the United States Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7846. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. Long of Louisiana, and Mr. Thone):

H.R. 7847. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, to prohibit the importation of agricultural commodities when pesticides are used in connection with such commodities in a manner which is prohibited in the United States by any Federal law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 7848. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.R. 7849. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 7850. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds to carry out or assist research on living human fetuses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself and Mr. ASPIN):

H.R. 7851. A bill to provide for a study of the availability of a route for a trans-Canada oil pipeline to transmit petroleum from the North Slope of Alaska to the continental United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 7852. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to require public disclosure of certain information relating to sales of commodities for export, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 7853. A bill to insure a fair and reasonable participation of U.S. flag commercial vessels in movement of petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 7854. A bill to discourage experimentation on animals by elementary and secondary school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 7855. A bill to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor to prosecute any offenses against the United States arising out of the "Watergate affair"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HOSMER, and Mr. HUBER):

H.R. 7856. A bill to amend section 9 of the Military Selective Service Act relating to re-employment rights of members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LUTJAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROY, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WARE, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 7857. A bill to amend section 9 of the Military Selective Service Act relating to re-employment rights of members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 7858. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 7859. A bill to provide for loans for the establishment or construction, or both, of municipal, low-cost, nonprofit clinics for the spaying and neutering of dogs and cats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7860. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of commercially produced domestic dog and cat animal products; and to prohibit dog and cat animal products moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 7861. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving to Congress the power to make or alter regulations relating to the times, places, and manner of appointing electors to choose the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nominating of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENHOLM:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution to express the support of Congress on participation in the Symposium on Management and Utilization of Remote Sensing Data to be held in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., October 29 to November 2, 1973; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 395. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

203. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to funds for advance or preconstruction planning on the O'Neill unit and North Loup Division of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

204. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to retirement compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 7862. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Litman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 7863. A bill for the relief of Donald R. Manning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7864. A bill for the relief of Louise C. Bauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH EXPRESSES APPRECIATION TO THE VALUE OF RADIO—PRESIDENT PROCLAIMS MAY AS MONTH TO FOCUS ATTENTION ON THIS MEDIA—WEST VIRGINIA STATIONS ARE LISTED

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, May

has been recognized by the Congress and designated as National Radio Month and I join in expressing tribute to the leaders of this dynamic industry on their outstanding service in the public interest.

The development of radio broadcasting has been called the "miracle of the ages," because it more than any other communication media links all corners of the world. Its advent also paved the way for television and the dazzling satellite communication network that are considered so commonplace today.

The dream of broadcasting worldwide is credited to a young inventor, Lee De Forest, who wrote—

My present task is to distribute sweet melody over the city and the sea so that even the mariner far out at sea across the silent waves may hear the music of his homeland.

But this dream might never have become a reality if other men of vision such as Sarnoff, Marconi and Bell had not shared it and realized the possibilities.

"I have in mind a plan . . ." These

words written by David Sarnoff in 1915 signaled the beginning of a lifetime of prophecy by a man who has probably exercised a greater influence over modern living than anyone since Thomas Alva Edison.

Sarnoff's plan was a "Radio Music Box" to bring news and music into 'he home by wireless. Over the next half-century, Sarnoff first dreamed and then fulfilled. As the head of the world's foremost electronics company, the Radio Corporation of America, he became the driving force behind such development as network broadcasting, black-and-white television and then color TV.

Back in 1922, when manufacture of the first "Radio Music Boxes" had barely begun, Sarnoff was urging researchers to develop a portable "radiolette" that would transmit information "not only at home but in the office, workshop, street, or elsewhere."

The first national application of this communications miracle was the live broadcast of election results in the Harding-Cox presidential contest by KDKA of Pittsburgh. This same radio station broadcast the first sports event—a football game between the University of Pittsburgh and West Virginia University.

In 1923, Sarnoff told the RCA board of directors—

I believe that television, which is the technical name for seeing instead of hearing by radio, will come to pass in due course.

And in 1930, a full decade before the first commercial TV sets were exhibited, he spoke of television as being "advanced to the stage when color as well as shadow would be faithfully transmitted."

The advent of television led some market analysts to predict that radio was doomed. But they reckoned without the inventiveness of electronics engineers and the unique mobility of the medium. Far from dying, the radio broadcasting industry has demonstrated a robust and progressive picture of its capabilities. There are in the United States today a total of 6,819 radio broadcasting outlets and approximately 368 million radio receivers. Every day, 100 million Americans listen to radio. It is the sole outlet of mass communications for the blind and a boon to the millions of elderly, poor or geographically isolated Americans who cannot afford television or receive its signals.

Mr. President, I salute the thousands of individuals engaged in the daily business of radio broadcasting who, through their responsible and dedicated efforts, attempt to inform, educate and entertain a vast majority of Americans. I am especially grateful to the broadcasting industry in our home State of West Virginia, where geological conditions are sometimes such that radio becomes a vital force in shaping the destinies of smaller communities and thousands of citizens isolated by mountainous terrain. I ask unanimous consent that a listing of these 92 public-spirited radio stations in the Mountain State be placed in the RECORD.

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

Beckley: WCIR, WCIR-FM, WBKW-FM, WWNR.
 Berkeley Springs: WCST, WCST-FM.
 Bethany: WVBC-FM.
 Bluefield: WHIS, WHIS-FM, WKOY.
 Buckhannon: WBUC, WVWC-FM.
 Charleston: WCAW, WVAF-FM, WCHS, WBES-FM, WKAZ, WKAZ-FM, WKNA-FM, WTIP, WTIO-FM, WXIT.
 Charles Town: WVXA, WZFM-FM.
 Clarksburg: WBOY, WHAR, WPDJ, WRGT-FM.
 Elkins: WDNE.
 Fairmont: WMMN, WTCS.
 Fisher: WELD.
 Grafton: WVVV.
 Hinton: WMTD.
 Huntington: WCMI, WEMM-FM, WGNT, WKEE, WKEE-FM, WMUL-FM, WTCR, WVQM-FM, WWHY.
 Hurricane: WPNS.
 Keyser: WKLP, WKYR.
 Kingwood: WFSP.
 Logan: WLOG, WVOW, WVOW-FM.
 Martinsburg: WEPM, WEPM-FM.
 Matewan: WHJC.
 Milton: WNST.
 Montgomery: WMON.
 Morgantown: WAJR, WAJR-FM, WCLG.
 Moundsville: WELF.
 New Martinsville: WETZ.
 Oak Hill: WOAY, WOAY-FM.
 Parkersburg: WCEF, WCEF-FM, WPAR, WTAP, WTAP-FM.
 Pineville: WWYO.
 Princeton: WLOH, WHGC-FM.
 Ravenswood: WMOV.
 Richwood: WVAR.
 Ronceverte: WRON.
 St. Albans: WKLC, WKLC-FM.
 South Charleston: WRDS.
 Spencer: WVRC.
 Sutton: WSGB.
 Weirton: WEIR.
 Welch: WELC, WXEE.
 Weston: WHAW.
 White Sulphur Springs: WSLW.
 Wheeling: WKWK, WKWK-FM, WNEW, WTRF-FM, WWVA, WWVA-FM, WHAW-FM.
 Williamson: WBTH.

COMMISSIONING OF THE U.S.S.
 "WILLIAM H. BATES" (SSN-680)

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1973, at Pascagoula, Miss., under a clear, blue sky and with a gentle breeze, the U.S.S. *William H. Bates* was placed in commission and added to the submarine force of the U.S. Navy. The *Bates* was named for and honors our former, great colleague who was ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee at the time of his untimely death in 1969. Bill Bates led the battle in Congress for a strong nuclear Navy and it is only fitting that one of our latest nuclear submarines should bear his name. Our good friend and committee colleague, the Honorable LES ARENDS, the House of Representatives' whip, gave the principal address at the commissioning ceremony and I commend his eloquent tribute to the attention of the House:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE LESLIE C. ARENDS
 OF ILLINOIS AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE
 "WILLIAM H. BATES" (SSN-680), MAY 5,
 1973

It is particularly fitting that one of our nuclear-powered warships should be named in honor of the late Congressman William H. Bates—a great patriot, statesman, and dedicated American who believed that a strong nuclear Navy is essential to preserving peace.

This nuclear attack submarine which we commission today could bear a no more fitting name. During his two decades of Congressional service, Bill Bates was one of the foremost authorities on national defense. As ranking minority member of the House Armed Services Committee, and as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, he was a most effective leader in strengthening our Navy.

To the members of the *Bates* crew particularly, let me assure you that your submarine honors a real professional.

Bill Bates understood the Navy. He served it long and well for ten years as a regular officer, and he clearly recognized its mission. He maintained that professionalism through his association with the Naval Reserve throughout his Congressional career.

As we commission the USS *William H. Bates*, I share the pride of the Bates family today. This occasion has special significance to me for two basic reasons—one very personal, and one of national importance.

First, Congressman Bill Bates was my close friend and colleague and a person for whom I had the very highest regard.

We sat next to each other on the House Armed Services Committee. He was my Regional Republican Whip in the House of Representatives. We worked together as delegates to NATO Conferences.

We frequently played golf together. Our families had a mutuality of interests and sought each other's company.

Our ideas and our ideals were similar. We shared confidences. We shared our problems, seeking the benefit of each other's advice. We shared our sorrows, and we shared our joys.

No finer man ever served in the Congress. No finer friend could any man have. He was a true nobleman—in character, in personality, and in intellect. He was a dedicated family man and a dedicated legislator. He was, in the fullest sense, a true patriot—dedicated to the service of God, and dedicated to the service of country.

Secondly, this occasion is particularly significant because it is my view, as it was Bill Bates' view, that a strong nuclear Navy is absolutely essential to the defense of this great country.

I am sure that you are aware of the leading role which the Congress has taken in converting our Navy to nuclear power.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee since its inception, I fought side by side with Bill Bates to ensure that the advantages of nuclear propulsion would be incorporated in submarines and surface warships.

I can think of no other defense-related matter in which the Congress has been more influential than in the fight to achieve a nuclear-power Navy. And Bill Bates was our staunch leader in that critical fight.

You may recall that the first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*, was started through special steps taken by the Congress. Yet, some of you may not realize that as recently as five years ago the Department of Defense decided to build no more atomic submarines. Under those plans, the *Bates* would have been one of the last submarines built for the United States Navy. As ludicrous as it may sound today, that decision would have persisted had Bill Bates and the Congress not refused to accept it.

The Defense Department of that period was so obsessed with its cost effectiveness studies that it nearly lost sight of the Nation's defense needs. Bill Bates was one of the key members of the Congress who undertook to educate the Congress and the public

as to what was going on, and he *did* just that with endless devotion.

The Congress responded to the warning of Congressman Bates and those of us who fought alongside him. As a result, the Congress reconstituted a nuclear submarine construction program and required the Defense Department to proceed immediately with the new high-speed nuclear submarines.

Today, with continuing Congressional pressure, we have 18 such submarines authorized, with five more being requested in the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget. Most of our defense planners *now* recognize the importance of these ships.

This was indeed a vital issue when Bill Bates brought it to the Nation's attention. If we had let our nuclear submarine construction program die in 1968, our defense posture would now be in dangerously serious jeopardy. Even as it is, the Soviets today continue to maintain a total submarine force level nearly three times the size of that of the United States. In addition, the Soviets have raced past us in numbers of nuclear submarines. They are operating 110 nuclear submarines compared with our 101, and they are building three times as many each year as we are.

This tremendous Soviet buildup has required a vast commitment of Russian resources. Yet, it has resulted in the development of a Russian nuclear submarine construction capability far exceeding that in the United States.

In other words, this country would have been in a position of unacceptable submarine inferiority had the Congress not insisted upon continuing the nuclear submarine program. And I daresay that, without the determined leadership of Bill Bates, the Congress would not have taken such wise and firm action.

But vigilance knows no rest. There are other nuclear submarine programs that must proceed. Of particular importance to the Congress this session is the funding request in the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget to build the first TRIDENT ballistic-missile submarine. This crucial issue was weighed and debated in the last Congress when funds for the TRIDENT missile and submarine development were authorized. The conclusion of a majority of the Congress was that our submarine strategic missile force was vital to national survival and that its modernization should proceed without delay.

We need the TRIDENT submarines with their longer range missiles—to increase the survivability of our seaborne deterrent in the 1980's and beyond, and to replace our aging POLARIS ships. We must press ahead with this program, and I assure you that I support the President's TRIDENT request.

Another issue of great importance to our Navy in the future is the development of a tactical cruise-missile submarine. This type of submarine is particularly well suited to attacking surface warships and merchantmen, and it has already been extensively developed by the Soviet Union to interdict our all-important ocean lifelines.

While our attention is of necessity focused on our traditional attack and strategic submarine programs, we must also look ahead to our Navy's needs as it prepares for the likely threats of the future.

Bill Bates was also a vigorous leader in the Congressional fight to provide nuclear power for the carriers and the major fleet escorts needed by our first-line surface striking forces. He was a principal author of the language in the law which made the Congressional action to provide nuclear power for frigates a Constitutional issue.

On the Floor of the House, he said: "It seems to me the time has long since passed when we should have nuclear power for our surface ships."

Referring to the long time it took our Navy to change from sail to steam, he said: "Let us not take two-thirds of a century again, as we did 100 years ago in making the

necessary transition. Let us cut the chains that bind the fighting ships to a pipeline. Let us cut the umbilical cord from the mother ship so that these nuclear ships can do the kind of a job that our Country and the times demand."

Our nuclear-powered warships have already demonstrated how essential they are in projecting our naval strength overseas.

There is no question now that we must exploit the advantages of nuclear power in all our major combatants and that adequate numbers of these ships must be built. Unless we do so, our future naval commanders will lack the means to ensure our survival as a Nation.

The William H. Bates carries the proud name of a man whose life was dedicated to establishing a strong national defense to preserve our cherished freedoms. I hope the example he set—his knowledge, his strength of character, his persistence, and his determination to do whatever was necessary to get the job done—will inspire all those who serve in this ship.

The reputation of the USS William H. Bates will depend on your hard work and determination. The responsibility for meeting this challenge now rests on your shoulders.

Good luck, and smooth sailing.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS AND INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the valuable role played by organizations such as the Sierra Club and the Friends of the Earth in protecting our natural environment. Now such groups are beginning to take the lead in protecting an even more important resource: the human resources of our country.

With the increasing revelations of unsafe working conditions in large industries which generate industrial pollution comes the need to provide adequately for the safety of workers. Some have questioned the propriety of the activity of environmental groups in such disputes. I urge anyone with such doubts to read the careful reasoning of David R. Brower, president of Friends of the Earth, in a rebuttal to an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle. His letter follows:

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH,
San Francisco, Calif., March 13, 1973.

EDITOR,
San Francisco Chronicle,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR EDITOR: Your editorial of March 7 errs in seeking to limit environmental organizations to their "traditional province." You chide the Sierra Club for taking sides with the union in the Shell Oil strike. We congratulate the club, remembering the early park victories it won with labor's help.

Friends of the Earth, meeting with 11 other conservation organizations, endorsed this strike January 30. We have long agreed with John Muir that "when you try to pick out anything by itself, you find it hitched to everything else in the universe." The fight for a better environment must go on concurrently inside the factory, in the inner city, and in suburbia, at sea, on the shore, in rural areas, in wildlands, and in the heart of wilderness.

The industrial worker is hardest hit by in-

dustrial pollution. If the toxic dust, fumes, and gas and the noise generated in a factory threaten neighboring communities, how much more they threaten him, at work and in his nearby home.

The Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union (OCAW) people deserve safeguards for their health and safety. They are not a resource to be wasted, nor are other working people, in or out of unions. The OCAW helped us block the monstrous waste of the SST. We will try to help them too, and the people as a whole.

The urgency of their proposals is pointed up by the alarming cancer mortality in another industry: one in every five asbestos workers who died within the last five years, died of cancer of the lung. This and other frightening numbers on industrial-caused death and disease in the asbestos industry was reported in the Chronicle March 12 from a paper presented by Dr. Irving J. Selkoff of New York Mount Sinai School of Medicine. Access to all company morbidity and mortality records of employees is one of the points of contention between the OCAW and Shell Oil. We believe employees have the right to know the risk a company faces them with. Shell makes many poisons. How well are they insulated from people?

FOE will continue to work with many labor groups in coalitions to defeat environmentally unsound projects, like the SST, urban freeways, the fight against black lung, the fight to end the broadcasting of toxic metals, and, in this case, the right of the worker to participate in decisions regarding his own health. Through cooperation between diverse groups with mutual aims we can combat the reluctance of corporations to acknowledge responsibilities: they could ignore in the days when there seemed to be more than enough environment to go around. On the immediate issue, other oil companies got with it. So should Shell. They should not seek special privilege by holding back.

Sincerely,

DAVID R. BROWER,
President.

QUICK AND ACCURATE INFORMATION FOR CONGRESS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Washington Post pointed up the problem faced by each of us in securing quick and accurate information as to what is going on in the Federal bureaucracy.

The report indicated the Congress has a grand total of three computers available to it, not counting the electronic voting machine. We have our bill status system, which tells us about our own bills. In addition to the House and Senate computers, the General Accounting Office has a computer, and the Library of Congress has one. In addition, the GAO and LOC also lease time on other computers from time to time.

The executive branch, on the other hand, enjoys the services of 5,400 computers at a cost of some \$2 billion a year, and it is on these computers that the Congress must rely for whatever information the agencies choose to give us.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why this variance should be allowed to go on. I do not suggest the Congress engage in a race to close the "computer gap," but

I do suggest there must be a way whereby the Congress can tap into the agency computers for information rather than rely on the agency interpretation of computer information.

Surely there is technology available to make it possible for a congressional computer to be connected to the computer banks of the agencies so that we as Members of Congress could select out our own information and interpret it.

In my own office, I am constantly told by the agencies that no more money is available at this time, for one program or another. The agency has the computer with all the data. All I have is a telephone line to the agency and I, and my constituents, are at the mercy of the voice on the other end of the telephone line. Now I am not suggesting that our agency people are misleading us, I do suggest that we might come to a different conclusion, from that of the agency on a given set of facts if we had them immediately available to us.

How helpful it would be if each of us could ask a congressional computer center to pull data from the agency computer giving the up-to-date status of funds, and projects as well as other helpful information. Then we could each speak with better knowledge to the question of available money.

WOMEN LEAD OPPOSITION TO ABORTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star and Daily News on April 17 there was a very interesting poll published relating to the abortion issue. The poll was conducted by a group of political scientists at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research.

The significance of this poll was the fact that a short time before the Supreme Court handed down their decision legalizing abortion in January, a majority of the eligible voters in the country were opposed to abortion.

Another very interesting fact discovered by the poll was that women themselves are opposed to abortion in greater numbers than men.

Earlier polls have indicated that the public has been fairly evenly divided on the question of abortion, but this most recent poll has detected a swing away from the permissive view on abortion.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to read this article.

Following is the complete text of the article:

OPINION POLL: WOMEN LEAD OPPOSITION TO ABORTION (By John Lear)

Although the recent Supreme Court decision upholding the legality of abortion was based largely on the argument that women have a constitutional right to make a personal decision concerning the children they will bear, American women themselves are not as determined to exercise that right as men are to guarantee it.

This is perhaps the most surprising finding of a public opinion survey just reported by political scientists at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research.

The survey disclosed that only a short time before the Supreme Court in January voted 7-2 in support of the view that the Constitution protects the right to abortion, a majority of the eligible voters of the country were opposed to abortion.

The data came from computer analysis of answers given by a sample of 2,738 citizens questioned between Sept. 15 and Nov. 6, 1972 by ISR surveyors. The sample was statistically representative of the whole electorate, and the weight of preference against abortion was roughly 3-2.

When the responses to the ISR questionnaire were separated according to sex, women in all three of the age brackets covered were found to be slightly more opposed to abortion than were men. Here are the figures:

PERCENT IN OPPOSITION

	Men	Women
Over 60.....	67	72
30 to 60.....	58	60
Under 30.....	43	49

Among the respondents in the under-30 age group, where a majority of both sexes favored abortion, the number of women opposed to abortion was 6 percent higher than the number of men.

In June, during the California primary, Dr. Warren Miller of ISR's Center for Political Studies, decided to include the abortion question in the 1972 edition of a pre-election survey ISR has been conducting regularly for a quarter century. By then, abortion not only had attained the status of a nationally debated social problem but seemed likely to become an active issue in the presidential campaign. The ISR survey received the following percentages of favorable responses to these four statements:

Abortion should never be forbidden—25 percent.

Abortion should be allowed in any case in which the prospective mother would have difficulty in bringing up her child—17 percent.

Abortion should be permitted only when the life of the mother would be endangered by the birth—47 percent.

Abortion should never be allowed—11 percent.

Although those absolutely in favor of abortion were more than twice as numerous as those absolutely opposed, the holders of the two extreme positions together totaled only a shade more than one-third of the population sample.

Since those who expressed a more moderate view accounted for almost two-thirds of the sample, analysts agreed that the most accurate separation of the data would combine the responses to the first two statements and juxtapose them against the combined responses to the last two. The result was 42 percent favorable to abortion, 58 percent opposed.

Because opposition to abortion is a tenet of modern Roman Catholic teaching, a substantial component of the opposition sentiment could be expected to be Catholic. The ISR data confirmed that expectation.

Of Catholics in the sample, 67 percent were opposed to abortion. But Catholics make up something less than a quarter of the population of the country and obviously could not alone account for an electoral majority in opposition. The balance had to be made up by non-Catholics. And when all Protestants were counted together, 59 percent of them were found to be lined up with the Catholics. Only Jews were steadfastly in favor of abortion and overwhelmingly so (82 percent).

Other differences became noticeable when

the so-called "establishment" Protestants (Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and several smaller groups) were split off from the more fundamentalist Protestant denominations. The Protestant "establishment" then was seen to have a 1 percent majority in favor of abortion while 63 percent of the far more numerous fundamentalists were opposed.

An even more interesting difference surfaced when the attitudes of Catholics, "establishment" Protestants, and Protestant fundamentalists were measured in terms of frequency of worship. Of "establishment" Protestants who went to church every week or almost every week, 57 percent opposed abortion; of those who appeared in church only a few times a year or not at all, 59 percent favored abortion.

Catholics who went to church every week or almost every week were 83 percent opposed to abortion; those who got to church but once or twice a year or never were 51 percent in favor of abortion. It was the Protestant fundamentalists who most resisted abortion regardless of the regularity of their attendance at church.

Among those who worshipped every week or almost every week, 75 percent were opposed to abortion; when church attendance dropped to only a few times a year or ceased altogether, 56 percent of the Protestant fundamentalists still opposed abortion.

What other elements influential in defining traditional morality in America can be identified in the ISR abortion data?

One is the immediate environment into which people are born and in which they grow up. Within the ISR sample, 72 percent of those reared in a rural setting opposed abortion, 55 percent of those who grew up in towns or small cities opposed abortion, and 54 percent of those who lived in big cities favored abortion.

Education is another factor in moral definition. The more schooling people have, the less willing they are to see abortion as an evil. College people are three times as favorable to abortion as are those whose education stopped in grade school. However, those at the college level favor abortion by only a 7 percent margin.

A third face of traditional morality is social class. Sixty-five percent of those who consider themselves members of the working class opposed to abortion. Those who characterize themselves as middle class are so evenly split on abortion that a majority cannot be said to exist on either side of the question.

Race is a factor, too. Blacks are more anti-abortion than whites are, although only slightly so.

In view of what the ISR study has already revealed, it is not surprising to learn that the older people are, the more they oppose abortion. Here the attitudes are expressed by age bracket:

Percent in opposition

Over 60 years.....	72
30 to 60 years.....	60
Under 30 years.....	47

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the date the brave people of Rumania celebrated their anniversary of national independence, but their struggle for total freedom is still unrealized. Rumania has endured almost constant alien domination since the 15th century when this

country was seized by the powerful Ottoman Turks. The significant chapters in Rumania's determined fight for self-rule did not unfold until the 19th century during the Russo-Turkish war. On May 10, 1877, Rumania proclaimed her independence and quickly allied with Russia to defeat the Ottoman Empire.

A prosperous era of some 60 years followed. Rumania established herself as an independent kingdom and played an important role in the international politics of Europe. However, the situation drastically changed with World War II. As the global conflict drew to an end, Rumania fell under Soviet occupation and, as in the case of other Eastern European countries, the program of complete Communist indoctrination was set in motion. It is rather ironic that Russia, once the power that helped Rumania win her independence had now become her oppressor.

Despite 25 years of strict foreign rule, the people of Rumania have refused to relinquish the remembrances of past glories and colorful culture. They are forbidden to openly celebrate the 10th of May as their traditional day of freedom. Instead, official celebrations have been shifted to the 9th of May, the anniversary of the Soviet victory over Nazi Germany in Rumania. So I believe it is fitting that we join together to openly commemorate this date for those who can only observe this occasion in their hearts, and pray that Rumania will persevere in her courageous efforts to one day be an independent nation.

TAX RELIEF FOR PROPERTY OWNERS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1973, the town council of West New York, N.J., passed a resolution calling for tax relief for property owners.

Mr. Speaker, property owners, and rent payers, too, for indirectly they assume the crushing real property burden, have reached a breaking point. I know that Hudson County which I represent is one of the most crowded parts of the oldest section of the United States. But I say to all Members of this House that the old epitaph: "As you are now so once was I and as I am now so must you be" is appropriate. The problems of blight and pollution which are part of life in northern New Jersey will be yours sooner than you think.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the breaking point. Dynamic action must be taken at the State level and the Federal, too, if municipal government is to survive. The resolution adopted by the town fathers in West New York deserves the attention of all Members of this House and I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the burden of financing public education is disproportionately and unfairly distributed among property owners, and

Whereas, said burden does not reflect the essential national concept of equality in distributing governmental costs, and education for all children, and

Whereas, the responsibility for providing a system of equitable cost distribution and quality education rests upon the State of New Jersey.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the Town of West New York, Hudson County, New Jersey, that it does hereby petition the Governor and Legislature of the State of New Jersey to take all steps necessary during the year 1973 to lift the burden of financing education from the property owner and to devise systems by which said costs would be re-distributed throughout the state on a uniform basis, and

Be it further resolved that the Governor and Legislature of the State of New Jersey is further petitioned to amend the constitution to dedicate any revenue sources so established solely for the purpose of financing elementary and secondary education, and

Be it further resolved that the Town Clerk is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the Governor, the State Legislature, and each Municipality within the State of New Jersey.

CERTIFICATE

I, Raymond F. Gabriel, Town Clerk, certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution passed by the Board of Commissioners of the Town of West New York on this 18th day of April, 1973.

RAYMOND F. GABRIEL,
Town Clerk of the Town of West New York.

TRIBUTE TO PARAMOUNT BOY SCOUT TROOP 661

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are familiar with scouting know that it is an outstanding accomplishment to attain the rank of Eagle Scout. It is, indeed, a tribute to the leaders of a troop when one of the members achieves the hard-won position of Eagle Scout. However, it is a rare feat for one troop to produce seven Eagle Scouts.

Such a troop is Paramout Troop 661, led by scoutmaster Bill Carpenter for the past 7 years, with the able assistance of his brother Bill, and Jim McVey.

Each year approximately 2 percent of the over 2 million Boy Scouts reach the coveted goal of Eagle Scout. To attain this position of honor, a Boy Scout must earn at least 21 merit badges by mastering various skills which demand intelligence, leadership, community spirit, initiative, patriotism, and athletic ability.

The young men of the Paramount Troop who exhibited these qualities are the following:

Paul Zandvliet, age 15, and his brother Pete Zandvliet, Jr., 16, attend Pius X High School in Downey, and are the sons of Pete and Lois Marie Zandvliet of Paramount. Paul has held the positions of assistant senior patrol leader, junior assistant scoutmaster, and instructor. Pete, Jr., who was named Scout of the Year, has been an instructor, junior as-

sistant scoutmaster, and a member of the leadership corps.

Garry Ford, age 15, and his brother Jerry, age 14, attend Bellflower High School, and are the sons of Mr. and Mrs. Bob Ford of Bellflower. Garry has been a patrol leader, a senior patrol leader, and a junior assistant scoutmaster. Jerry has attained the positions of senior patrol leader, and instructor.

Mike Brady, 15, a student at Paramount High School, is the son of Ronald and Patricia Brady of Paramount. He has been a junior assistant patrol leader, and junior assistant scoutmaster.

Steven Martin, age 13, is in the seventh grade at Clearwater Intermediate, and is the son of Ronald and Agatha Martin of Paramount. He has been a patrol leader, and an instructor.

Michael Nelson, age 13, is also a student at Clearwater Intermediate. He is the son of James M. and Jacqueline Nelson of Paramount, and has attained the positions of patrol leader and instructor.

Mr. Speaker, these seven young men are a credit to their families, to their schools, and to their communities, and I salute them for their outstanding achievements in scouting.

I also commend their leaders Bob and Bill Carpenter and Jim McVey for the leadership and guidance they have provided.

Originally formed in 1963 at Our Lady of Rosary Church in Paramount, but in 1971 moved to Faith Presbyterian Church in Paramount; the friends of troop 661, which currently has registered 45 boys in their program, should take great pride in their efforts to develop community-minded leaders through Scouting.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the accomplishments of troop 661, and the quality of the program which has produced seven Eagle Scouts.

NONESSENTIAL FUEL CONSUMPTION SHOULD BE CUT

HON. LES ASPIN
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the U.S. fuel squeeze, the bill of the world's largest oil customer—the Pentagon—will climb hundreds of millions of dollars in the next year.

I am calling upon the military today to take the lead as the country's largest petroleum consumer and drastically cut nonessential consumption.

Much of the Pentagon's fuel consumption is nonessential—like driving around thousands of officers in staff cars—and this consumption should be cut back.

I am also asking the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Thomas Moorer what plans are being formulated to cut back nonessential fuel consumption.

The first place to start is with military staff cars and I am sure that there are a number of areas for potential sav-

ing which will not affect essential military operations.

Officials of the Defense Fuel Supply Center, which purchases gas for the Pentagon, believe that energy conservation and the budgetary squeeze will cut back military fuel purchases. One official has already admitted to a member of my staff that cost increases will be at least "more than \$100 million" for the next year.

Just like the ordinary consumer, the military should cut its nonessential consumption in order to save energy and taxpayers' dollars.

The Defense Department purchases gasoline and oil for all Federal agencies, but civilian departments account for only \$100 million worth of the annual \$1.4 billion the Pentagon buys.

I am also asking various civilian agencies to take similar measures.

Federal agencies, including the Pentagon, should take the lead in finding ways to conserve petroleum products.

PENSION REFORMS LOOM IN CONGRESSIONAL SIGHTS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, over the past few days, I have inserted the fine four-part series of pension reform articles from the Christian Science Monitor in the review of my colleagues. I insert the conclusion, "Pension Reforms Loom in Congressional Sights." As one who has introduced several bills in this area, I am hopeful the Congress will be successful in passing pension legislation in the near future. Perhaps the information from this series will prove helpful as my colleagues continue their deliberations. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: "Pension Reforms Loom in Congressional Sights."

PENSION REFORMS LOOM IN CONGRESSIONAL SIGHTS—CHIEF PLANS TAKE DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO KEY ISSUES OF VESTING AND PORTABILITY

(By David T. Cook)

BOSTON.—Congress is pushing for pension reform.

In the first two weeks of the current session 30 pension reform bills were filed.

More than 120 others have been introduced since then, according to Vance Anderson, special counsel to the House Labor Committee's pension study task force.

Of the more than 150 pending pieces of pension related legislation, three reform packages are given the best chance of becoming law.

Sweeping reform is proposed by Sens. Har-

rison A. Williams Jr. (D) of New Jersey and Jacob K. Javits (R) of New York in S 4. Senator Williams is chairman and Senator Javits ranking Republican member of the Senate Labor Committee. The Williams-Javits bill is cosponsored by 51 other senators.

In the House, Rep. John H. Dent (D) of Pennsylvania is sponsoring two bills, HR 2 and 462, containing provisions similar in concept to the Williams-Javits bill in the Senate.

LESSER CHANGE

The Nixon administration is proposing less radical changes in a pension-reform package of the two bills submitted to each House.

Messrs. Nixon, Dent, Williams, and Javits agree that tighter fiduciary standards are needed in pension-fund administration.

All three packages would:

Make pension administrators responsible for making good any losses caused by a breach of fiduciary responsibility.

Prohibit pension-fund administrators from using pension assets to further their own interests.

Limit a pension plan's investment in securities of its sponsoring firm to 10 percent of the fund's portfolio.

The three reform packages also substantially agree on disclosure proposals that would:

Require pension plans to issue annual reports to all employees. The report would list the fund's significant transactions, as well as its assets and liabilities.

Require the annual report to state which of the plan's investments had become uncollectible.

The reform packages disagree about how fast employee pension benefits should vest. Benefits are vested when an employee can collect a pension whether or not he is employed at the sponsoring firm when he retires.

VESTED IN 15 YEARS

Under the Williams-Javits bill, benefits would be vested after 15 years with one company. After eight years of service, 30 percent of a worker's pension benefits would be vested. An additional 10 percent would vest each year for the next seven years.

The Dent reform package provides the quickest vesting and thus the highest potential cost for employers. Under its provisions all benefits would be vested following 10 years of service with a firm after an employee reached age 30.

The Nixon reform package provides the slowest vesting for young employees, but more rapid vesting for middle-aged workers. It is based on the "rule of 50."

Under this plan half an employee's benefits are vested when his age and years of service with a firm total 50. An additional 10 percent of his benefits vest during each of the next five years.

Vested benefits are of more value when they are funded. A pension plan is fully funded when, if the sponsoring firm were to close its doors, the plan's assets could pay every worker all benefits promised (vested) to him.

The Williams-Javits Senate bill would give a firm 30 years to accumulate funds to cover all benefit credits, vested or not.

The Dent bill would allow a pension plan 25 years to get together assets to cover all vested benefits.

PENSION REFORM AT A GLANCE

Reform package proposed by	Bill number(s)	Legislative action completed this year	Vesting provisions	Portability provisions	Funding provisions	Pension insurance provisions
Representative John H. Dent.	H.R. 2, H.R. 462.	None	After reaching age 30, a worker's benefits would vest completely after 10 years with a firm.	Firms would be required to participate in a portability plan run by the Secretary of Labor.	Firms would have 25 years to set aside funds to cover all vested pension benefits.	Government insurance would provide 90 percent of pension benefits not covered by a firm's pension plan.
Senators Jacob K. Javits and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.	S. 4	Favorably reported by Senate Labor Committee. Awaiting action by the full Senate.	Pension benefits would be completely vested after 15 years with a firm. Benefits would be 30 percent vested after 8 years; an additional 10 percent would vest each subsequent year.	Firms could participate in a portability plan run by the Secretary of Labor.	Firms would have 30 years to set aside funds to cover all pension benefits, vested or not.	Pension benefits, up to \$500 a month, would be insured.

The Nixon plan would require a fund to annually set aside 5 percent of vested liabilities not previously funded, but would impose no time limit for full funding. If vested liabilities were to grow each year, the plan might never be fully funded.

Despite the extensive reforms they have proposed, both the Dent and Williams-Javits packages propose federally sponsored pension-insurance plans to protect workers if their plan should fail. Under both packages the insurance program would be administered by the Labor Department.

Under the Williams-Javits proposals, retirement benefits under plans meeting federal standards would be insured up to \$500 a month.

The Dent package suggests insuring 90 percent of vested benefits not covered by a firm's pension fund assets.

The Nixon administration opposes reinsurance. The President says it would require regulation "on a scale out of keeping with the free enterprise system."

The reform packages also disagree on the desirability of making pension benefits portable. Benefits are completely portable when those earned in one firm and industry can be taken by an employee without loss to another company in an unrelated industry.

The Williams-Javits bill would make portability a voluntary matter. Employers could transfer workers' unvested pension benefits to a portability fund operated by the secretary of labor. The money would either be given to the employee in care of his next employer's pension plan, or held by the government's portability fund and paid to the worker at retirement.

Mandatory portability under a similar system is proposed by the Dent reform package.

PORTABILITY OMITTED

The Nixon proposals don't contain portability provisions.

The Nixon package does have "self-help" features the other two don't include.

The administration plan would permit workers whose employers don't have pension plans to set up their own retirement funds. The individual could contribute 20 percent of his annual income up to \$1,300. The money set aside would not be taxed until it was taken as retirement income.

The administration package also would liberalize Keogh Act provisions available only to the self-employed. Contributions up to 15 percent of income would be permitted, instead of the present 10 percent maximum. The maximum dollar set-aside would move from \$2,500 to \$7,500.

The cost of pension reform is disputed.

A House labor subcommittee study found "major reform proposals don't differ significantly in potential costs." This report forecast that most employers' pension costs would go up between a fraction and 7 percent if vesting and funding reform proposals were enacted.

But a Treasury study found that the Williams-Javits bill's vesting proposals would be considerably more expensive than the Nixon administration's proposed "rule of 50." The Treasury says the Nixon reform package would push up employer costs 5 percent while the Williams-Javits proposal would cause an 11 percent pension cost increase.

Reform package proposed by	Bill number(s)	Legislative action completed this year	Vesting provisions	Portability provisions	Funding provisions	Pension insurance provisions
The Nixon administration.	S. 1557, S. 1631, H.R. 6900, H.R. 7157.	None.....	Benefits would be 50 percent vested when a worker's age and years with a firm totaled 50. After that, an additional 10 percent would vest each year.	None.....	Firms would have to set aside 5 percent of the value of unfunded vested pension benefits each year.	None.

PROMINENT CITIZEN FEARS LOSS OF FREEDOM IF NO-KNOCK LAW CONTINUES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Thomas Gray Webb, historian for DeKalb County, Tenn., has recently set out in a letter excellent and well-reasoned arguments against the so-called no-knock law.

Professor Webb points out that the right given police to, in effect, break into homes is frighteningly reminiscent of the police state of Hitler's Germany.

Because of the interest of the American people and my colleagues in this matter, I place the letter from Professor Webb, together with the enclosed editorial from the Nashville Tennessean, in the RECORD:

SMITHVILLE, TENN.,
May 6, 1973.

DEAR MR. JOE: I am enclosing an editorial from a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean. It concerns the so-called "no-knock" law which Congress passed several months ago, and which at the time I considered absolutely unconstitutional, since it clearly violates the Fourth Amendment. The then Attorney General, John Mitchell, pressed for this law, saying that it was necessary for the maintenance of "law and order." Subsequent events have shown just how much Mr. Mitchell was truly concerned with law and order.

If it has become necessary for us to lose our most basic and precious freedoms just to maintain order, then we have truly failed as a nation. Hitler's Germany, though totally lacking in freedom, was a very orderly nation. I think that we do not wish to pay such a price to suppress the narcotics business, dangerous as it may be.

I feel that the time has come for Congress to repeal this law which was pushed on the nation by an administration which many feel is the most corrupt in our entire history. This same administration has made strong efforts to suppress the freedom of the press; had they been successful we might never have known just how corrupt the administration was.

Those who opposed passage of the law stated not only that it was unconstitutional but that it would be greatly abused. These instances cited in the editorial show that it is being abused, and there have been other instances, some here in Tennessee.

Some two hundred years ago spoke William Pitt regarding the rights of Englishmen: "The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement." Surely in our quest to insure the rights of the individual we have not ended with less rights than an Englishman had two hundred years ago.

I truly believe that the time has come for

the Congress to reassert its powers as set out in the Constitution. One of the best ways to begin will be to repeal this unconstitutional law violating one of our basic rights.

I remain,

Sincerely,

TOMMY WEBB.

NATION IS IN TROUBLE IF NO-KNOCK CONTINUES

It is difficult to read about the raids by federal narcotics agents on two private homes in Collinsville, Ill., last week without feeling great anxiety for the survival of basic civil liberties in the U.S.

In each raid residents were surprised by the shattering of glass, the noise of their doors being battered down, and numerous men swarming into the homes with guns drawn. There are no warrants shown and no proper identification made. The raiders were long-haired, unshaven and poorly dressed, according to the residents, and they shouted obscenities as they barged in.

In each case the home was damaged. Residents were cursed and abusively treated, guns were placed at the heads of some and their lives threatened. Women were roughed up and addressed obscenely and one was forced to remain only partially clad as the agents stared.

In both cases the federal agents had made a mistake and gone to the wrong house. Instead of finding narcotics law violators, the agents had burst in without warning on the private family activities of law-abiding citizens. When the errors were discovered, the agents stalked off without apology.

"They acted like those German Gestapos," said one of the victims, Mr. Herbert Gigliotto, a boiler-maker. "If they were representatives of the federal government, we're all in trouble."

This is not the first time that such incidents have occurred since the "no-knock" law was signed by President Nixon July 29, 1970. This law—which is contrary to constitutional guarantees that the people shall be secure in their homes from government intrusion—has led to numerous shootings and destruction of property of innocent citizens.

Most of the incidents have been due to "error"—but this only serves to point up the dangers of the no-knock law. Errors inevitably occur when constitutional guarantees are relaxed and careless, poorly-trained men are given guns and sent out to enforce the law in their own way. To prevent such errors was the reason the founding fathers put the Bill of Rights in the Constitution.

In August, 1971, Treasury agents—formed by a juvenile that a certain person kept hand grenades at his home—battered down an apartment door in Silver Springs, Md. It was the wrong apartment. The agents then went downstairs to the right apartment and battered down its door. The man they sought was in the bathtub. Thinking his home was being robbed, he climbed out of the tub, grabbed an antique revolver and fired once at the officers. The agents shot eight times at the man. One of the bullets lodged in his head, leaving him an invalid, perhaps for the rest of his life. In the apartment the agents found four deactivated hand grenades, apparently souvenirs which some child had mistaken for the real thing.

These horrors are bad enough in themselves—but what makes them worse is the

fact that after they occur the agency responsible usually fails to see anything wrong and defends the actions of the agents. Sorry, but it's the law, seems to be their stock reply. Well, it's time to get rid of such a law. The nation's defense against criminals does not depend on wholesale violations of constitutional principles and the perpetration of injustices against innocent persons.

The no-knock law passed by Congress at the behest of Mr. John Mitchell, who had been named attorney general to give the Nixon administration the image of a law-and-order administration.

It was argued at the time by constitutional authorities and others that the no-knock law would lead to errors and abuses. But Mr. Mitchell disagreed, "Civil liberties will be protected because the courts will make proper safeguards," he said. And he said he doubted there would be any threat to "innocent people in their homes."

Well, it has been made abundantly clear since the law was passed that Mr. Mitchell was wrong. Innocent people have been threatened and injured in their homes—and they will continue to be threatened as long as the no-knock law is the law of the land. The courts can't stand as safeguards when irreparable errors are made by the arresting officers.

This is not the first time Mr. Mitchell has been wrong, either. Recent developments in the Watergate case have shown the former attorney general was wrong a number of times. Both Mr. Mitchell and President Nixon have suffered a severe loss of credibility as experts on law and order. So far about all this administration has come up with is a law that abuses the rights of the innocent without providing any special advantage in finding the guilty, which violates the nation's traditional values of justice and is taking the nation along the path to oppression and the loss of liberty.

Unless this misdirected sense of law and order is halted by Congress, Mr. Gigliotto is right: "We're all in trouble."

CRUCIFIXION AT WOUNDED KNEE—1973

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, once again the papers in my State of South Dakota have shown the light of truth and disbelief during the confrontation and occupation of Wounded Knee, the sacred burial grounds of the Sioux.

In my attempts to tell the whole story of the goings-on while militant AIM Indians occupied Wounded Knee, I was totally shocked by the fact that this Nation did not hear what occurred on Easter Sunday of this year. I hope my colleagues and the people of this country note the flagrant disregard AIM has for the rights and justice of others by seeing what their rank and file did to an unknown body

while others looked on not believing their eyes.

I would like the Congress to also note that an AIM Indian is far from representative of the whole Indian construct. What the Rapid City Journal reported on April 23, 1973, as related by Mr. Terry De Vine, an AP reporter, and printed below, is far from the comprehension of middle America in plausibility.

The article is as follows:

MARSHALS WATCH AIM EASTER SPECTACLE
(By Terry De Vine)

WOUNDED KNEE, S. DAK.—Federal officers surrounding Wounded Knee spent Easter Sunday watching what appeared to be an American Indian Movement (AIM) version of the crucifixion.

U.S. deputy marshals manning one of several roadblocks around the village watched for nearly six hours as insurgent Indians in the village kicked and pummeled an unidentified person tied to a makeshift cross near one of the AIM bunkers.

U.S. Marshal Jack Richardson, Wichita, Kan., deputy commander of the Special Operations Group (SOG), said initially it appeared that the object tied to the cross might be a dummy dressed in a marshal's camouflage uniform.

However, marshals who viewed the incident through binoculars from about 1,000 yards away said the body doubled over whenever it received a blow.

They said the person was cut down late Sunday afternoon and dragged back to the village by several Indians.

Richardson speculated that the militants might have staged the spectacle in full view of the federal position in an effort to get marshals to fire on the bunker.

He also said it might have been an attempt by AIM members to force marshals to expose themselves, setting them up for fire from AIM snipers.

Richardson said he could offer no definite explanation for the bizarre performance.

Meanwhile, a National Council of Churches representative, the Rev. John Adams, said about 70 persons began a five-day protest march from Rosebud to Wounded Knee Sunday.

AIM attorney Ramon Roubideaux of Rapid City had said earlier that 500 persons would participate in the march to protest treatment of Indians in general.

Richard Hellstern, deputy assistant U.S. attorney general, said the marchers will not be allowed to enter the reservation, which has been declared off limits to nonresidents.

AIM Security Chief Stan Holder was scheduled to be arraigned Monday in Rapid City on charges stemming from the Feb. 27 takeover of the village.

Holder who surrendered last week to federal authorities, was released on bond and allowed to return to the village to talk to other AIM leaders in hopes of bringing about a peaceful settlement to the siege, which is now in its 56th day.

Nineteen other persons arrested early Easter morning also were to be arraigned in Rapid City. Hellstern said 13 of those arrested were attempting to backpack food into the besieged village through federal lines. The others also were trying to enter the village, he said.

Hellstern said seven federal arrest warrants have been issued against persons involved in an airdrop of supplies into Wounded Knee last Tuesday.

He said a Boston Globe reporter, Thomas Oliphant, who was expected to surrender to federal authorities Monday, was believed to be the organizer of the airdrop.

"We think we have the entire group isolated," said Hellstern. He said those arrested will be charged with conspiracy and crossing state lines to participate in a civil disorder.

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH—ITS IMPORTANCE IN OUR NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, those who are aware of the importance of medical research realize the necessity of a harmonious effort jointly shared by the Government and the medical community. The costs of medical research are high, and thus Government assistance is invaluable. But the potential rewards of medical research clearly justify these costs.

Medical research is a most productive Government investment, for its benefits are clear and tangible, affecting the lives of millions of people. The goal of medical research is to improve the lives of all people—a goal that surely should be identical with the best interests of Government. Unlike some Government programs that do little to improve the quality of life—and sometimes even harm it—medical research is a necessary means toward a wholly desirable end.

Yet, for all the accomplishments of medical research in the past 20 years, the partnership of the Federal Government and the medical community is being seriously challenged. The fiscal 1974 budget proposals of the President would, I believe, grievously wound medical research throughout our Nation.

One medical professional deeply concerned about the proposed budgetary cutbacks is Dr. Kurt J. Isselbacher, Mallinckrodt professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School; chief, gastroenterology, Massachusetts General Hospital; chairman, executive committee, Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School; and chairman, Harvard University Cancer Committee.

Dr. Isselbacher's statement on the subject of medical research is excellent. I urge my colleagues to give particularly close attention to the incisive analysis of Dr. Isselbacher:

STATEMENT BY DR. KURT J. ISSELBACHER

I am most honored, Congressman Drinan, to be appearing before you to emphasize the importance of biomedical research as it relates to the health and welfare of the people of our nation.

Today we seem to be at a crossroads in the relationship between the federal government and medical research community. Those who are aware of the importance of medical research recognize the need for the continued growth and rational expansion of the cooperative effort between medicine and government. On the other hand the Administration seems to disagree with this concept. It has outlined a withdrawal of federal support for research and is dismantling the research training programs thus assuring a reduction in the pool of able young medical scientists. Even if one could agree with the reasoning of the Administration, its actions are far too drastic and far too precipitous. At the present time the area of medical research represents one of the finest examples in our history of cooperation between government and medicine. This country's biomedical research establishment has been second to none in the world. Nevertheless in spite of past achievements we are told that there

should be reduction in the ever proliferating biomedical research grants and a return of medical scientists into clinical practice so that health care delivery can be improved and manpower increased. However one should note that less than 4% of our medical school graduates go into full-time medical academic careers and a still smaller percentage are in full-time research. We are told about useless expenditures for ivory tower research and that much of our biomedical research is not relevant. At the same time there are recommendations that medical research can be conducted on a crash program basis such as the moon shot effort. This assumes that the federal government can legislate advances in medical research which clearly it cannot. Unfortunately the Administration does not appear to understand the very serious implication of its drastic if not devastating decisions not only for the next few years but the effect these actions will have for years to come.

I would like to address myself briefly to four areas:

1. The importance of training of biomedical investigators.
2. The importance of basic or fundamental research.
3. The role of applied and contract research.
4. The importance of the peer review mechanism.

1. *The importance of the training and fellowship program.* I need not reemphasize to you again the importance of the training programs to develop medical researchers. Not only are these individuals the scientists who will carry out our future research efforts but they also are the major source and resource for our medical school faculties. The training programs have provided the mechanisms for encouraging the best minds of our nation to be brought into the field of research and teaching. While some training funds have come from private organizations such as the American Cancer Society, the financial resources of such organizations have never been large enough to provide more than a small fraction of the necessary fellowship and training support. *Only the federal government has funds of this magnitude.* While anyone who has examined the problem of medical research and medical school teaching in this country recognizes the vital nature of the fellowship program, the Administration has insisted that the training programs be dismantled and eliminated forthwith.

What are their reasons for this? The first argument is that *there already are too many medical researchers in this country.* Their specious argument is that since there are more research grants approved by the National Institutes of Health than can be funded this indicates that there are more scientists than necessary to do the job! Of course this reasoning is false. The obvious reason for this situation is that there are insufficient funds to support the many research proposals that have been considered scientifically sound but cannot be funded. The second argument (most recently made by our new Assistant Secretary for Health) suggests that an inequity exists since training and fellowship support does not exist in other fields such as in the arts, philosophy or history and that this inequity should be eliminated by phasing out the programs in the biomedical sciences. This reasoning amounts to throwing out the baby with the bath water. The third argument is based on the view that the government is now paying for the training of individuals who go out and develop lucrative practices and that the government should not support the training of such individuals. We would agree that this is not desirable. However the evidence shows that more than 80% of the individuals trained in the biomedical area pursue academic careers and choose to remain in aca-

demographic positions which are much less lucrative than private practice.

The Administration, therefore, suggests that individuals who wish to pursue biomedical research should continue their training by taking out loans. This sounds good to those not familiar with the problem, but such a system will not work. It should be pointed out that over 36% of graduate students have a major indebtedness and over 56% of medical students are in debt by the time they graduate. More than 50% of the individuals who are in the training and fellowship programs are in debt and 70-75% of this group have indicated that they would not be able to continue their research training if this training had to be achieved on the basis of loans because of their already significant indebtedness. The Administration fails to recognize that we need to encourage not discourage the training of biomedical scientists. Since they represent 4% or less of our medical graduates, by denying them the opportunity to enter academic careers their numbers will not significantly swell the ranks of the general practitioners. We cannot on the one hand respond to the Administration's request to expand the number of medical schools and increase the enrollment of students and at the same time diminish the pool from which the faculty for these schools will be derived.

It should be noted that in 1972 the amounts spent for training of biomedical investigators were less than 0.2% of the total health expenditures.

2. *The importance of basic or fundamental research.* As indicated above, there are those who argue that support of basic research amounts to a useless expenditure of funds for research conducted by ivory tower investigators working on irrelevant projects. The past performance of our biomedical establishment certainly belies this Act.

Basic research in the medical sciences is the study of life processes. Such research is essential to our understanding of diseases, their mechanism, treatment, and hopefully their cure. Tied to our past achievements in basic research is the fact that many of the contributions and discoveries and advances in disease have come from unpredictable areas by individuals working in completely unrelated fields and often while working on unrelated problems. Many examples can be cited to indicate the importance of biomedical research and the fact that a breakthrough in the elucidation of a disease often comes from a serendipitous observation by an able and observant scientist working in another scientific area:

(a) The recent advances in our understanding of the role of viruses in the causation of cancer have come from our understanding of how viruses infect bacteria. Dr. David Baltimore of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology discovered an enzyme in bacteria which converts RNA into DNA. This enzyme is considered by workers in the cancer field to be related to the mechanism whereby certain RNA viruses can influence cells and alter the DNA and genetic information of the cells making them malignant. This work was carried out not under the aegis of a cancer research grant, and was the result of Dr. Baltimore's basic studies of viruses and how they infect bacteria.

(b) The Nobel Prize winning work of Dr. John Enders on the eradication of poliomyelitis resulted from his finding that viruses could be grown in the test tube on cultures of monkey kidney cells. Enders was interested in developing a means for growing viruses so that he could work on the possible role of viruses and cancer. At that time he was not intending to solve the polio problem. The results of this work are now history and through his efforts the polio vaccine was developed.

(c) The breakthrough in the antibiotic treatment of tuberculosis was again made by a Nobel laureate, Dr. S. Waksman of Rutgers,

a soil microbiologist whose work led to the application of streptomycin to the treatment of tuberculosis.

(d) Significant advances have recently been made in viral hepatitis, a disease with which some 20-30,000 people are hospitalized every year at an estimated total cost of about \$60 million. Ten years ago Dr. Baruch Blumberg, a population geneticist, quite by accident found that a particular antigen occurred with great frequency in the blood of Australian aborigines. He was not looking for the hepatitis virus but as a result of his alertness what he discovered in the blood of these Australian aborigines has turned out in fact to be the hepatitis virus which causes so-called serum hepatitis. As a result of this pioneering work (again by someone who was not originally studying that particular disease), we now have a blood test to detect this hepatitis virus.

(e) The revolutionary treatment for Parkinson's disease came as a result of studies carried out by Dr. George Cotzias working on neurologic problems caused by manganese poisoning in the miners of Chile. It was only later that Dr. Cotzias found that his observations to have relevance to the important problem of Parkinsonism.

If one wishes to look at the economic benefits that have come from basic research one can turn to the study performed by Mr. Owen McCrory, a consultant in medical economics. He has estimated that in 1967 alone there were 2.7 million wage earners alive and working due in part to the new methods of treatment. These workers paid the federal government \$1.7 billion in income and excise taxes in their earnings. The NIH appropriations for that fiscal year of 1967 were \$1.4 billion. *McCrory has concluded from his analysis that the funds appropriated in fiscal 1972 to the NIH and the Mental Health Administration have been repaid to the federal government eight times over in income and excise taxes of wage earners whose lives have been saved due to medical research successes.*

In this regard I might also refer to some studies which we carried out 18 years ago on genetic disorder, Galactosemia, a disease causing mental retardation which we found to be due to the hereditary lack of an enzyme. In the past enzyme research was thought to be real ivory tower science. However as a result of our studies there is now in the state of Massachusetts a routine screening test for Galactosemia on all newborn infants. As a result the disease can be discovered at birth and the infants can be prevented from developing mental retardation.

3. *Applied Research.* It is obvious that the basic research is valuable if it can be properly applied so that it can lead to the diagnosis, treatment, cure and prevention of disease. Recently, however, the Administration has focused on applied research at the expense of basic research. In point of fact while applied research is important, it cannot be carried out at the expense of or in lieu of basic research. To achieve its goals the Administration is focusing heavily on research contracts. The contract research approach suggests that we now possess all of the basic scientific facts needed for the conquest of a disease such as cancer, and all that is necessary is to set up timetables of expected progress, hire the required researchers (although this can't be done by eliminating training grants and fellowships), and then confidently set back and expect this disease such as cancer to disappear from our midst.

However if we look at past history we find that whenever significant scientific thrusts have been successful they have always been based on a solid foundation of fundamental research established with the efforts of many scientists over a considerable period of time and not through "crash programs." If in the late 1940's there had been a crash program aimed at the polio problem the funds would have been used to build a better res-

pirator and perhaps the polio problem would still be with us now.

We must never forget that for the most part we have little insight about the mysteries of life in spite of all we have done, and thus it is almost impossible to plan ahead for what the future will bring. The best that we can do is to try to bring our most intelligent and able minds to bear on a given problem and let them follow their own direction. Scientific discoveries are generally unforeseen events not included in theory for otherwise they would have been foreseen.

4. *The peer review mechanism.* Let me finally comment on the importance of the peer review mechanism in the awarding of funds. This is a system which over the last 20 or 25 years has worked very effectively in the allocation of funds for research and training. By this system a request is reviewed by experts in the field and judged on merit and quality in the fairest way possible. The decisions are made without regard to geographic location or political factors, but purely on the quality and substance of the proposal. Obviously no system is perfect and errors in judgment can and do occur. The Administration would like to eliminate the peer review system, and to make decisions "in camera" with no or little scientific advice. If one eliminates the peer review mechanism, funds could be allocated across the country on a regional basis. Rather than being awarded to the most able scientists, one could then justify grants being allocated to many states not receiving large research funds. This may make political sense but it does not make good scientific sense. The peer review mechanism permits investigators knowledgeable in a field of discipline to examine proposals and recommend awards based on one criterion alone—scientific merit. It is ironic that recent scientists while visiting Russia have been asked repeatedly about our peer review mechanism. The Russians apparently have recognized the merits of our system and now wish to implement it in their own country. Former NIH Director Robert Marston has sounded a warning in his farewell speech April 27:

"The peer review system has given us the best science through a federal agency with the least political interference of any governmental process ever developed. It is truly one of the great achievements of American government but it is being destroyed."

I would like to conclude, Congressman Drinan, by emphasizing that the training of biomedical scientists and support for biomedical research must be continued at an appropriate level. Research must be supported in a balanced manner. Basic and applied research are not mutually exclusive, and fundamental research should not be eliminated or downgraded at the expense of applied research or because money is needed to improve our health care delivery system. All these various components of our health related efforts are important.

What constitutes a reasonable expenditure of funds for biomedical research and training? I would submit that industry has shown us the way. Most of our large corporations allocate a certain percentage of their resources (generally 8 to 10%) for research and development. It seems perfectly reasonable to me that a certain percentage of our total health expenditures should be allocated for biomedical research and training. At the present time this percentage is 2% and decreasing annually. This percentage is far too low and if it continues to drop, our whole effort to improve the health of our people and the quality of life will be seriously jeopardized. We hope (a) that there will be an increase in funds in the 1974 fiscal budget for biomedical research, (b) that the allocation of these funds, using the peer review mechanism, will continue to take cognizance of the importance of fundamental research, and (c) that it is recognized by all that research and training of biomedical scientists are interrelated and go hand in hand.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE NATIONAL UNION ASSEMBLY OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF MOTION PICTURE AND TELEVISION UNIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my office was visited by representatives of a number of motion picture and television people whose local unions are located in New York City. Among those in the group were Abraham Kanter, business representative, U.S.A. Local 829, Olga Barrekette, Local 161, Motion Picture Script Supervisors and Production Office Coordinators, John T. McGuire, assistant executive secretary, Screen Actors Guild, Fredda Briant, business representative, TWAU Local 764, Dick Weaver, Local 18032, Association of Theater Agents and Managers, Steve D'Inzillo, Local 306, IATSE, Anthony J. Luisi, Local 16, NABET, and Howard Linkoff, Local 15, NABET.

The problems which face working people in this industry are similar to those facing most working people in this country: foreign competition, much of it really coming from foreign branches and operations of American-based multinational corporations, is causing tremendous unemployment among movie and television workers. The need for legislation such as H.R. 241, the Foreign Investment and Multinational Corporation Control Act, grows daily, and I am pleased to see that the Committee on Ways and Means has begun hearings into this critical subject.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at the conclusion of my remarks several resolutions adopted by the National Union Assembly of the National Conference of Motion Picture and Television Unions:

RESOLUTION

Competitive bidding for U.S. governmental agencies producing or processing motion picture and audio-visual materials

Whereas, Approximately one-half billion dollars is annually allocated by the combined agencies of the U.S. Government for the production and processing of motion pictures, and

Whereas, These productions are allocated for use by these governmental agencies for educational, defense, training, propaganda and entertainment medias, and

Whereas, The present governmental bidding system of cheapest production cost is unfair and inequitable to union employees working under more advantageous wages and conditions provided by their collective bargaining agreements, and

Whereas, The construction industry satisfactorily resolved similar problems by the passage of the Davis-Bacon Act which requires all employers bidding on U.S. Government contracts pay the going rate, plus fringe benefits presently applicable in the area, and

Whereas, Such requirement applied to the motion picture industry would give private producers using union employees the opportunity to compete in the open market for a share of government production in the American tradition of equal opportunity and free enterprise,

Now, therefore be it resolved, that we the delegates to the National Conference of Mo-

tion Picture and Television Unions meeting in Phoenix, Arizona on February 22, 1973 hereby declare our vigorous support of legislation that would amend the United States Service Contract Act requiring contractors of the departments and agencies of the United States government engaged in the production and processing of motion pictures and audio-visual materials to pay the prevailing wages and fringe benefits of the industry.

RESOLUTION: BURKE-HARTKE BILL

Whereas: The AFL-CIO Economic Policy Committee has recognized that increased foreign imports and United States owned foreign operations have resulted in the loss of job opportunities for American workers, and

Whereas: The foreign investments of American motion picture and television film producers have created catastrophic unemployment among workers in the United States domestic film industry, and

Whereas: The Foreign Trade Investment Act of 1972-73 (Burke-Hartke Bill) establishes tariff and trade regulations that protect American workers from displacement by foreign imports, and

Whereas: Some Federal administrative agencies have considered the motion picture and television industry as a communications media and not a producer of tangible items, goods or articles;

Now, therefore be it resolved that the National Conference of Motion Picture and Television Unions meeting in Phoenix, Arizona on February 22, 1973 go on record supporting the Burke-Hartke legislation, and

Be it further resolved that Title III, Section 301(a) "Categories of Goods" of the Bill include the following:

"The products of the motion picture and television industry shall be understood to be within the meaning of the term 'goods'."

RESOLUTION ON THE REPEAL OF THE PRIME TIME RULING ON TELEVISION

We, the delegates to the National Conference of Motion Picture and Television Unions hereby reaffirm our opposition to detrimental Prime Time Ruling of the Federal Communication Commission and call upon the Commission to order its immediate repeal.

We also call upon the Commission to adopt rules that would drastically reduce the use of re-runs on television. Such action would be fairer to the viewing public in that it would bring an increase in new programs and would at the same time vastly increase employment among actors, technicians, craftsmen and all those engaged in the production of motion picture and other programs shown on television.

RETIREMENT OF OSCAR A. CRIST

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1973, Mr. Oscar A. Crist, the chief deputy U.S. marshal for the District of Colorado will be retiring. This will bring to a close more than 36 years of distinguished service to the people of this country by Mr. Crist. He served 4 years in the Armed Forces and 32 years as a deputy marshal. He is, at this time, the senior deputy marshal in the U.S. Marshal Service.

When I had the privilege of serving as U.S. attorney for the District of Colorado I became well acquainted with Mr. Crist. His service to the courts and the judicial process was outstanding. I can say with

all honesty that his good work was a great aid to me and my staff. My association with Oscar Crist is something I will always treasure.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity, on behalf of myself and Mrs. Brotzman, to wish Oscar Crist much pleasure and contentment in his richly deserved retirement.

PETROLEUM IMPORTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill designed to insure that U.S. flag vessels will carry at least 20 percent of our petroleum imports. I believe that a continuation of our present reliance on foreign shipping for a resource so vital to our Nation could lead to severe problems in terms of our security and our balance of payments. A conversion to American tankers would provide measurable improvements to our employment rate and greater control over the effect of such shipping on the environment.

I hope that all Members will consider carefully the facts in the following summary:

A BILL TO REQUIRE THAT A PERCENTAGE OF U.S. OIL IMPORTS BE CARRIED ON U.S. FLAG VESSELS

This legislation will guarantee that U.S. flag vessels, when available at fair and reasonable rates, will carry a minimum of twenty percent of U.S. oil imports of petroleum and petroleum products, with the percentage rising to 30 percent by 1977.

The bill will provide the impetus to achieve the full intent of Congress, as expressed in the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, to build a strong and competitive American Merchant Marine. Presently there are no U.S. flag tankers regularly engaged in the U.S. oil import trades.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The United States is currently in double jeopardy because of our dependence on both foreign sources of supply and foreign flag vessels to import our growing oil needs.

The President's energy program, announced on April 18, 1973 is an attempt to reduce our dependence on foreign oil supplies. This bill would free the U.S. from the dangers of peacetime economic and political coercion by nations controlling vessels engaged in U.S. oil trades, while providing our nation with a large tanker fleet available in a national emergency.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

In 1975, with an estimated 8 billion barrels a day of required oil imports, the projected drain on the U.S. balance of payments of approximately 2 billion dollars for the transportation costs of U.S. oil imports could be reduced by one-fourth if U.S. tankers carry the percentage of oil imports envisioned by this bill.

EMPLOYMENT IMPACT

Over 45 thousand seafaring, shipbuilding and allied industry jobs will be created initially; rising to over 65 thousand by 1985.

ENVIRONMENT

Presently over half of U.S. oil imports are carried on runaway flag vessels of Panama and Liberia, which have higher accident rates than U.S. vessels.

U.S. vessels are manned by experienced American crews and are regulated by the U.S. Coast Guard.

There can be meaningful enforcement of pollution controls on U.S. flag tankers—enforcement on foreign tankers will be difficult if not impossible if we are wholly dependent on foreign tankers for our oil needs.

H.R. 7853

A bill to insure a fair and reasonable participation of United States flag commercial vessels in movement of petroleum and petroleum products imported into the U.S.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 901(b) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), shall be further amended by striking the colon after the words "in such manner as will insure a fair and reasonable participation of United States-flag commercial vessels in such cargoes by geographical areas," inserting a period, and adding the following:

"The appropriate agency or agencies shall also take such steps as may be necessary and practicable to assure that at least 20 per centum of the gross tonnage of all petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States on ocean vessels, including movements (1) directly from original point of production and (2) from such original point to intermediate points for transshipment or refinement and ultimate delivery into the United States, shall be transported on privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for U.S.-flag commercial vessels, in such manner as will ensure fair and reasonable participation of U.S.-flag commercial vessels in such cargoes by geographical areas: *Provided*, That the quantity required so to be carried in U.S.-flag commercial vessels shall be at least 25 per centum after June 30, 1975, and at least 30 per centum after June 30, 1977, if the Secretary of Commerce shall on December 31 preceding each such date determine that U.S. tonnage existing or on order and scheduled to be delivered by such date would be adequate to carry such quantity."

FOOD COUNTS MOST

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, in times past, in times of war, our producers have been called upon to go all out for "food to win the war" and history shows that they were very successful.

A recent editorial by Bill Paulson in the Mountain Lake Observer, in our Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota, comes up with the idea that food also won the peace for us in Vietnam.

This is a most interesting premise that I would like to share with my colleagues and all of the other readers by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOOD COUNTS MOST

History may record that the American farmer was a decisive influence on the road that led to peace. The farmer, free enterprise agriculture, has made our country the food larder of the world.

This is notably true for communist countries where there is high rate of efficiencies in agriculture and the incentives to produce are abysmally low.

It is evident that food can be an influencing policy in the world today. Note that Russia is buying millions of tons of grain abroad, a large amount of this from the United

States. China, too, has to depend upon additional foodstuffs and has or is bargaining with Canada, Argentina, and our country.

There is no question that hungry people have to stay close to their food supply source and the greatest and biggest source of food supplies is the United States.

Could this fact, then, have been the hidden instrument that kept the big communist powers from retaliating when we put military pressure on North Vietnam. This could be the explanation for the lack of retort. That the food-producing capacity of our country, of our farmers, was much more important to both Russia and China than the plight of Vietnam.

DUNBARTON COLLEGE CLOSES

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1973 the Washington Star-News published an article dealing with the passing of Dunbarton College from the scene at the end of the present academic year. Despite the dedication of the members of the Order of the Sisters of the Holy Cross and the superb leadership of the college's chief executive, Dr. Paul G. Buchanan, Dunbarton just could not make it.

Mr. Speaker, if this were an isolated example it would be a sad event, but the closing of this fine private college for women is all too common across this Nation. It seems as though the private college which receives its operating expenses from tuition and fees is finding that its back is to the wall. While Dunbarton is a small college this situation affects some of the Nation's biggest universities. Indeed such educational giants as New York University and Boston University are also feeling the financial pinch. Federal assistance has dried up as the Nixon administration moves its priorities elsewhere and costs continue to soar.

Mr. Speaker, we must take action now if we are to save the private college. Time is running out if more colleges are not to go the way of Dunbarton College.

Because this situation is so critical I hope all Members will read the Star-News account of Dunbarton's final commencement.

The article follows:

LAST CLASS GRADUATES—DUNBARTON COLLEGE

Dns

Dunbarton College, a small Catholic school for girls in Northwest Washington, died yesterday. It was 38.

The 22-acre, tree-lined college, victim of spiraling costs and waning interest in parochial, single-sex institutions, awarded its last bachelor of arts degrees to 77 graduating seniors during brief afternoon ceremonies and then shut its doors to students for the last time.

The campus will remain open, but studentless, until Aug. 31 to allow school officials time to mop up unfinished affairs and the board of directors to make a decision on what it is going to do with the valuable property at 2935 Upton St.

"This is both a sad and a happy occasion," Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., D-Mass., told the graduating class, "but the passing of Dunbarton College will not lessen the advances its graduates have made."

O'Neill, majority leader of the House who received an honorary degree during the final

ceremonies at Dunbarton, said that the closing of Dunbarton College is part of a national trend away from small, private female institutions in the nation.

He cited statistics that there were 298 public and private one-sex colleges in the nation in 1960, but by 1970, 40 percent of these had become coeducational and 37 colleges had closed down. Of the 37, all but 10 were Catholic colleges.

O'Neill attributed the decline of single-sex colleges to a "fiscal crisis facing all campuses, with declining enrollments at Catholic institutions that comes as other types of institutions extend their facilities to others without regard to race, color or creed."

School officials said the decision to close Dunbarton came after six years of accumulating debts and recurring problems which have faced Catholic colleges elsewhere—crime, lack of federal funding, unpopularity of female-only institutions, competition from community colleges, and a decline in the interest of church-related schools.

College President Dr. Paul G. Buchanan, who led an unsuccessful fight to reverse the trend here, said the overriding consideration in closing the school was \$3.5 million in debts accumulated since 1967 and an operating deficit which was expected to reach \$1 million this year.

School officials said offers for the college have come from a number of private schools and a proposal has been made to turn it over to the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington.

The college was founded in 1935 by Sister Rose Elizabeth of the Order of the Sisters of the Holy Cross and it will be up to the order to make a final decision on disposition of the property.

Dr. Lillian Bateman, assistant to Buchanan, said juniors who attended the college this year and completed their school requirements, will get degrees from Dunbarton when they finish their required course work at other institutions. Freshmen and sophomores have been placed in other universities here and in other parts of the nation.

However, some faculty members have not been so lucky. Dr. Bateman said, since only a few have found places at other colleges and universities because of the glut of Ph.D.'s on the market this year.

"It's a shame, because there are some good teachers here," she said.

CONGRESS MUST REASSERT ITS CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY IN THE AREA OF WAR POWERS

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the House-passed amendments to the second supplemental appropriation of 1973 which prohibited the spending of the defense appropriation for the bombing in Cambodia, I would like to state specifically the reasons for my votes on this issue.

When the Addabbo amendment was first offered, I supported the amendment. I also voted for the Long amendment. Later when a separate vote was demanded on the Addabbo amendment, I voted against this provision.

Only after the Long proposal specifically prohibiting U.S. combat activities in or over Cambodia was passed did I reverse my position on the Addabbo amendment. By prohibiting the transfer of \$430 million by the Department of

Defense, the Addabbo amendment not only blocked additional funding of the United States bombing in Cambodia, but it also blocked the transfer authority for funding of U.S. defense-related activities in important strategic areas such as the Middle East. My colleague, Congressman CLARENCE LONG, best stated the case for the language of his amendment rather than Mr. ADDABBO's proposal—

I feel that the proposed amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) is a good amendment if that is all we can get, but I think that we need a much more precise instrument and I feel that my amendment is more precise because it is a clear message from the Congress to the President that all bombing in Cambodia must stop. It is an explicit, not merely an implicit message.

Despite my turnabout on the Adabbo provision, I want to make it clear that the intent of my votes was firm and consistent throughout the House consideration of U.S. activity in Cambodia. I did not believe that the Congress should back into further American military involvement without the specific review and approval by the Congress of the President's policy in Cambodia.

In my view, there was no logic or right in the administration's attempt to use the transfer authority within the Department of Defense to establish congressional approval of the U.S. military policy in Cambodia. President Nixon could easily come before this Congress and advise this body of his intended policy of action in Cambodia and ask for a resolution of support.

Frankly, I could probably support, in the short term, the bombing campaign President Nixon has directed in Cambodia. The North Vietnamese have violated the terms of the cease-fire negotiated by Mr. Kissinger; they have failed to withdraw their military advisers and military personnel from Cambodia, and they have directly encroached on the sovereignty of that unhappy country.

It has been suggested by Secretary of State Rogers that President Nixon can cite violations of the cease-fire agreement as authorizing measures for the U.S. bombing in Cambodia. In my view, there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution that suggests that executive agreements are of such force that Presidents have the right to unilaterally commit the Armed Forces of this Nation to either implement or punish violations of those executive agreements.

The Tonkin Bay resolution was cited by President Johnson as the expressed authority for maintaining the American commitment in Southeast Asia. That resolution was repealed by Congress in January 1971. President Nixon justified the continuation of American involvement in South Vietnam by citing his responsibility as the American Commander in Chief to protect our American servicemen and bring back our prisoners of war. American troops have now been withdrawn and our POW's have been returned. Now, in the absence of a declaration of hostilities by the Congress, there is no legal basis that I know of for the continued American commitment of land, sea, or air forces in Southeast Asia.

My votes last week on the Addabbo and Long amendments, therefore, were not cast so much in opposition to the U.S. Cambodia policy as they were a statement of my belief that the Congress must reassert its constitutional authority in the area of war powers. I earnestly hope that the President will heed the message from the Congress and seek a direct congressional authorization of the U.S. policy in Cambodia.

THE WATERGATE AFFAIR: IS A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR ENOUGH?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the confidence of the American electorate in our political system has clearly been shattered in the wake of the Watergate revelations.

This collective faith can only be restored by a complete investigation and thorough prosecution of those involved in these crimes. In this light, the appointment of a special prosecutor by Attorney General-nominee Richardson will be crucial in setting the stage for swift justice in the very near future in this matter.

It is equally important, however, that the House of Representatives not shrink from its responsibility in this matter. Section 2 of article I of the Constitution gives the House of Representatives sole authority and responsibility for the initiation of proceedings for the impeachment of the President.

We have reached the point where the latest Gallup poll indicated that 40 percent of the American people believe the President had prior knowledge of Watergate or was involved in the Watergate coverup. I do not presume to judge the President's guilt or innocence, and neither should any Member of the House. As Members, however, we are charged with the constitutional responsibility of measuring the President's conduct in the Watergate affair against the constitutional standard for impeachment. By taking the lead in the initiation of such an investigation, the Judiciary Committee would be acting in a responsible manner to clear the air of charges that the President was involved in the Watergate bugging and coverup.

I now submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, a perceptive article on this subject, written by Harvard Law School professor and associate dean, Paul M. Bator, that appeared in the New York Times of May 15:

A WATERGATE "WARREN COMMISSION"

(By Paul M. Bator)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Ambiguities and confusions abound in the discussions of an independent prosecutor in the Watergate case.

There is, first, the question of what it is that we want. Is it simply an impartial and

independent investigation and airing of the facts? If so, what we need is not a special prosecutor appointed by the Attorney General but a person or group appointed to function as a commission of inquiry as, for instance, the Warren Commission. Such a person or group can be made completely independent of the executive branch and given subpoena and other necessary powers.

But this is not what is primarily talked about. What is sought is, a prosecutor whose purpose in making an investigation would be to determine whether criminal charges should be brought and, in the event, to press them.

But if this is what is in mind, then the extent to which we can or should demand independence may be limited. It is highly doubtful that the function of bringing criminal prosecutions on behalf of the United States can be taken away from the executive branch of the Government. The Constitution vests executive power in the President and commands him to take "care that the laws be faithfully executed." The enforcement of Federal criminal law is a central part of the function of executing the laws. For the Congress or anyone else to purport to create an agency wholly independent from the executive branch with power to enforce the criminal law would probably be unconstitutional. It may also be unwise.

The Watergate prosecutor should be independent but he must also be accountable. There should be someone to pass on his performance with power (to put it brutally) to fire him. Until impeached, the President (or his officers) must retain that authority.

Elliot Richardson, nominated to be Attorney General, is therefore on sound ground when he insists that the independent prosecutor must ultimately be accountable to and subject to the authority of the Attorney General and the President.

But this does not mean that the prosecutor cannot be given wide de facto independence. Mr. Richardson should draft instructions which make it clear that the prosecutor may proceed to subpoena (and procure immunity for) witnesses and to seek indictments without advance clearance from him. Indeed, it would be quite legitimate and desirable to instruct the prosecutor to engage in no advance consultations with Mr. Richardson. But this is not the equivalent of total independence. The prosecutor should be required to report from time to time to the Attorney General, who must retain the power to appraise his performance and to fire him if necessary.

I appreciate that even this creates an uncomfortable dilemma. Many do not trust the President in this matter; how can they trust the prosecutor if he is in any way accountable to the President? My answer is that to some extent the dilemma is unsolvable: under our Constitution, lack of confidence in the Presidency does not justify creating an extraconstitutional independent prosecuting authority. Notice, however, that the solvent of public opinion alleviates the dilemma: the best guarantee of the prosecutor's independence will be his ability to say to the public that the President (or Mr. Richardson) is interfering with the impartial execution of his functions.

And one aspect—perhaps the most significant aspect—of the dilemma is, I believe, solvable. The executive branch is not the proper authority to pass on the question whether the President should be impeached. It would be proper, I believe, to insulate from the executive's authority evidence discovered by the prosecutor bearing on Presidential misconduct. Mr. Richardson should instruct the prosecutor to transmit any such evidence directly to the House of Representatives, which should authorize its Judiciary Committee (or create a select committee) to receive and consider it.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT F. FROEHLKE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend best wishes to Robert F. Froehlke as he leaves his post as Secretary of the Army and heads for new endeavors and new challenges.

Since he came aboard as Secretary on July 1, 1971, we have gotten to know one another well. Our professional relationship has been one of straightforwardness and honesty. We have, at times, disagreed but without being disagreeable.

Our personal relationship has been a genuine one because Bob Froehlke is a likeable guy, a man of integrity, devoted to doing the best possible job while in service to his country.

Such dedicated public servants come along all too infrequently, and their stay is all too brief. But Bob Froehlke has left his mark on the U.S. Army through his active leadership in the nearly 2 years he has been Secretary, and the country as a whole is the beneficiary. His 2-year tour of duty as Assistant Secretary of Administration was just as meaningful and provided the foundation for his efforts as Secretary.

At this point in the RECORD I want to include Bob's farewell remarks and the letter he received from the President.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, ROBERT F. FROEHLKE

It is customary to remark that one leaves with "Mixed Feelings."

Let me omit what is expected and say the unexpected. The reason is not that I just want to come up with something new. I simply feel a man should take a more positive approach than that of his soul nicely split in the middle, which, anyway, sounds for my normal taste a little bit too much like schizophrenia.

We should not coddle ourselves by indulging in those ever quoted Mixed Feelings. A man has his assigned task. He does it to the best of his ability and with a genuine, perhaps even zestful eagerness. Then he comes to the end of the time allotted him for that particular task, that particular mission. And he leaves. Still deeply interested in what had been his work, still feeling close to those who became his friends in a common endeavor, he passes on to meet new problems, new joys—or miseries—and a new style of life. Another page is being turned over.

Those who have dealt with me over the years know that this attitude is not cold or heartless, it is merely a reflection of a life-affirming view which I might have inscribed on a plaque somewhere, someday in my home somewhere: "No regrets, please. Life goes on colorful, rich, vibrant."

It is also customary for him who departs to express in a few well polished phrases what he thinks, "in all humility," he has accomplished and how much, nevertheless, still remains to be done by his successors. I do not believe it behooves a man—even with that nice saving qualifier "in all humility"—to speak of his own achievements. History and our peers will judge what each of us has really accomplished. Let not the individual himself try to assume the role of arbiter. He is too close to himself to be objective. How painful for his listeners to hear him embarrassingly strive to hold the "appropriate" medium line between self-congratulating pride and self-doubting modesty. And yet, I am sufficiently human to take great

satisfaction in what I perceive the Army has accomplished during my tenure.

Am I, then, to express no thoughts, no feeling at this moment of departure? That would be more than wrong, it would be inhuman: It would leave all of us here assembled with a sense of emptiness, and ill at ease. Moreover, it would be entirely against my own inner grain, my belief—my credo, I might say—that in this modern, technological, bureaucratic age men are in more dire need than ever before to communicate, *truly* communicate, with one another.

And this, friends, is really the issue I have at heart while taking my leave from you and from that great, but also big, institution: The United States Army. Yes, big too, and therein lies a problem. It has been my observation that in *all* large organizations—civilian or military, secular or clerical—depersonalization is the most serious and most pervasive single threat to the effectiveness of the whole body and to the sustained performance of its members. Have we not all seen individuals, soldiers as well as civilians, turn from eager, enthusiastic, courageous men and achievers into dehydrated bureaucrats? Do not let us accept the myth that this is an unavoidable consequence of numerical growth itself, that there is no room for warm-blooded strong personalities and for human relations within the big green machine. Let us, for Heaven's sake, not end up by equating efficiency and excellence with Systems Analysis.

My whole life has been so definitely wedded to practical affairs that I can hardly be considered a dreamer walking in the clouds. Yet, I venture to state that one *can* move from de-personalization to re-personalization. And while there is no glib psychological cookbook or Manual on Leadership which can provide a mechanical procedure, or concocted recipe there are a few very simple ways:

First: The higher a man is placed in the organizational totem pole, the greater an effort he must make to take a personal as distinguished from a merely professional interest in the ideas, the ideals, the inner being of those serving under him.

Second: Let those in positions of Command be untiring talent scouts. I guarantee you that very astonishing finds will be made if you are forever on the lookout for the man who might be a born planner, a born logistician, a born inspirer of others in combat or in peace. Only, I beg, do not ever commit the error of trying to make an excellent piano player into a violinist or vice versa. Even the most gifted among us are endowed only in some fields, and in this complex age it is most necessary to form a very precise judgment of *who* is good at *what*, and, above all else, who is a man of rocklike character able to stand through a crisis and who is but a clever theoretician unable to act. We do have the talents; let us unceasingly search for them. The Department of the Army is not a computerized machine, composed of what is technically referred to as "Personnel," but a dynamic body of soldiers and civilians, men and women, real live warm human beings. Let us not only take care of their material needs but let us make a vow to keep their hearts and souls alive today, tomorrow and forever more.

History teaches that even the great and peaceful Democracies may fall on hard times of terrible and terrifying crises. Should such times ever arrive—and there is none among us who cannot see that we live in a dangerous and explosive World—the supreme civilian authorities of this our nation must be able to call on and count on its Armed Forces as a means of last resort.

While I pray that the call to arms will never actually come, I also pray, trust and believe that, should it come, this Army of ours will be quietly ready in body and spirit. Nancy and I leave you with perhaps a tear in our eye, but definitely sincere and hearty smiles on our faces. We refuse to think that we are leaving good friends. Rather, we

thank the good Lord that we have had this opportunity during this completed chapter of our lives to make many new friends.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1973.HON. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: It is with deep appreciation for your outstanding service—and sincere regret that you will be leaving us—that I accept your resignation as Secretary of the Army, effective May 15, 1973, as you requested.

For more than four years, you have been a leader in our efforts to improve the management effectiveness of the Department of Defense. As Assistant Secretary for Administration, you contributed substantially to the efforts of Secretary Laird and Deputy Secretary Packard to recruit outstanding personnel and to mold them into a hard-hitting management team. And your superb efforts in developing clearer lines of policy and fiscal control over the Department's intelligence resources has had the added benefit of improving communications among all the intelligence agencies.

Perhaps most importantly, the Army today is a stronger, more confident group of men and women than it was when you became Secretary two years ago. You have been not only an outstanding leader during this time of transition to an all volunteer force, but also one whose personal dedication has been felt throughout the ranks. The result is a renewed pride and sense of mission within the service, and greater respect for our men and women in uniform among the American people.

I will always be grateful to you for your willingness to play a part in our Administration, and I hope these past four years are ones which will be a continuing source of pride to you. You have served our Nation with great distinction, and as you return to private life, I am pleased to have this opportunity to extend my warmest best wishes to Mrs. Froehlke and to you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

PARKVILLE, MD., STUDENTS INDUCTED IN NATIONAL JUNIOR HONOR SOCIETY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Alvin V. Burgess chapter of the National Junior Honor Society at Parkville Junior High School in Parkville, Baltimore County, Md., recently inducted 50 members.

The criteria for membership in the society include outstanding achievement in five areas: Scholarship, leadership, service, character, and citizenship. The young people recently inducted represent both the high ideals of the society and the thousands of junior high school students who are annually made part of this select group.

Each member accepts by his or her induction a high standard of achievement against which to compare future endeavors. I congratulate and send best wishes to these inductees:

Pam Alexander, Pam Amoss, Cosette Arbin, Ellen Armandt, Kathy Bailey, Sharon Baumber, Mary Beall, Lisa Belsky.

Theresa Bents, Diane Ciampaglio, Alice Clark, Beth Clark, Beverly Davis, Penny Derickson, Manette Frese, Terry Gradi.

Richard Huneke, Debbie Insley, Laurie Jones, Stacie Klebe, David Koepfer, John Lathroum, Cindy Leach, Susan Lisek, Karen Lombardi.

Wayne Mahaffey, Andrea Miller, Harriet Miller, Joanne Miller, Keltie Mull, Janice Myers, Susan Myers, Linda Naumann.

Kathy Naylor, Ginger Owens, Scott Parks, Patti Powell, Lois Rassa, Elena Rivieri, Kimberly Roberts, Sue Roznowski.

Steve Sauthoff, Ray Schulmeyer, Tessie Schulmeyer, Coralea Simmons, Brian Torone, Ron Tyszko, Eddie Vance, Karen Waitkus, Cindy Zuromski.

FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is currently undergoing the effects of a transportation crisis in the form of a shortage of railroad boxcars.

I have received numerous communications from constituents concerning this problem, and according to recent reports the average daily nationwide shortage of boxcars now amounts to over 16,000 units.

The Washington Post of Sunday, May 13, 1973 contains an excellent article summarizing the problem, and in order that all of the Members might be informed as to this pressing difficulty I include it at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

(By William H. Jones)

When Gordius, king of Phrygia, tied a knot which was incapable of being untied except by the future ruler of Asia, the knot stayed that way until cut by Alexander the Great.

Similarly, the nation's rail transportation network today has been tied into a very tight Gordian knot—and there's no expectation that it can be cut open any time soon.

The annual freight car shortage has struck America in 1973 with a vengeance never before experienced, aggravated by the cumulative pressures of huge export grain deals for which there was no adequate prior planning, the ravages of unseasonal weather and record flooding, bankrupt railroads in the Northeastern states and a booming national economy.

"In history, it's never been this bad," said Thomas J. Byrne, the rail section chief of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Since the crisis started building in January, Byrne has spent most of his waking hours placating angry shippers, governors and congressmen, as well as cajoling railroad executives to get moving.

The shortage of freight cars peaked at a record high during early April and since has eased a bit with the opening of seasonal Great Lakes shipping. But a severe shortage still exists and experts say it may be several years before the transportation system recovers from what began in euphoria last August, when the U.S. announced it would sell 422 million bushels of grain to the Soviet Union.

At various times since, grain elevators have stood filled to capacity with no railroad cars nearby for loading, and farmers have fretted because they lacked fertilizer to plant new grain crops—the fertilizer was in Texas, waiting to be loaded into freight cars.

Lumber has not been delivered, causing delays on some construction projects across the nation. Food as been tied up, which

could become a factor in supermarket pricing.

During the worst period, Byrne said, there was an average daily nationwide shortage of between 16,000 and 18,000 boxcars, plus a like amount daily of hopper cars.

Back in January, the ICC thought the crisis was bad when only 9,000 boxcars and 10,000 hopper cars were short every day. At present, the shortages are down to about 12,000-13,000 each of boxcars and hoppers a day.

"We consider any daily average in excess of 8,000 a real critical situation," said Byrne, whose agency has pressed to the limits its power in what has become a virtual national emergency.

"There are just not enough cars to meet the demand," said Byrne, "with the huge grain shipments, growing demand by cotton shippers, a jam-up of lumber, and the booming economy."

The shortages are nearly everywhere: manpower is lacking, locomotive power is not enough, railroad yards are clogged, grain elevators at ports can't handle the volume.

The only portion of the distribution pipeline capable of meeting demand has been ocean shipping. At times, about 50 ships were motionless in the waters off Gulf Coast ports during March and April, waiting for berths to open up so their empty holds could be filled with grain.

But there has been a separate impact on maritime shippers, whose rates for moving others commodities have risen sharply in recent months because ocean vessels were committed for more lucrative grain shipments. There are now fewer ships to go around.

Basically, a transportation bottleneck of various proportions occurs every year because crops and products are not produced on a continual basis. There are peaks and valleys of demand for all types of transport and the industry as a whole cannot afford to build a fleet large enough to handle every last shipment during peak demand.

The huge and unexpected impact of grain shipments for export, however, created a greater bottleneck in 1973. There is a widespread fear that, by the time of the next harvests this summer, elevators and the transportation pipeline still will be clogged.

On top of the grain agreements, the economy has moved forward at a pace too rapid for the transportation system to accommodate. "You can't get there all at once," said economist Arthur Okun on Friday, discussing the overall economic boom today. "Even if the capacity is there, it can't all be turned on at once."

Okun, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Johnson, asserted that while he's basically an expansionist, "it's important to get there in a gradual way, less abruptly."

Edwin M. Wheeler, head of the Fertilizer Institute, recently testified on Capitol Hill that there is "no vehicle in the English language that describes the urgency of the situation or our utter frustration in trying to solve it."

He noted that some 46 million tons of fertilizer are expected to be produced in 1973 and that 75 per cent of the output is needed on the farms now. "Unless we can move this material, there is no hope for reduced supermarket prices," Wheeler testified.

W. H. Van Slyke of the Association of American Railroads said the major problem has been at the Gulf Coast ports, where the overwhelming majority of grain tonnage is sent for loading on ships. There just aren't enough grain elevators at the ports to unload rail cars fast enough, he said.

During the winter months, an alternative—the Great Lakes—is frozen shut. And shipping all the way to the East Coast has never been feasible because of longer-distance costs.

On one day in April, for example, the Houston port unloaded 719 freight cars while another 2,419 remained backed up either in the port area or north of Houston.

The opening of Great Lakes ports has changed the picture in more recent weeks. On May 2, for instance, 738 cars were unloaded at Duluth-Superior and no cars were backed up. In Houston on that day, the backlog was down to 1,632.

Any "easing" of the crisis is more apparent than real, however. For one thing, Byrne said, flooding throughout the Midwest has adversely affected shippers' ability to load freight cars.

And Robert Brastrup, administrator of the Montana Wheat Research and Marketing Committee, in a telephone interview from Helena, pointed out that farmers are now in the fields seeding and not in a position to deliver grain as they were during colder months.

Since last fall, Brastrup estimated, farmers in Montana alone have shipped 100 million bushels of grain out of their state, mostly on train cars. Trucks have been used as much as possible, but the supply of rental trucks is exhausted.

Another factor in the recent, slight easing of the grain bottleneck has been the only truly innovative project to date—shipping grain as if it was coal, through facilities at Newport News, Va., operated by the Chessie System (combined Chesapeake & Ohio/Baltimore & Ohio railroads).

Chessie's coal unloading operation was idle and company executives approached Continental Grain Co. with a suggestion that grain be shipped in open-top coal hopper cars, which would be made part of a so-called "through" train—meaning that an entire train was made up of grain-carrying hoppers and moved over the tracks of several railroads to a destination without switching and yard delays.

Some earlier attempts to ship by open hopper, with the grain covered by canvas or plastic and shipped from the Midwest to Gulf ports, had failed because heavy rains and winds ripped off the covers and soaked the contents to the point that grain solidified.

Chessie, however, helped design a combined plastic-cotton covering kept in place by what are really huge rubber bands. The new grain trains being moved into the Virginia port area are utilizing unique machines that pick up entire hopper cars and turn them on their sides for unloading into waiting ships.

Other railroads' grain shipments through the ports of Virginia and Baltimore have increased sharply. James E. Carr, newly named senior vice president of the Norfolk & Western Railway, said last week that in the first quarter this year, N&W moved 27,000 carloads of grain through Hampton Roads, a 59 per cent increase from a year earlier.

Carr also revealed that Continental Grain might expand a grain elevator operation in Norfolk and said an unidentified firm will probably soon announce a "fairly substantial capital expenditure for a Tidewater grain operation."

While expansion of grain export operations at East Coast ports could have a long-term impact, the proportion of overall tonnage today is very small—even with Chessie's innovation. (Chessie also inaugurated new through trains to bring lumber to the Washington area from the Pacific northwest.)

Of an estimated 1.15 billion bushels of wheat exports in the 1972-73 crop year ending June 30, about 30 million bushels will be processed through the coal operation in the Virginia port.

Overall, considering all the unexpected pressures, most government and transportation experts give the nations railroads high marks for their performance in recent months.

In the 12 months ended Feb. 28, railroad companies added 6,998 new covered hopper cars to their fleets at a cost of more than

\$125 million. And as of March 1 another 5,198 hoppers were on order—all of them with bigger capacity than older cars.

Orders for new and rebuilt freight cars in the first quarter this year—20,126 cars—were nearly double the year earlier pace and the highest since 1966.

Cumulative freight volume carried by the major railroads in the first 15 weeks of 1973 was 236 billion ton miles, up 8.8 per cent from the 1972 period. Seven Midwestern railroads have ordered 300 new diesel engines, too.

One problem in this area, however, has been the northeast railroad crisis, where six bankrupt companies cannot afford the capital outlays needed to buy new equipment.

This has resulted in a situation where profitable southern and western lines are seeing the new freight cars not on their own systems but tied up in the northeast. Southern Railway president W. Graham Claytor, Jr., says his firm lost "several millions of dollars" of potential revenues in the first quarter because enough cars were not available to meet customers' demands—despite Southern's record investments in new rolling stock, which was elsewhere in the U.S. rail network.

During one recent week, the Burlington Northern, another profitable company which has been buying new freight cars, found that 57 per cent of its boxcars and hopper cars were on other railroads.

According to spokesmen for western railroads, the less profitable lines in this region find it easier to pay penalties for holding on to other companies' freight cars too long than to build new cars.

Some hard-pressed representatives of grain producing states have called on the ICC to issue an "exclusion order," which could force all railroads to immediately send back freight cars to the railroad of ownership. But that could leave the northeast with inadequate cars to move food and fuel, other experts said.

Stephen Alles, president of the Association of American Railroads, said recently that since all forecasts indicate greater transportation needs in further years, some rail companies must be given federal financial aid to improve capacity and utilization. Basically, the industry supports a program of government-guaranteed loans.

Brastrup, of the Montana wheat committee, said the three main ways to deal with the problem on a long-term basis are to build even more hopper cars, to enforce stiffer penalties on eastern railroads that tie up freight cars, and to establish a new rate structure for grain hauling that will encourage such efficiencies as through trains.

There is little doubt that in the next decade, at least, American's output of grains for export will soar with demand from abroad. This year alone, the Agriculture Department said Thursday, farmers are expected harvest a record 1.28 billion bushels of wheat, or 8 per cent above the 1972 pace.

THE COURAGE AND PROPHECIC QUALITIES OF HON. HALE BOGGS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago our distinguished colleague and majority leader, the late Hale Boggs, placed a statement in the Record which at the time aroused skepticism in some of us as well as in the public and the press.

A reading of his statement today shows

its truly prophetic qualities and reflects again his courage and the contribution Hale Boggs made to our country:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 5, 1971]

DIRECTOR OF THE FBI J. EDGAR HOOVER SHOULD RESIGN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I apologize for my voice. I have a cold.

What I am going to say I say in sorrow, because it is always tragic when a great man who has given his life to his country comes to the twilight of his life and fails to understand it is time to leave the service and enjoy retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The time has come for the Attorney General of the United States to ask for the resignation of Mr. Hoover.

When the FBI taps the telephones of Members of this body and of Members of the Senate, when the FBI stations agents on college campuses to infiltrate college organizations, when the FBI adopts the tactics of the Soviet Union and Hitler's Gestapo, then it is time—it is way past time, Mr. Speaker—that the present Director thereof no longer be the Director.

The greatest thing we have in this Nation is the Bill of Rights. We are a great country because we are a free country under the Bill of Rights. The way Mr. Hoover is running the FBI today it is no longer a free country.

I was astonished to read in the paper this morning where Mr. Mitchell says that he is a law-and-order man; therefore, Mr. Hoover, being a law-and-order man, will stay on. If law and order means the suppression of the Bill of Rights, infiltration of college campuses, the tapping of the telephones of Members of Congress of the United States, then I say "God help us."

I ask again that Mr. Mitchell, the Attorney General of the United States, have enough courage to demand the resignation of Mr. Hoover.

WITHOUT TAX FUNDS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the borough of White Oak in western Pennsylvania boasts a community athletic association that now possesses a 38-acre play spot which contains baseball fields, a lighted football gridiron, basketball courts, a new gymnasium, a snack bar and picnic grounds.

Other places, I am sure, have provided similar facilities for the enjoyment of their youngsters. None, however, in my judgment, can exceed in spaciousness and quality of equipment of the White Oak complex.

What is more, the job done by the residents of White Oak serves as needed evidence that private effort still has an important role in the building up of our country and that not everything in the way of civic progress must come through the use of tax funds.

The people of White Oak made the recreation center possible. They got the idea, organized the association for the purpose of fulfilling it and then set out and raised the money needed in fund drives and by donations and dues paid by the organization membership. The only outside help was a contribution by

the Scaife Foundation of \$20,000 toward the cost of a community center and lights for the football field.

Most of the hard labor was furnished by the fathers of the children benefited. A lot of the fund raising was done by their mothers. The Boy Scouts, too, have given a hand. A giant electric scoreboard is the work of Explorer Post 22, produced under the guidance of Duane Simpson, an electrical engineer and a former president of the athletic association.

The present officers of the association are Manuel G. Stoupis, president, Tom A. Kemper, vice president, C. A. Neuschwander, secretary, G. A. Antoncic, treasurer, and C. A. Mandella, assistant secretary.

The association, with its physical plant now worth an estimated \$150,000, has had 6,000 children participate in its programs since it came into being back in 1956, a figure that is increasing at a higher rate year after year. Last year it supported a long list of activities for both boys and girls and now has ambitious plans to add tennis courts, sledding trails, skating rinks, handball courts and more equipment for indoor games in Winter months.

The people of White Oak deserve congratulations. They also deserve the thanks of all of us for having proved once more in this age of heavy governmental spending, and growing reliance upon it, that all Americans have not lost the knack or the zest for getting things done through their own initiative and effort:

What makes this athletic complex unusual is that it was built without any government funds—federal or local.

White Oak can be justly proud of that.

THE PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, when I mailed out 150,000 questionnaires in early January to the people of Mississippi's Fifth Congressional District, I was staggered by the incredible response. My first newsletter, mailed in late April, reported the results of that poll.

Some 30,000 South Mississippians responded to the questionnaire. I believe that such a response is additional evidence that the people of Mississippi are deeply concerned about the problems of this country.

So that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle may study the results of the poll, I hereby submit them for inclusion into the Record:

THE PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN

1. The three issues people feel are the most important and should be given top priority are: (1) economy, (2) education, and (3) taxes.

2. Many programs have been introduced to restructure the American health care system by replacing individual medical practice with large, federally-subsidized clinics. Cost estimates range from \$12 billion to \$77 billion. Do you favor enactment of such legislation?

Yes: 13%; No: 85%; Undecided: 2%.

3. Federal farm controls and supports should be: (a) Phased out within five years: 44%; (b) Continued substantially as is: 52%; (c) Increased: 4%.

4. Do you favor federal intervention when prolonged labor strikes threaten the public interest?

Yes: 62%; No: 28%; Undecided: 10%.

5. Do you think Social Security payments should be automatically adjusted upward with the cost of living?

Yes: 71%; No: 15%; Undecided: 14%.

6. Do you think the U.S. financial contribution to the United Nations should be reduced?

Yes: 87%; No: 9%; Undecided: 4%.

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

Yes: 30%; No: 55%; Undecided: 15%.

8. Do you favor removal of the Social Security earnings limit?

Yes: 72%; No: 22%; Undecided: 6%.

9. Would you favor passage of a constitutional amendment to prohibit busing to achieve racial balance in public schools?

Yes: 91%; No: 5%; Undecided: 4%.

PLANNING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of burgeoning population and increasing overcrowding of cities, more attention needs to be paid to far-sighted planning of community development.

In Santa Barbara, Calif., there exists a Community Planning Association, from whose experience over the years I believe many other cities could benefit. The activities of this organization, and the need for such planning, are described in an article by Leon B. Sager, entitled "The 'Intentional' Community", appearing in the spring 1973 issue of *Cry California*, a magazine dedicated to creating greater public awareness of the problems to be faced in maintaining a beautiful and productive California.

The article follows:

THE "INTENTIONAL" COMMUNITY

(By Leon B. Sager*)

Internationally known for its beauty, the California coastal city of Santa Barbara has become endangered by a dramatic increase in population, primarily new residents. Santa Barbara is in one of the fastest-growing counties in the United States, with a current population of 250,000 mostly concentrated in the Goleta Valley area west of the city. The expansion rate was 56 percent between 1960 and 1970, twice that of the state and four times that of the nation. One of the most serious consequences of this tremendous growth is the rapid conversion of pleasant orchards and open land to drab, unplanned housing and commercial units. In company with many other localities, Santa Barbara now faces the question: can unlimited growth and unplanned urbanization be stopped?

* A resident of Santa Barbara, Leon B. Sager is active in several community groups interested in preserving the character and beauty of the city. His articles have appeared in the magazine of the Center for the Study

of Democratic Institutions, among other publications.

Fortunately, there is among the citizenry a strongly motivated group of capable and concerned individuals willing to devote a large amount of time to civic affairs. This has been true for over half a century. Notable among them, recognized nationwide for her effective environmental activities, Miss Pearl Chase expresses her sentiments and those of her associates: "A city that develops finely should delight the eye, feed the intellect, and lead the people out of the bondage of the commonplace." Santa Barbarans are also fortunate to have a daily newspaper, the *News-Press*, which is alert to the environmental hazards of uncontrolled development.

As early as the 1920s, within a year of the disastrous earthquake of 1925, a Community Arts Association was formed, with branches in drama, music, the arts, and plans and planting. An architectural board of review was created, and all proposed structures required the board's approval—something found in few cities in the country at the time. Largely creditable to these pioneers and their successors is the charming Spanish-style courthouse, built in 1929, with its high-ceilinged supervisors' chambers emblazoned with murals depicting the history of the city from the 16th century, as well as palm-tree bordered Cabrillo Boulevard; State Street's wide, mosaiclike sidewalks, benches, trees and fountains; and El Paseo, a section of shops, offices and restaurants, including the "Street of Spain." This mall-type development in the heart of the city, combined with ample free and convenient off-street parking, has enabled Santa Barbara so far to counteract the attraction of new and elaborate suburban shopping centers and escape the blight and deterioration suffered by the downtown areas of so many cities across the country.

Unfortunately, other less-attractive developments have also emerged. An example is the contiguous, unincorporated community of Goleta to the west above Santa Barbara. *Today's Action, Tomorrow's Profit*, a brochure published by the Community Environmental Council of Santa Barbara, to which the writer is indebted for part of the research in this article, says of Goleta: "Prior to 1950, the city remained a small town surrounded by orchards and cropland of fine quality. Goleta urbanized rapidly during the late 1950s and early 1960s, with growth sprawling outward from the town center. Though by 1965 the city was already well on the way to saturation, construction has continued at an undiminished pace, filling the entire eastern portion of the valley with new development." Most of it is unsightly and, unless significant changes occur, destined for ever-greater deterioration. The delightful and productive lemon and avocado orchards which helped make the area unique and lovely are being rapidly converted to unplanned and undistinguished residential and commercial districts.

In 1964, after years of effort, citizen groups developed a movement to create coordinated county and city general plans. All segments of the community participated. To assist in design and final plans, the county board of supervisors engaged the services of Simon Eisner & Associates of Pasadena. Primarily providing a land-use policy for the city as well as the county, the plans, as adopted, make recommendations concerning zoning, subdivision laws, building heights, transportation and land assessment. Despite far-sighted features, many of which have been beneficial to both city and county, there is continuing disagreement as to whether the plans provide sufficient safeguards against excessive growth. There is even concern that the plans would not prevent disastrous development of much of the south coast area of the county.

It has become clear that a short-range, exclusively local economic perspective is in-

adequate if the area is to escape the fate that has befallen cities and their suburbs across the nation. In the early 1960s, a period of economic boom in Santa Barbara as well as throughout California, land-use policies, basic in determining population density, became the dominant issue. Citizens divided into two general groupings, developers and conservationists, the one primarily concerned with immediate profits, the other with the long-term effect of growth on their way of life.

In the continuous struggle, each group has scored both victories and defeats. Developers have frequently increased population density by securing zoning variations altering the general plans. Though conservationists frequently found themselves accepting the inevitability and even desirability of some expansion, they have continued the fight and often stemmed the tide of development.

Differences between organized citizenry and elected officials are no novelty in either the city or the county. George Clyde, a member of the county board of supervisors who retired a short time ago, observed that "The people of Santa Barbara County had to come to the rescue of their coastline three times recently after the supervisors had approved [development which] would have been detrimental." But, as Mr. Clyde has also noted, "Attitudes of elective officials have changed somewhat in the past two years, and there is a possibility—a slim one—that the drastic decisions needed to preserve our environment will be made."

"Two of the prime decisions that must be made are: the adoption of a new General Plan, radically limiting future population growth; and the rolling back of zoning to conform to such a new General Plan."

"If these two steps are not taken, the environment of the South Coast area of Santa Barbara will be degraded simply by an overabundance of people. Population projections show a South Coast total in the year 2000 of nearly 300,000 persons—and this figure is below the holding capacity of the present General Plan. We can probably live with some growth but we cannot live in a quality environment as we know it today with anything like 300,000 people in the South Coast area."

Control of high-rise buildings has long been a primary concern of Santa Barbara residents, particularly proposals for such construction on the waterfront. They were familiar with the unfortunate development at La Jolla, near San Diego, where high-rise at the water's edge proved disastrous, ruining the ocean view for the entire city and curtailing public use of the beaches.

Citizen groups were active and effective in the 1960s in stopping two efforts to construct high-rise buildings. In 1966, the Santa Barbara Biltmore Hotel obtained a conditional-use and variance permit for construction of a high-rise annex on the beachfront. A local group took the matter to the Santa Barbara Superior Court where they received a ruling in their favor. When this was contested, the matter was taken to the District Court of Appeals in Los Angeles and the decision of the lower court was upheld.

The El Mirasol Hotel had been a Santa Barbara landmark for over half a century. Set in beautifully landscaped grounds, it entertained guests from all over the world. But by the 1960s, the property was in a state of increasing decline. It was sold, the buildings were torn down, and plans were developed in 1969 for a high-rise apartment complex, including a six-story structure, which required a variance of zoning. Powerful forces were set to work and a variance was approved by the city council. A high-rise structure in the very heart of the city seemed a certainty. Again, a group of citizens instituted legal action, at the conclusion of which the court reversed the city council's decision.

Fearful, nevertheless, that the developers

would ultimately make a breakthrough, many citizen groups combined their efforts to secure permanent safeguards. The culmination was a well-attended series of three forum meetings in March and April, 1970. After all sides had been heard, polls indicated that a large majority opposed high-rise. Apparently impressed by such evidence, the city council resisted all pressure by the developers and high-rise was again avoided.

Santa Barbara's zoning ordinances provide that no building in a residential area may be higher than 30 feet for one- or two-family units, 45 feet for three or more units, and 60 feet for industrial or commercial structures. As with any zoning, however, the city council was empowered to grant variances. Still apprehensive that this might happen at some future time, a group of organizations led by the League of Women Voters placed on the November 1972 ballot a proposition, now incorporated in the city charter, which precludes any future amendment or variance of the building-height limits existing in the charter.

Another important city ordinance, passed in 1969, pertains to El Pueblo Viejo, an area consisting of some 72 blocks in the center of the city. Under the terms of the ordinance, no structure may be built or altered in the area which does not conform to one of three styles of architecture: California adobe, Monterey or Spanish Colonial.

Thus, continuous efforts on the part of conservation-minded citizens have been necessary to preserve the quality of Santa Barbara's environment.

In January, 1969, Santa Barbara was struck by an environmental disaster which quickly became and for many weeks remained a front-page story, with repercussions continuing to the present. A Union Oil Company drilling operation lost control of an oil well in the Santa Barbara Channel. Huge quantities of oil poured into the ocean, quickly reached the beaches, and what had been one of the nation's choice playgrounds and a habitat for birds and marine life became a scene of filth and desolation.

Again, the community responded. Within two days, an organization was formed which called itself GOO (Get Oil Out! Inc.) and addressed itself to the immediate task of cleaning the beaches and rescuing oil-soaked birds. GOO's long-term goal was, and is today, to terminate all oil-drilling operations in this area of the California coast and to make offshore operations safe in other areas. Demands for both state and federal legislation were made by the group.

The sensitivity of the issue and its national scope became quickly apparent. It was to be a battle with giants. A full and reliable account of events surrounding and following the misfortune is to be found in *Black Tide* by Robert Easton, a Santa Barbara author. In summary, possibly GOO's greatest achievement after three and a half years of unremitting effort is the focusing of national attention on the problems of offshore oil-drilling. Though other accomplishments must be considered modest, they are not insignificant. On the state level, authorization of drilling permits has come to a complete stop, and a sanctuary zone has been established around the Channel Islands where oil companies cannot operate. Federally, as of this writing, there has been a temporary blocking of the installation of two drilling platforms—a potential of 140 wells—and of exploratory drilling on 35 leases in the Santa Barbara area. Initiated by GOO and similar organizations in most coastal states, extended Congressional debate is in progress considering whether all offshore drilling should be discontinued.

On still another front, a major disruption occurred in Santa Barbara during the 1960s. Surprisingly, this resulted from a decision by the Regents of the University of California to expand and relocate the already existing Santa Barbara State College into a branch of the university in the Goleta Valley. At first,

citizens were pleased. A branch of the esteemed university would surely add prestige to the city. But concern quickly developed when it was learned that plans were being made for a student body of 25,000 which would require a faculty and staff of some 1,200, and neither the Santa Barbara City Council nor the County Board of Supervisors had been consulted during the planning. A major oversight was the lack of provision for off-campus student housing. Concern soon turned to consternation.

Isla Vista, a new, unincorporated section close to the university campus, became a bonanza for fast-buck builders. Very shortly it became an architectural nightmare. With housing space at a premium, students were compelled to pay exorbitant rental for shabby quarters with few or no services. The housing situation, coupled with student opposition to being drafted in the Vietnam war, resulted in a series of violent disturbances that shocked the entire community. Then came tragedy.

In the wake of the burning of the Isla Vista branch of the Bank of America came the fatal shooting of a student. A long period of turmoil ensued: conflicts between students and university authorities, over-reaction by some police and sheriff forces, and lack of decisive action by the board of supervisors. After weeks of conflict and months of negotiation, quiet was restored. Plans for university expansion have since been curtailed and a new organization has evolved—Isla Vista Community Council.

Finally, there is the fight over the Highway 101 or crosstown freeway which has gone on with the State Division of Highways since 1954. It was then that studies were begun by the state to convert the existing four-lane divided highway to a full freeway. During the intervening years, a series of community meetings took place at which citizens and government officials debated the routing, design and size of the proposed construction. In November, 1971, the Santa Barbara City Council finally entered into an agreement with the state, under the terms of which the surface-level freeway will generally follow the existing Highway 101 route and the Southern Pacific railroad tracks will be moved north adjacent to the new freeway, forming a single transportation corridor through the city. According to the planning program approved by the State Highway Commission last April, right-of-way acquisition is due to begin this year, with construction starting in 1976. But the plan is still opposed by many Santa Barbarans who continue to explore possible alternatives.

Thus, as the Santa Barbara community strives to deal with its problems, it is working steadily to broaden citizen participation in public decisions. Opportunity for education is exceptional, through programs conducted by the Continuing Education Division of Santa Barbara City College, in cooperation with the Community Environmental Council. Some 26,000 individuals, equal to over half the adult population of the city, attend one or more lectures or courses each year. Speakers include members of the faculties of local colleges and UC Santa Barbara, as well as fellows, associates and visiting scholars from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Recently, the Adult Education Center sponsored a series of lectures and discussions entitled "Last Call for Santa Barbara—the Good Life or Megalopolis?" The well-attended sessions undertook a critical review of the problems facing the South Coast of Santa Barbara. The tape-recorded proceedings were edited and elaborated into the aforementioned brochure, *Today's Action, Tomorrow's Profit*.

An 800-member Citizens Planning Association carries on much of the civic-oriented activity in the area. Few actions of public interest in Santa Barbara County (comparable in size to the state of Delaware) escape its scrutiny. Its influence is attested by the fre-

quency with which consultation is sought by the city council and the board of supervisors before enactment of legislation. The association was a leader in creating the Santa Barbara General Plan. Concerned with land use, open space, density and a multitude of other community problems, CPA has arranged frequent public meetings, among them a series in the fall of 1972 entitled "Water, Water Everywhere," sponsored by the League of Women Voters.

One of CPA's foremost concerns is the South Coast region of Santa Barbara County, under heavy assault from developers and threatened with the congestion and dangerous levels of pollution which afflict the Los Angeles basin. Together with numerous other ad hoc groups whose formation was prompted by concern for the community at the time of the oil disaster, CPA has hopes that the haphazard development can be halted before it exceeds the holding capacity cited by former supervisor Clyde. Among such groups is the Community Environmental Council, formed in 1970. Composed largely of people in the 20-to-40 age bracket, it has become a strong voice for comprehensive environmental planning. A basic premise shared by these organizations is that, for the most part, Americans have not anticipated problems—they have reacted to them. Santa Barbara, they are determined, shall be different.

Old or new, citizen organizations have much to engage them. In February, 1972, following the city council's adoption in 1971 of the crosstown freeway routing and relocation of the Southern Pacific tracks, the Southern Pacific Land Company and its associate, American Communities-Santa Barbara, Inc., presented a multimillion-dollar development program to the council. Their original proposal included a 500- to 1,000-room motel/conference complex and various other developments directly on the beachfront. Proponents of the project claimed it would attract tourists and thus act as a significant boost to the economy. Many Santa Barbarans, however, viewed such claims with reservation, if not alarm. In their opinion, the proposed closing of Cabrillo Boulevard, together with the thousands of tourists who would be drawn to the area, presented a serious threat to the character and quality of Santa Barbara life.

A newly formed citizen group, the Committee to Save East Beach, with the cooperation of other organizations, sponsored a citizens' symposium of lectures and discussion regarding the proposal, and also engaged the services of the design firm of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill to assist the committee in conducting a one-month study of the overall situation in lower Santa Barbara from the freeway to the waterfront, prepare a sketch plan, and assist local talent in developing alternate proposals for the waterfront area. Following completion of the study last July, the result, entitled "A Plan for East Beach," was presented at a large public meeting. William Penn Mott, Jr., director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation, and John Fisher-Smith of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill addressed the group. Mr. Fisher-Smith showed slides contrasting well-planned design in cities across the country with poorly planned and haphazard development.

Responding to this broadly based citizen concern, the city council authorized the committee (now renamed "The Committee for Santa Barbara") to meet with the developers, representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, and other interested parties, to create a comprehensive development plan for the city's vital waterfront area. These meetings have established a basis for cooperation which may prove fruitful. They may, in fact, lead to the kind of innovative development Santa Barbara is known for.

A strong research and design team has been created by the Committee for Santa

Barbara to work with landowners, developers and city planning authorities toward a comprehensive design for the entire lower Santa Barbara area. Hopefully, the plan will include open space and parkland melded with hotel, housing and commercial developments.

What of the future? It is evident that much further deliberation is needed. If present community concern and involvement can be sustained and enlarged, there is reason to hope that the problems can ultimately be resolved and the beachfront area made an harmonious addition to the city's many attractive features.

Many Santa Barbarans believe that if they are to avoid the catastrophe of megalopolis, the entire county must be seen in perspective; contradictions and conflicting priorities must be resolved. Further, in the opinion of many observers, Santa Barbara must study its problems in relation to a regional concept. It must consider the impact upon its own environment of social and economic decisions made by neighboring counties to the north and south, and it must take proposed state and federal actions closely into account.

As in many other communities the nation over, concerned residents and officials know that without such effective comprehensive planning, they are faced with increasing environmental deterioration, the inevitable result of a never-ending series of rear-guard actions which are sometimes successful but hold dim prospects for long-range solutions. However, if past efforts are indicative, the prospect is good that Santa Barbara can preserve the qualities which have won the admiration of visitors from every part of the world and uphold its reputation as an "intentional" community deeply concerned with the quality of life.

CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS ENDORSES NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent a letter to constituents in the Hudson City section of Jersey City, N.J., soliciting responses from citizens on pending national problems and seeking solutions.

Naturally I received a number of views, many of which were worthwhile and which I shall seek to implement. However, one respondent, Mr. Fred Bogad of 3719 Kennedy Boulevard, Jersey City, N.J., offered a suggestion which I think has some merit. Mr. Bogad suggested a national day of prayer when people turn away from mundane things and give time to prayer. I think that Mr. Bogad's idea is an excellent one and I think that many religious persons would agree with him. Certainly I do.

Mr. Speaker, there are also a great many persons not particularly religious who might appreciate one day a year when America comes to a halt, no newspapers, no television, no public transportation except for emergencies. This would be a day when all Americans could commune with their God or simply spend the day with their families at home, a kind of national recharging of the batteries. Harried, frenetic Americans might find a national day of peace and tranquility an excellent idea.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include Mr. Bogad's letter. I urge all of my colleagues to read his views.

The letter follows:

JERSEY CITY, N.J.

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Washington, D.C.:

I have never bothered with this type of mail simply because I have very little faith in letters to Congressmen. Perhaps you are an exception to the rule. If so, here is my first and probably last reply to this type of mail.

How about setting aside one day where people do not buy newspapers, turn on the radio, turn on the stereo, turn on the television.

Instead give time to prayer to God and no other.

The same manner of prayer that Jesus told his disciples to do as in Luke Ch. 11, Vs. 2/4.

This can be done on a non-denominational basis.

Sincerely,

FRED BOGAD.

THE HIRELINGS FLEETH

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the unraveling of the Watergate affair has been a tribute to a vigorous, free press, as President Nixon aptly put it in his address to the Nation.

The editor of my hometown newspaper, The Pike Press, has written an editorial invoking Biblical references which gets right to the point, or at least to one of the points about Watergate. Now that those who betrayed the trust of the American people are leaving the Government, the country must now begin to turn its attention to other pressing matters. True, Watergate must be fully dealt with, and all those guilty of misconduct must be brought to justice. But the Nation must also go about its business in the meantime, and perhaps that is not being sufficiently done now.

Text of editorial follows:

THE HIRELINGS FLEETH

But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep.—St. John x.11

Many a politician has learned to his regret the truth of the maxim: I can take care of my enemies; it's my friends I need to fear.

Now, one of the greatest politicians of them all, has learned the calamity of being surrounded by those whose "zeal exceeded their judgment."

The Watergate tragedy was brought on essentially because of a handful of infantile men who were hirelings and careth not for the sheep, meaning in this sense, the American public, their true masters—not the President and not a committee to reelect the President.

And so the hirelings fleeth. And surely the sheep are scattereth as opinions of the public range from anguished cries for impeachment to cynical resignation that it's just Amer-

ican politics—common to both parties and hardly unprecedented.

At least we hope public officials will think twice before they excoriate the press again for shining its searchlight where it belongs—from courthouse to White House.

But to his credit, in his nationwide address President Nixon recognized the merit of a "vigorous free press." It could presage a badly needed new understanding with reporters.

And at some point or other the country is going to have to set its mind on some matters besides Watergate. Other problems have been overshadowed, but they're still very much with us. Some day we're going to have to get back to them.

TRADE POLICY: WILL CONGRESS CAPITULATE AGAIN?

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, when Members of Congress venture home to give speeches, I have no doubt that one of the most frequently used topics is the urgent necessity of reasserting the role of the Congress vis-a-vis the President in determining national policies. It is also a subject very much in vogue at Washington dinner parties. Yet, with all the talk one hears on this subject, it is amazing how easily this sentiment is lost when a specific opportunity is at hand to take positive action.

Most recently the House had the opportunity to pass a bill through which the Congress would have worked its will on the economic stabilization program. Instead, the House passed an extension of the President's authority devoid of directive or guidelines. I can imagine no greater contradiction of the sentiment for balancing the power of the two branches of Government. There is now on the horizon yet another congressional capitulation to Executive authority. I refer to H.R. 6767, the Trade Reform Act of 1973. The bill virtually surrenders international economic policy to the President. The bill would give the President almost unlimited authority to raise or lower import quotas and tariffs. We have surrendered domestic economic policy to the White House—now, if we surrender international economic policy, we might as well pass one last bill giving the President the power to set taxes and adjourn sine die, lock up the Capitol Building and go home for good.

I am in agreement with many of my colleagues that the President needs an element of flexibility in order to deal effectively at the economic negotiating table—but not to the extent of an "Economic Tonkin Gulf Resolution," such as the President requests. Surely the distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee can find a legislative formula which will come down somewhere between putting quota and tariff rates in cement and leaving them entirely up to the President.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues may think that I am throwing a wet

blanket on what has been billed as "free-trader" legislation. The bill is advertised as giving the President the authority to suspend import duties, for example, but surely this can work both ways—"The King giveth and the King taketh away."

Beyond the important constitutional issue of congressional delegation of authority, a problem arises concerning business decisions. As Mr. David J. Steinberg describes, if the President's bill is passed, we will have a "yo-yo trade policy" with tariff and quotas moving up and down with no regularity or predictability. The consequence for the American consumer, the businessman, and everyone in the economy is permanent uncertainty. Business planning and decisionmaking will be completely disrupted and, as a result, consumer and labor interests will suffer. Most economists would agree, I am sure, that a high level of uncertainty in the economy is very unhealthy. It results in poor planning and a misallocation of resources. This warning from Mr. Steinberg of the Committee for a National Trade Policy should not be taken lightly.

What the administration asks for is simply more power. It is typical of this administration to contend that the solution to problems is more power. But what about programs and policies? What policies will the administration pursue and what programs will they develop if armed with this power? We see no indications of this in the bill, in the President's messages or in the initial administration testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. We have no indication of how the President intends to give the United States a dynamic trade posture.

Furthermore, we are given no idea of what goals the administration intends to pursue. They want to expand trade, they say, but what is the goal by which they can be measured? Five percent expansion, 10 percent, 20? And over what period of time?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are given no idea of the administration's feelings and plans with respect to the institutional support for trade policy. Are they satisfied with the support given by the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, which are supposed to be promoting and aiding U.S. export activities? Are they satisfied with existing insurance procedures in the Export-Import Bank? If they are, they stand alone. Those who operate in this field know only too well that we need new institutional supports for the expansion of U.S. trade and the restoration of a favorable trade balance. We need only look at the track record of the countries who have enjoyed the most success in recent years in trade to see that the key to success is an open partnership of public and private agencies promoting a country's products in the world market place.

Mr. Speaker, until the administration gives us a clear picture of its goals—in measurable terms—and elaborates for the Congress and the American people the policies and programs it will pursue, we have no way to judge whether they deserve to have the increased power they

seek. To increase trade power in a trade policy vacuum is not responsible legislation.

Surely the Congress can find some formula which will give the President sufficient negotiating leeway and yet put some restriction on his discretion. We should say, for example, Mr. President, you can give away this much and no more. I am confident that the Congress can do it. I know we should do it. But I am afraid that, based on our track record, we will not do it.

SUCCESS AGAINST POLLUTION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the fight against pollution has been a long, continuous struggle. There are many avenues which may be taken when attempting to tackle this problem. One such means has been meeting with success in the Chicago area, local action.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial from the Suburbanite Economist newspaper. This commentary aptly describes how these local groups have achieved success against pollution:

SUCCESS AGAINST POLLUTION

While it is difficult to produce concrete evidence of success in the fight against pollution on a state or national level, it is encouraging to note that citizen action at the local level is getting results.

In Summit, for example, a persistent group known as Save Our Resources and Environment (SORE) has recently won a victory after a three year fight against a roofing company. It is true that the battle went on too long, but the fact that the company is reputed to be the world's largest manufacturer of asphalt felt roofing products undoubtedly made the fight harder and the victory sweeter. The company is presently under a permanent injunction issued by Judge James J. Mejda of Circuit court to desist from polluting the air. The company can be closed if emissions are denser than the court order allows and the emission of certain particularly obnoxious chemicals is strictly forbidden.

In nearby Blue Island a company that makes a fence post coating material is also under a permanent injunction issued by Judge Nathaniel M. Cohen of Circuit court to desist from polluting the air in the vicinity of its plant with foul odors.

As we mentioned, in both instances the action that led to the injunctions was instigated by concerned citizens. And both groups have been kind enough to credit the Economist Newspapers with providing the proper publicity needed to make their crusades a success. Something we were glad to do, of course.

The point we want to make is that local action may be the strongest weapon in the fight for clean air. City, state and national bureaucracies do a lot of talking about the need for a war on pollution, but that's about it all amounts to: sound and fury, no more. When citizens at the grass roots level become concerned and go to court they can get results, though the effort takes time and money. It cannot be won in a week or a month, but the rightness of the cause will win out in the long run. It cannot be denied.

As an example of the waste and delay that appears to be going on at the upper echelons of the pollution bureaucracy we point to the controversy going on over the appointment of Mrs. Mary Lee Leahy as the state director of the environmental protection agency. A part of the fight involves criticisms leveled at Chicago's program by Governor Walker. Among these are a charge that the city has an \$80,000 computer which it received from the federal government as part of a million dollar grant in storage, that the city has been "keeping secret" results of investigations on individual polluters for certain kinds of air pollutants and that the city has not supplied the state with a record of citizens' complaints or smoke violations.

These are charges, we point out, and may not be completely true. However, the fact that there are even grounds for such charges is somewhat of an indictment of the bureaucracy. And, of course, the fact that you have two agencies spending their time throwing stones at each other is a complete waste of the taxpayers' money.

That's why we urge local groups to tackle pollution in their community. Relief cannot be denied on any just grounds and though our courts may not be perfect justice usually does prevail in the long run.

TRIBUTE TO SYLVIA ZANKICH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, a testimonial dinner will be held in San Pedro, Calif., to honor a lady who has dedicated her life to the service of her community.

Sylvia's entry into community affairs began after a needless tragedy occurred where eight children drowned in the Bixby Slough. Sylvia brought this public hazard to the prompt attention of the local officials and began working to convert the hazard into a recreational area. She worked on the steering committee and organized the public to develop support for the project, which became a reality in 1972.

Her dedication and commitment to the community was recognized by all who knew her and, as a result, she became an active leader in the efforts to improve the quality of life of the people in the South Bay area.

Sylvia Zankich has been in the forefront of efforts to upgrade the activities designed to provide a safe and healthy outlet for the children of our area. Both the San Pedro and Wilmington Boys Clubs have benefited by her contributions and leadership, as have the Los Angeles County Foster Home, the San Pedro Retarded Children's Foundation, the Little League, the Pumpkin Ball, and other community programs for children.

In addition, she has served as the Wilmington Heart Fund Community chairwoman for 7 years. As chairwoman of the United Services Organization, she has brought her zeal and drive to the funding of the worthy philanthropic projects the benefit service personnel and all of the people of the harbor area. Sylvia has also served the Mahar House, the Red

Cross, the NAACP, and the John Tracy Clinic. She was also the driving force behind the organizing of a new chapter of the Community Service Organization for the underprivileged of San Pedro and Wilmington.

As a successful businesswoman in the bail bond business, Sylvia Zankich is active in the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce and the San Pedro Businessmen's Association.

Her organizing talents have been recognized by public officials in the harbor area, as she was a member of Governor Brown's Advisory Committee, a member of the mayor's Community Advisory Committee, and vice president of the Los Angeles Commission of Consumer Affairs and Social Services.

The first honorary mayor of San Pedro, Sylvia Zankich is a participant in the governmental process, serving in the League of Women Voters, a delegate to many Democratic State conventions, and a National Democratic Convention. She has also been called upon to lead numerous political campaign organizations in the harbor area.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in calling to the attention of the House of Representatives the kind of community spirit and volunteer efforts that have made the harbor area such a great place to live, work, and play. These qualities are epitomized by Sylvia Zankich—a fine lady who is recognized as an inspiration to us all. I commend her for her years of dedication, and I salute the people of San Pedro for honoring such a well-deserved individual who has meant so much to the betterment of our community and Nation.

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ROBERT
F. FROEHLKE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge the untiring efforts of a great American. The President has accepted the resignation of Secretary of the Army, Robert F. Froehle, effective May 15, 1973.

During his 2 years as Secretary of the Army, Secretary Froehle has streamlined and improved the Army's management effectiveness. Under Secretary Froehle's leadership, the U.S. Army completed its mission in Vietnam; saw the return of our prisoners, and trained and equipped the Republic of Vietnam army.

Additionally, credibility of the Army with Congress and the American public was largely regained during Secretary Froehle's tenure. The renewed pride, confidence, professionalism, and sense of mission within the Army is a tribute to Secretary Froehle's complete personal dedication.

It is my honor to pay tribute to Secretary Froehle, an American who has served his Nation with great distinction.

ELECTION REFORM

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the Campaign Reform Act of 1972 I introduced an amendment which broadened the responsibilities of the U.S. General Accounting Office of Federal Elections to include the distribution of information on election administration.

While the finance reporting side of the Office of Federal Elections has received most of the publicity, the Election Information Clearinghouse is making considerable progress.

In January of this year the clearinghouse released a study of election difficulties in seven jurisdictions: Oakland, Calif.; Detroit, Mich.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Los Angeles, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Akron, Ohio.

The report made 26 recommendations on how the administration of elections can be improved after studying the elections in the seven cities. The recommendations ranged from the role of the courts in election day procedures to ballot size and having election boards practice election day operations.

At the present time the clearinghouse is conducting a basic survey of the more than 7,000 election boards across the country. They are in the final stage of preparing the questionnaire that will be mailed out. The questionnaire will go into problems such as local registration procedures, distribution of election information, machinery used, and the structure of the local election board. The questionnaire will also ask to see if there has been any fraud or election sabotage in the past 10 years in their area.

Currently the clearinghouse is starting two studies on two specific problems in the election administration field. One is on voter registration procedures, and the second is on voting equipment.

The voter registration study will look into the various methods of registration from simple cards kept at a central office to an on-line computer system. The study will investigate the effectiveness of the various systems comparing statewide to county registration and the chances of fraud of the different procedures.

The other study on voting machines will examine the election machinery that is currently available. It will discuss the successes and failures of these machines, their cost, and the chances of fraud from the different systems.

These two studies should serve as a source material for all districts that are looking for new ideas in election administration.

Starting in July, working with the Congressional Research Service, the Clearinghouse will issue reports on changes in election laws and court decisions. Besides the monthly reports there will be quarterly summaries and a year-end final report.

There are, of course, many other areas that still need study.

There are many questions surrounding absentee voting and how this can be made easier. A related problem is the development of residency standards. With our very mobile society, this is becoming an increasing problem.

The Watergate has brought to light the sabotage attempts that go on all too often in political campaigns. We must do everything possible to end all such practices.

At the beginning of the 93d Congress I introduced legislation that I feel will help improve voter participation in presidential elections—moving election day up one month. I was pleased to see that the majority whip in the other body, Senator ROBERT BYRD, introduced similar legislation. This would shorten the campaign and put the election in a period of the year when the weather is better. Another proposal in my bill would establish simultaneous voting hours for presidential elections so that the results from the East Coast will not influence the West Coast.

The Watergate has done serious damage to our entire political system. We have a responsibility to make changes that will give the public renewed confidence in our political system.

A MOTHER'S PLEA: DO NOT MAKE
MARIHUANA LEGAL

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert A. Francis is the director of the Florida American Legion Boys State. He sent me a copy of a letter which appeared in the St. Petersburg Evening Independent on Thursday, May 3, 1973. I believe this letter represents the views of many parents as to the dangers they see regarding the potential legalization of marihuana. I urge my colleagues to take note of this message:

A MOTHER'S PLEA: DO NOT MAKE
MARIHUANA LEGAL

EDITOR: I am writing this letter on the way to Fort Lauderdale to visit our son at the drug-abuse rehabilitation center—called "The Seed"—founded by Art Barker:

My husband and I are taking this trip (500 miles) twice a week on Monday and Friday, to attend the open meeting. We leave at 2 p.m., and arrive home between 3:30 and 4 a.m.

From 7:30 to 11:30 a.m., we sit with hundreds of parents at The Seed, looking across to hundreds of young people. We do not talk, we just sit and listen as one youngster after another unfolds his or her story of drug involvement. Ages range from 10 to 25 years—drugs from marijuana to heroin.

Then the time comes for the parents to say a few words and when the microphone reaches us, we get up, look at our son, tell him we miss him and love him.

On March 18 he was 17 years of age. For 16 years he was a fine upright boy with a good sense of justice and high goals, a loyal friend and loving son—a good student, a popular boy who was good in school and good at sports.

Shortly after his 16th birthday, he told us that he was smoking marijuana, that he liked the high feeling it gave him and so did his friends. To subdue our protests and horror, he informed us that he saw harm in taking alcohol or tobacco and would not partake in such partying with his friends even if they should do so. Both, he told us, are addictive and habit-forming.

But marijuana—that was a different story! No hangover, not addictive, and most of all—as he had read—our own government commission stated publicly after much research (not in the houses of families with teenagers) that marijuana is a minor drug compared to alcohol and tobacco; and that same commission recommends legalization of the weed. The same argument was given us by all his friends.

From then on we had to watch our only son turn from an open-minded, honest boy to a boy who had many secrets; who, in place of a kiss when he came home, would look downward, hurry to his room and lock the door. The Visene bottle was never out of reach. His grades in school dropped from A-B to C-D and, on the last report card, an F. The F was for skipping too many days in school, a fact we were not even aware of. A boy with a 100 per cent attending record was twice suspended for 10 days each time, for leaving school grounds without permission. Dents and scrapes on his and his father's car became numerous and so were the traffic tickets.

One night he and two of his friends were arrested while smoking marijuana in our son's car on a deserted strip of marshland. They were all 16 years old. They were handcuffed and brought to the police station. Our son was not charged because his friends had the marijuana and paraphernalia in the back seat at the time of apprehension. Lucky?

I don't know how often I have stood in the laundry crying because I had found another shirt or slacks with burnt holes down the front . . . holes made by burning marijuana held with a so-called roach clip. Eleven joints were found behind a book; a plastic bag half full of the weed was found under the car seat; another joint in the back pocket of his jeans—these were a usual find. For the rest of the family, another day of tears, threatening, begging him to stop. He would and could NOT!

Two weeks before his 17th birthday, we had him picked up by the local police, brought to the police station and then to the Juvenile Detention Center, to obtain a court order to have him ordered to the full-time Seed program.

Now all we can do is love him and hope he will understand that in order to save him from a criminal record, we had him taken against his will, hoping Seed will do for him what it was able to do for so many others—clear his head, make him happy and high on life again in place of being high on marijuana, so he will be able to function as a useful citizen.

We miss him so! We are scared parents! We do not believe in the government commission's recommendation and findings. We do not want marijuana legalized!

Legalization of marijuana would add to our nation's problems—the problem of the habitual "pot head."

In the name of our children, WAKE UP! The government commission should be awakened to the reality of its responsibilities. The damage already done amongst the young users, and the users who went on to other drugs, is great.

The commission's attempt to justify its recommendation of legalizing marijuana by comparing it to the already legal and misused drug "alcohol" . . . is irresponsible. Marijuana should be judged on its own destroying merits.

FIVE FACES OF FREEDOM

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the winning address in this year's competition of the Capitol Hill Toastmasters Club was a stirring reminder of the men who have died for our freedoms.

The address, by Williamson Day, then won two area competitions which now take it to the May 19 finals of the Toastmasters Clubs of the District of Columbia, Virginia and Maryland. I would like to share with you Mr. Day's dramatic statement reflecting the fervor and patriotism which is embodied in so much of American history and tradition:

FIVE FACES OF FREEDOM

By Williamson Day

Five faces of freedom * * * five faces to remember. Five faces to take with you, to hold in trust for your children and your children's children. Five faces of freedom.

The French and Indian Wars, 1754. A 22-year old colonel of provincial militia stands in a makeshift fort somewhere near the twisting Monongahela. He stands in torrential rain, the end of an ill-conceived and disastrous campaign to attack French-held Fort Duquesne. After seven years, Colonel George Washington's men are rebelling. Without food or ammunition, they break into the last of the supplies—the rum—and Washington fits together the words he will use to surrender to the French.

You kneel before the Colonel, holding down a wounded soldier. What passes for a surgeon is amputating his leg. You hand the soldier his anesthetic: a wooden block to clench between his teeth. You know he will die, but not quickly or pleasantly.

The Revolutionary War, 1777. The wind howls down the Schuylkill and across the Valley Forge plateau. It is subzero weather. In weeks past it has snowed, but tonight it is too cold to snow. You are huddled with remnants of the 11th Virginia, Varnum's Brigade, and Lee's Dragons. You sit, swathed in rags, tucking bits of straw and grass into your boots to keep warm.

Near you sits a sentry, a Marylander hoping to be home by spring. He is numb with cold, too weak to stand. An officer limps by, and the sentry, grasping his rifle, stiffens in salute. The next morning, as dawn colors the sky, you find him—frozen in salute.

World War I, 1918. Ardennes, France, Verdun is to the South, Chateau-Thierry behind, the Meuse-Argonne line ahead. It is Christmas Day. The snow has frozen with mud. Trenches zig-zag across the breast of the earth, scarring the French countryside. You see Americans and Englishmen leave their trenches and meet Germans in no man's land to exchange chocolates and cigarettes: American Lucky Strikes for German Ecksteins. The soldiers sing, first in German, *Stille Nacht, Heilige Nacht*; then in English, *Silent Night, Holy Night*. They shake hands and thread their way back through the coils of barbed wire to their trenches. Hours later, they meet again, eviscerated, lying lifeless on the wire. In the pockets of the Germans, saved for later, Lucky Strikes; in the blouses of the Americans, in the tunics of the English, Ecksteins.

World War II, 1943. The Marianas, Southwest Pacific. The United States has been at war for two years. You are an American marine, bare to the waist, short on water, testing your condition. You press your tongue to the roof of your mouth and your gums bleed.

Now your squad moves up. Someone's flame thrower explodes, covering him with jellied gasoline. He crawls grotesquely, screaming, until, burned and charred, he is immolated.

The Vietnam War, 1972. The United States has been in Indochina for 12 years. Before that, the French had been at war for 8. You are stationed in a military hospital in Saigon—in the Burn Ward. You see a lieutenant, 22 years old, the point of his patrol, with second- and third-degree burns on 80 percent of his body. His skin has turned sour.

"You've got a girl," says a doctor. "Try to think about replying to her letters. She knows you're burned." The lieutenant stares with hollow eyes. "You'll be out of here in no time," the doctor says. The lieutenant is smarter; for all intents and purposes, he was dead the moment he was hit.

Five faces of freedom. Five faces that gave us the liberty we enjoy tonight. Take those faces with you. Keep those faces for those who follow you. But remember: those faces are looking at us, looking into our eyes. If we fail to preserve our freedom, if we fail to keep our legacy of peace, dare we look back?

NO TITLE NECESSARY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, any comments I might make about the brief item which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point would serve only to dilute the effectiveness of the material. So, without introduction, I offer for the consideration of our colleagues the Art Hoppe column which appeared in the San Bernardino Sun-Telegram on May 8:

Following is the text of an historic address I delivered to my wife at 9:00 p.m. E.S.T. on Monday, April 30th:

My fellow spouse, I want to talk to you tonight from my heart.

It was last June 17, when I was trying to get a little rest on the back porch after my strenuous efforts to make our yard a better yard in which to live, that I first heard reports of seven termites being found in our basement.

While I did not say so at the time, as your husband, I was appalled at this senseless invasion of seven termites in our basement. And I immediately asked younger members of our family, who shall be nameless, to investigate.

When they reported there were no more termites in our basement, I believed in them. I had faith in them, I did not know that in their zeal to spare the neighborhood from worry, they concealed facts from the neighbors, from you and from me.

When gossips continued to insist there were more termites in our basement, I repeatedly asked whether this was true. I received repeated reassurances it was not.

Then, last March, new information came to me suggesting a real possibility the charges were true. That was when the kitchen fell in.

Now I have always believed, rightly or wrongly, as the father of this family, that maintaining the integrity of this house was a sacred trust. I was determined we should get to the bottom of this matter and the truth should fully be brought out, no matter how many termites were involved.

At the same time, I was determined not to take any precipitous action, and to avoid, if at all possible, any action that would appear to reflect on innocent termites.

Moreover, while I usually inspect the basement myself, I was extremely busy as you know, painting the living room and building a gazebo. Gazeboes first, basements second. For it is my sacred duty, as head of the household, to make this a better house for all members of our family.

Who, then is to blame, for the front wall caving in?

The easiest course would be for me to blame those to whom I delegated the responsibility to inspect the basement. But that would be the cowardly thing to do.

I will not place the blame on subordinates—on those whose zeal exceeded their judgment, and who may have done wrong for a father they deeply believed to be right.

In any family, the man at the top must bear the responsibility. That responsibility, therefore, belongs to the head of the household. I accept it.

And I pledge to you tonight, dear, that those who are responsible, other than myself, shall be brought to justice and that all termites shall be purged from this house long after I have left it.

And, speaking of that, I have already devoted entirely too much of my invaluable time to this whole sordid affair. Having been betrayed by those I trusted to investigate this matter, I have now asked others whom I trust to investigate this matter.

I feel we should now turn our attention to less divisive subjects and work together for peace in our family. To this end, I am off on a grand tour of Europe to discuss our mutual problems with other heads of households in order that we may build an even better house.

God Bless America! God bless each and every one of you! And God help us if the roof falls in! Thank you.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to discuss the matter or prohibiting food stamps to persons participating in a labor strike.

Under the present system, America's taxpayers are in effect subsidizing people who voluntarily choose not to work in connection with a strike. The right to strike is basic—but those choosing to do so have no right to be supported by taxpayers' funds, particularly since some of those taxes are paid by the companies and individuals involved in the labor dispute.

Therefore, the targets of some strikes are placed in the unconscionable position of seeing some of their tax money go to help support those striking against them.

No one knows how many millions of dollars are siphoned away from legitimate welfare recipients each year by strikers. The Department of Agriculture, which administers the food stamp program, admits there is no way of knowing. All a striker has to do is say he is out of work to qualify for the food stamp benefits; he need not say he is voluntarily unemployed because he has chosen to go on strike.

The legislation we are today discussing would in no way penalize those who

legitimately qualify for food stamp benefits, but would prevent the general public from having to foot part of the bill for a labor dispute.

This proposal, amending the Food Stamp Act of 1964, does not exempt persons whose families qualified for stamps prior to a strike, and would be limited to members of unions actually on strike, not union members forced out of work because of another union's strike. The purpose of the legislation is to exclude from food stamp benefits those who voluntarily choose to stop working in connection with a strike.

Under the present system, the American public is being misused, the target of labor strikes is being unfairly abused, and those who legitimately qualify for welfare are being cheated of funds that otherwise would be available to them.

The Agriculture Committee and the Congress should act promptly to correct these gross inequities by stopping the subsidy of strikers at the taxpayer's expense.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to visit with a delegation of Coloradans who were in Washington to promote opportunities for the handicapped. The group was headed by Mr. Sam L. Redman. He is the executive secretary of the Colorado Governor's Committee To Promote Opportunities for the Handicapped. Sam is handicapped and is living proof of the accomplishments our handicapped citizens are capable of achieving.

During the course of my meeting, I was advised that one of the members of the delegation, Miss Mary Margaret Zabrasek, had written an essay on employment of the handicapped which was judged to be the best such essay written in Colorado on this important subject. Because of my deep interest in the handicapped, I asked to be sent a copy of the essay. Having read it over, I can see why Miss Zabrasek was selected the winner of the contest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of my colleagues would find Miss Zabrasek's essay to be of interest. Accordingly, I ask for unanimous consent to enter the essay in the RECORD at this point.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED— TOMORROW'S CHALLENGE

(By Margaret Zabrasek)

"Although people may be the victims of fate, they will not be the victims of our neglect." This quotation by John F. Kennedy nearly ten years ago, exemplified the renewed concern for rehabilitating the mentally, physically, and socially disabled. Since then, the results of those efforts are evident in the many new programs that have been innovated to assist millions of disabled Americans who could enjoy useful and productive lives.

Through personal interviews, it was found that the basic need of any disabled person

is understanding. A handicapped person should be treated as normally as possible. At a local bakery, where six of the ten employees are handicapped, the manager commented, "Many customers, unfortunately, tantalize and abuse them due to ignorance. However, if pitied and over-protected, their growth will be hampered and the low estimate that the disabled have of themselves will even deteriorate more as failures in life are inevitably encountered."¹

Much of the individual's success will depend on his own determination and courage in overcoming obstacles. The manager of a department store cited an example of one of his own employees, "A young man afflicted with spastic paralysis who would have been completely non-productive now contributes to the success of this business due to his own desire to be a useful member of society."² Touring the store, I witnessed his ability to be serviceable and through conversing with him learned that he manipulates a motorized wheelchair only with his feet—coming to work in any type of weather.

The attitude of employers toward disabled persons is important. First, it must be comprehended that the handicapped are people—with all the favorable and less favorable attributes of humans, and as Helen Keller, blind, deaf, and mute, stated, "It is good to give the unfortunate a living; it is still better to raise them to a life worth living. It is not so much the infirmity that causes unhappiness as the grief of a useless, dependent existence."

My community is meeting tomorrow's challenge today. The Division of Rehabilitation provides assistance in preparing for, finding, and maintaining a suitable occupation. A vocational program has been instituted at the local college where one hundred persons are currently enrolled for individualized job training. Also, there are industries organized especially for the handicapped which provide a program of paid work including work adjustment training, occupational skill training, and final placement in a competitive job in the community.

The director of one of these industries is himself disabled. He is a model of those impediments one's motivation can conquer. Coming from an impoverished family of seven children, he incurred a spinal injury at the age of sixteen and would never walk again. He studied accounting and was so successful that he retired at thirty five years of age. Appointed treasurer on the Executive Board of this particular industry, he detected the embezzlement of funds and was requested to become director without remuneration. He accepted and formed a productive enterprise which has expanded to other cities. This man instills in his disabled employees the same zeal to do productive work and be self-reliant.

Progress has begun—with the handicapped themselves, proving their abilities in spite of their disabilities. A college professor, leaving education to become involved with the handicapped, commented, "We must avoid limiting the severely disabled by our own concepts of what they can accomplish."³ Their employers attest to their attendance records, amount of production, and job stability as qualities of an exceptional employee.

One young lady who works with the handicapped feels that she receives more satisfaction and benefits from the experience than from the time she has given of herself. To realize tomorrow's challenge of employing the handicapped, more people need to experience the appreciation and loyalty shown by disabled persons for common considera-

¹ Mr. Bob Boyer—Duncan Donuts, Sunset Plaza.

² Miss Pam Wilson—Goodwill Industries, Contact and Rehab. Div.

³ Mr. Robert Bryan—Pueblo Diversified Industries, Administrative Assistant.

tions given them. Once this is developed, the problem of employment will be conquered and attention can be focused on improving other aspects of the handicapped person's life and future.

SPECIAL PROSECUTOR NECESSARY

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, public sentiment for an impartial investigation of the Watergate scandal is growing daily. One of the most comprehensive analyses of what is obviously the viewpoint held by the majority of Americans was published as an editorial in the Parkersburg News, of Parkersburg, W. Va., on Friday, May 11. I commend this editorial, which is reprinted below, to the attention of all Members of Congress:

SPECIAL PROSECUTOR NECESSARY

Elliot L. Richardson, President Nixon's new choice to fill the office of attorney general, this week answered critics of the Watergate investigation by announcing that he would indeed, name a special prosecutor to supervise efforts to uncover the "whole truth" of the scandal.

The cry for a special prosecutor from outside the government to press the Watergate bugging and related alleged illegal acts in connection with the 1972 presidential campaign was heard before Mr. Nixon addressed the nation on the Watergate last week. It has intensified since with complaints that the President should have named a special prosecutor himself rather than leaving the situation in the hands of Richardson.

It has seemed obvious that such a move had to be made if any credibility was to be attached to the President's pronouncement that he intended to press the Watergate investigation no matter who was involved. The believability of such an impartial investigation appeared all but impossible from inside the government, particularly on the heels of the resignations of L. Patrick Gray as acting director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Richard Kleindienst as attorney general.

Both Gray and Kleindienst had been associated closely at one time or another with high officials of the Committee to Re-Elect the President and presidential aides H. R. (Bob) Haldeman, John Ehrlichman and John W. Dean III, who also have resigned from the White House staff. Watergate hangs heavily over the heads of all of them.

Even Richardson, who is believed to be clean as a houndstooth as far as Watergate is concerned, is viewed with suspicion due to his service in the administration in a variety of positions since Mr. Nixon took office. No direct accusations were leveled at Richardson when the President announced that he would have full responsibility for the investigation, including the authority to name a special prosecutor. However, many congressional Democrats and Republicans did charge that it was still like having a member of the family investigate the family.

Richardson's promise to name a special prosecutor, therefore, is welcome. Richardson went a step further in his announcement by inviting the Senate Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on the appointee and said he would welcome an expression of confidence by the Senate in the choice of prosecutor.

Even with continued daily revelations and speculation over the scope of the Watergate

scandal, with implications of presidential involvement and with mutterings about impeachment or resignation by the President, Richardson's action seems at long last to have placed the investigation on the right track.

But, both the Senate and Richardson must move swiftly—the Senate on Richardson's confirmation and Richardson on the naming of the special prosecutor. Public confidence in government has been badly shaken. The job of restoring that confidence by independent investigation must begin at the earliest possible moment.

BILL TO AID THE COAST GUARD

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, during our debate over appropriations for the U.S. Coast Guard last week, I was amazed to learn of their severe shortage of manpower and funds.

I listened with great interest to a most impressive compilation of their difficulties. I learned that the Coast Guard budget and personnel are strained to the breaking point. I discovered that things are so bad they have been forced to close 20 stations since 1967 and 13 more are in the process of being closed. It was specifically noted that the Coast Guard simply does not have the manpower or facilities to fulfill its responsibilities in the inspection and licensing of small craft.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last to condemn the excellent work that the Coast Guard has done throughout its long history. I could not begin to estimate the number of lives they have saved, the number of criminals they have helped to bring to justice.

With their new responsibilities in protecting the rights of American fishermen in our coastal waters, new important duties in the enforcement of laws to protect our seaboard from pollution and contamination, with their ever-increasing workload to conduct their traditional functions of rescue and law enforcement, with the catalog of difficulties and shortages revealed in our recent debate, it seems only reasonable that we relieve the Coast Guard of responsibilities that can be accomplished by capable State and local authorities.

It is for this reason that I have today introduced legislation to return the administration of the boat inspection and licensing programs on Leech, Cass, and Winnibigoshish Lakes in Minnesota to State and local authorities.

The State of Minnesota, assisted by dedicated county sheriffs departments, has led the Nation in establishing firm small craft safety programs and rigorously enforcing regulations. If there is any effect at all, in turning over the responsibilities for these programs to the Coast Guard, it is to reduce their effectiveness. The State of Minnesota has the regulations necessary to assure the safety of small craft passengers. County law enforcement agencies have the manpower to enforce them.

I urge the House of Representatives to pass this legislation and allow the Coast Guard to return to far more important business.

AMERICAN FOODSTUFFS: BIG CLOUT FOR TRADING

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, for the review of my colleagues, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the May 14 Chicago Tribune which more fully explains this reasoning:

AMERICAN FOODSTUFFS: BIG CLOUT FOR TRADING

(By Elliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, May 13.—Oil is America's big new resources problem. America is fresh out of it. But where to buy oil is less a problem than how to shop for it. The producing countries have plenty of oil. The trouble is that they also have plenty-plus of the dollars America is pressing on them for their oil.

As America has been growing more insecure, the people in the oil-producing countries have been growing richer at her expense. It's little wonder that the oil powers have been growing steadily more formidable in the eyes of Americans. The sharper America's new oil shortage pinches, the higher America's fuel cost bill is inflated, the drier her gas and oil pumps run; and the weaker Americans assume they are, the stronger they believe their sources of oil are.

This latter-day American disposition to talk poor invites a weak trading stance. It fails to reckon on the trouble the oil-producing countries would be in without the American market. Their need to move their oil into America is at least as critical as their oil is for the American standard of living.

But America's need to buy foreign oil accounts for only part of the inclination of the oil-producing countries to play ball with her. Their need to buy the one line of products which America is uniquely able to sell accounts for the willingness of the oil-producing countries to keep the trading friendly and to keep the terms reasonable. America's ability to export basic foodstuffs is her secret weapon.

Americans of faint heart and strong susceptibility to suggestions of weakness in foreign dealings are inclined to foreshorten the proportions of America's oil problem by measuring it purely in terms of her dollar drain. Admittedly, America is going to need oceans of oil from overseas. Admittedly too, she has allowed her dollar drain to be inflated to the proportions of a nonstop hemorrhage.

The pessimism in vogue among market watchers thruout America is asking how America is to find the money to pay her prospective oil import tab. The realism on the rise among marketmakers is discovering that having American foodstuffs to ship is a sure way to magnetize return cargoes of oil.

Last month, one of America's major oil companies—by definition, one of America's major importers—approached a knowledgeable Congressional friend from the Gulf oil country and the rich farm area just above it. The purpose of their call for help was to latch on to 10,000 tons of top-quality Mississippi Valley rice. And cost was of no concern to this oil company foraging for rice. All that mattered was getting the rice to

barter for acceptance of its bids for crude in the Middle East.

Unlike soybeans or the rest of America's long line of rich feed crops for live stock and poultry, rice is scarcely a top premium crop. To Americans, trading rice for oil is an obvious bargain, at any price. By the primitive nutritional standards still prevailing in the Middle Eastern oil world, getting rice in barter for oil is a fair exchange. It's better business than just taking in still more dollars.

This tellable incident—by no means isolated—drives home a point I have been at pains to make. America is accepting the disadvantages of financial weakness when the advantages of economic strength are in her grasp. Dealing from her economic strength is America's surest hope of recouping her financial losses and overcoming her financial weaknesses.

Nevertheless, the same mentality which presided over America's decline and fall from undisputed world financial leadership is resisting the opportunity to reclaim for leadership. The endemic stupidity dominating Washington still sees American agricultural products as the export giveaways so many of them were until just a short time ago.

The overeducated ideologies who not only accepted but welcomed the multiple devaluations of the dollar inhabit an academic vacuum insulated from the realities represented by the terms of trade. The dogmatic opportunism of devaluation has hoodwinked America into marking down the export selling prices of her basic foodstuffs to countries poor in their larders and rich in their treasures. Then, while all America is up in arms over the runaway in domestic food prices, this same institutionalized idiocy is bragging that American farm exports are up—as if they could be down? Adding insult to injury, the dollar devaluation which left America with less to show for the farm exports her creditors need also obliged her to put up more cash to pay for the oil she herself needs.

The potential hold America's agricultural resources are giving her over her creditors is more than a headstart. It is here to stay. None of her creditors have the soil, the space, the people, or the technology to outgrow their dependence on American foodstuffs. More than incidentally, some of these creditors also supply America with the oil she needs. Trading hard to feed them well guarantees a fair trade to fuel America.

Old-time Yankee trading knew how to harness dollar diplomacy to lead from strength and to deal away from weakness. The opportunity will be around for a long enough time to justify the hope that the mentality in charge of American policy-making will rediscover the technique.

PEACE IS HIS PROFESSION

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, a most distinguished Arkansan and American will complete his honored career in uniform this year when Gen. Horace M. Wade, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, retires after 35 years on active duty. General Wade enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps in 1937 and advanced through the grades to his present rank.

Overseas he served in the Middle East and was Chief of Staff of the Supreme

Headquarters of the Allied Powers in Europe. He has been decorated with the Silver Star, Legion of Merit with two Oak Leaf Clusters, DFC, Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and numerous other awards.

A native of Magnolia, Ark., General Wade graduated from the University of Arkansas in 1948, and was named a distinguished alumnus during 1971. He has achieved higher military rank than any other Arkansas graduate. During his service in various corners of the world and in all parts of the United States, he has never lost his loyalty to the State in which he was born nor to the Razorbacks. An active member of the Washington Chapter of the University of Arkansas Alumni Chapter, General Wade was asked to deliver the after dinner address at the chapter's annual spring meeting.

At this time, I would like to share with you the General's thoughts looking back on 35 years of military service as stated to the Arkansas alumni:

ADDRESS BY GEN. HORACE M. WADE

I am happy and honored to be here with my friends and fellow alumni of our great University.

I don't think I'm any different from anyone else who accepts an invitation to address a group, so I too have spent considerable time thinking of a subject which I could use to talk with you about tonight. I hastened to dismiss several subjects since I know you already know about our great state and equally great university. I'm sure that you know that the Razorbacks have had their last losing football season. You are obviously well informed on the Washington scene. After all, it is "foreigners" such as ourselves that make this city and our federal government operate.

Then I thought a little more and soon I realized that it has been 25 years since I received my degree at the University. I have spent those 25 years in the uniform of the United States Air Force. In fact, I have been on active duty with the Army Air Corps and the United States Air Force for the last 35 years. And, I suspect that makes me unique to this group.

In effect, I have devoted my life and my personal career to the military service. One might ask, "Why?" And—over the years—many have asked me, "Why?" Sometimes when asked this question, I felt there was more to it than simply, "Why?" I sometimes perceive a negative reaction to anything or anyone "military." So, I have homed in on this question as a departure point for my brief remarks tonight.

I entered flying school in late 1937 at Randolph Field, Texas. Some of you may recall the environment of those days. The American public was concerned predominantly with domestic issues. There was little concern for—or for that matter, little knowledge of—the international scene. As a result, there was little concern for military readiness.

World War II was on the horizon. Japan was flexing its muscles in the Far East—especially in China. Hitler was starting his madness in Europe. But America was not stirred. Even in the early 1940's, there was heavy Congressional debate over the extension of the draft laws. You may recall that the legislation to extend the period of conscription was passed by just one vote.

The attack on Pearl Harbor changed all that. The American public was now stirred. We responded to a crisis. Our nation was at war—our national security was threatened. During those war years, the military enjoyed

an excellent relationship with the civilian sector. The military public image was good.

Following World War II, we all looked to an era of peace. We dismantled our vast military machine. The public approved of this for Americans were tired of war. Then came Korea! But this time, our people could not see the threat to our national security. They could see no tangible results of the fighting and, alas, they really could not see a viable peace. We did not lose that war, but many wondered what we had won. Enthusiasm for armed conflict—and its warriors—was on the decline.

John Foster Dulles, as Secretary of State in the 1950s, kept the ever-present thought of nuclear holocaust in front of the American people. The massive retaliation strategy of the 1950s required large defense expenditures. It also tended to polarize our thinking. It drove many Americans toward a more pacifist attitude. This fear of war—reflected in pacifism—impacted adversely on the civilian attitudes with regard to the requirements of our armed forces.

In the early sixties, President Kennedy sought to change the massive retaliation concept. He focused a sharp effort to build-up our conventional forces. He foresaw the possibility of having to engage in limited conflicts. The Kennedy charisma tended to carry this conventional force build-up with the public.

However, as we increased our involvement in Southeast Asia, the public again found our military exploits unacceptable. Again, as in Korea, there was no apparent threat to our national security, no sign of tangible results, and little prospect for a traditional victory.

The lengthy conflict in Southeast Asia has left a bad military taste with many people in this country. Again today—as in the 1930s—one segment of our society seems to be looking inward. They would have us withdraw from our national commitments to the international community. With this withdrawal would come the natural drawdown of military forces and a lessened emphasis on our national defense posture.

I do not intend to change anyone's mind on this issue. I would like, however, to provide my input to the continuing dialogue—or to provide "food for thought" as we would say back home. What would our nation be like if it were not for our defense policies and for our military forces? In answering that question, I might also answer the original question, "Why" did I stay in uniform all these years?

Let me say at the outset of this discussion that the only purpose for our military is Peace. I spent many years in the Strategic Air Command and our motto then, as now, was Peace Is Our Profession.

Our job is to *deter war*. Believe me, none of us have any desire to fight a war—especially in this age of superpowers and nuclear weapons. We realize that the man in uniform is the one on the firing line. No one wants to get shot at . . . killed . . . or held prisoner for 6-8 years. To think otherwise is ridiculous.

Our job then is deterrence.

Essentially, there are three factors in the deterrence equation. All three must be present if deterrence is to work.

First, we must have a military force capable of defeating any potential aggressor's force—after we have first been attacked.

Second, we must have the national will to employ that force, and

Third, any potential aggressor must know we have the force and the will to use it against him.

If these three factors are present . . . and if we are dealing with rational human beings . . . then we will have deterrence.

There are those, of course, who ask, "What are we deterring?" They see no threat to our national security. Let me cite just one example. These skeptics look to Western Eu-

rope—the scene of two major world wars. Because there is stability and security, they would challenge the fact that any threat exists to the NATO countries. Consequently, they counsel for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from that area.

Unfortunately, our own successes have created a paradox. There is stability and security in Western Europe because there is a NATO military force—and there is a potential threat. For example:

The Warsaw Pact ground forces significantly outnumber NATO forces. (Incidentally, their mobility and discipline were convincingly demonstrated against one of their own—Czechoslovakia—a few years ago.)

The Warsaw Pact air forces in Europe have half again as many tactical aircraft as NATO.

The Soviet Navy is the second largest fleet in the world, and they possess the largest submarine fleet.

Certainly, no one can predict what would happen if the NATO forces were not there—nor what might have happened over the last two decades. But when I recall the incidents in Greece, Berlin, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc., I have to wonder.

There are other examples beyond the borders of Europe—such as Cuba, here on our doorsteps. However, I don't wish to belabor the point.

I do wish to note that excessive overt aggression has been deterred . . . a nuclear war has been deterred to date. I think there's a very good reason for this. We have a first class military force and have, on occasions such as the Cuban crisis, demonstrated a willingness to use that force. Our potential aggressors have received the message. In effect, we have the three ingredients to the deterrent recipe.

The question now is, "Will we retain this deterrent force?" Can we as a nation afford it? I would respond to those questions with a question, "Can we afford not to?" In effect, your Department of Defense serves as an insurance policy on the life of this great nation—and on its great ideals. Who among you would like to sacrifice the most cherished of all intangibles—FREEDOM?

But, the critics ask, "What price tag is attached to our insurance premium?" Well, in this fiscal year, defense spending accounted for just over six percent of our nation's GNP. It accounts for about twenty percent of all public spending—federal, state and local. And this year—Fiscal 1973—defense spending, in real terms, is at lowest since FY 1951. In effect, none of the real growth in our national economy over the past 22 years is allocated currently to National Defense.

I do not wish to get carried away with this issue, but it is a frequently misstated and misunderstood issue. Personally, from my perspective, I think six percent of our GNP is a reasonable investment in our national security.

Our nation represents the greatest idea in government ever tried by man—democracy. Winston Churchill was credited with observing that "Democracy is the worst form of government . . . except for all the others." It is difficult to logically dispute that Churchillian observation.

Our experiment has worked. It provides the world's best environment for individual expression, educational and occupational opportunities, standard of living, and personal freedom. I realize it is not all perfect. We also have inequalities, prejudices, poverty and sickness.

But we in America have the unlimited opportunity to do what the people want to do. We are free to act as the majority wishes. I contend this freedom is assured as long as we pay the premiums on our policy. As long as we have a strong military force in-being and a national determination to employ that force, if necessary—then we will deter war.

And we can continue to harvest the benefits of peace—and freedom.

I have devoted my life to this concept. I am happy and proud to have done so. I have shared many wonderful experiences with some of the finest people in the world—our uniformed military men and women. Many of which, incidentally, are—like you and me—residents of the great state of Arkansas. The caliber of our military men and women and their dedication to this country have been amply demonstrated by our returning POWs. It is also reflected by another group which has received less recognition. Yet, they and their families have suffered even more. I speak of our many men missing in action and of those who gave their lives for our freedom—yours and mine.

I am proud of this nation . . . I am proud of its people . . . I want those who follow us to be equally proud—and free. That is why I devoted these many years to the uniform of my country.

Thank you very much.

RUMANIA CELEBRATES 96TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last week on the 10th of May, the people of Rumania and people of Rumanian descent throughout the world celebrated the 96th anniversary of the independence of their country.

In honor of that occasion, I rise today to pay tribute to the brave and freedom-loving people of Rumania who have resisted the dictatorship which has attempted to assimilate and erode their national and cultural integrity.

Rumania first won her freedom in 1877 after four centuries of suppression by her more aggressive neighbors who parceled her territories among themselves. It was only when the Russians and the Turks were distracted by the war in the Balkans that Rumania under the direction of Prince Charles was able to assert her sovereignty.

Four years later, Prince Charles was proclaimed Charles the I. King of Rumania. In the ensuing years, Rumania took her place among the international community of nations and grew as a peace-loving, prosperous member of the European community.

Unfortunately, this enlightened period came to an abrupt halt in 1945 when the U.S.S.R. and its army forced a puppet regime faithful to the Kremlin upon Rumania. It has been 28 years since the political independence of Rumania was crushed and yet the spirit of the people remains strong and determined.

They look to the 10th of May as a symbol of their illustrious past and they draw sustenance and hope from its memory. While their supposedly representative government all but ignores the traditional date of Rumanian National Independence, within their hearts Rumanians still remember the 10th of May.

Mr. Speaker, despite the concerted efforts of the ruling dictatorship, the

people of Rumania still harbor an intense desire for personal freedom and liberty. It is only fitting then that we pause to pay our respects and admiration to the people of Rumania and express our sincere hope that their long-sought independence will be soon returned to them.

SENATOR TOWER SPEAKS OUT ON AMNESTY

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, judging by the correspondence from my district, one of the major issues now facing the American people is that of amnesty for those who fled military service or deserted from it during the past decade. Some of our colleagues have already introduced bills this session which would grant unconditional amnesty to such individuals and allow them to return to our Nation without penalty. These proposals have been receiving the active support from some organizations around the country.

One private organization which has been effectively explaining and advocating a position in opposition to amnesty is Young Americans for Freedom—YAF. This organization of college, high school, and young adult members has distributed thousands of pieces of literature and materials calling for no amnesty as well as making available to the American people buttons and bumper strips against amnesty. Its leaders have testified before the Republican and Democratic Platform Committees as well as congressional committees. I want to commend them for their tireless work on this project. Their voice on this issue is truly the voice of responsible young Americans.

I would like to especially call to the attention of my colleagues an article written by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower). The article, which follows, appeared in the October 1972, issue of New Guard, the magazine of YAF:

A QUESTION OF AMNESTY

(By Senator JOHN TOWER)

As the end of our involvement in the ground combat in Vietnam comes within the foreseeable future, the question of amnesty for those who have dodged the draft or deserted the armed forces during recent years has been raised.

There are really two points to be considered in this problem:

First, whether amnesty is to be granted for draft dodgers and deserters who acted out of cowardice, and

Second, whether amnesty should be granted to those who did so in protest of the war.

There appears to be no question about the prosecution of those men who deserted or evaded the draft for reasons other than to protest the war. Everyone seems to agree that these men committed illegal acts and should be prosecuted for them.

There are those in our society, however, who now contend that amnesty should be granted to those men who refused military service as a personal protest against the war,

But, if we grant amnesty to some, it will be difficult indeed to distinguish those who honestly protested the war from those who fled because they feared to risk personal danger and who would claim that their act was a virtuous one.

It seems to me, that the courageous individuals who refused the draft to make a personal protest against the war have already followed the true course for civil disobedience and willingly stood trial for their illegal act, arguing that their protest is a form of defense in court. Those who have fled their country to avoid prosecution do not seem to me to be those who courageously protest the war.

NOT DESERVING OF FORGIVENESS

I cannot agree that those men who left their friends to suffer the hardships of Vietnam without them are deserving of forgiveness. These men have violated the law and if they have found refuge in foreign lands, they have not yet been tried or punished. Some contend that to be exiled from one's homeland is punishment enough. But those who have chosen this course have done so of their own will. It is hard for me to believe that they love their country more than those who have remained within it. Those who have chosen self-exile as an alternative to military service have placed their own moral judgment above loyalty to their country.

I shall not support efforts to return these men to the United States free from prosecution. If they wish to return, they should be allowed to do so, but they should remain subject to prosecution. They should be given an opportunity to tell the motives behind their actions but they should be willing to subject themselves to justice, and they should not be given amnesty. I shall not support efforts to return these men to the United States with amnesty. If they wish to return to be tried and to serve punishment, if any, then I shall welcome them.

There were many men who would have preferred not to serve in the Armed Forces when their nation asked them to do so. But these men saw their duty and willingly served although they would have preferred not to. And there were a few, on the other hand, who felt so strongly a moral obligation against the war that they stood trial and made their case a forum for their opposition. I am proud of the former, and I disagree with the views of the latter; but I respect both. I do not respect those that fled their country rather than see military service and I do not believe we should grant those individuals our respect after the war is over.

A discussion of amnesty brings us also to the question of the draft. Because there are many drawbacks to drafting young men for military service, not the least of which is the placing of an unfair burden on those who are selected, I have supported efforts to move into reality. Toward this end, I have supported military pay raises, subject to fiscal constraints, which are designed to increase the number of volunteers. And I have offered and supported a number of various pieces of legislation designed to make military service more attractive.

These include legislation to improve compensation for our reserve forces, to extend coverage of the Serviceman's Group Life Insurance Program to the Reserves and the National Guard; to credit for pay and retirement purposes service performed as a member of the Senior Reserve Officers Training Corps program or in the Service Academies, and several other bills aimed at improving the quality of life for those on active duty.

Responsible action by the Congress to improve living and working within the armed forces, and thus make military service more attractive for volunteers, hopefully will boost the level of volunteers. Together with our reduced manpower commitments overseas,

an increase in volunteer should make the draft no longer necessary.

That is my hope, just as it is the hope of most Americans.

But amnesty for those who have fled their country rather than answer the selective service calls would break a faith with those who have served. I shall oppose moves to grant amnesty for draft evaders and military deserters.

GASOLINE AND OIL ALLOCATION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as was predicted, the gasoline and oil shortage is getting worse. Farmers are having increasing difficulty in obtaining diesel fuel. Five hundred and sixty-two gasoline stations have closed throughout the country. An inordinately high percentage of these is in Minnesota. Trucking companies and taxi companies are being forced to curtail operations, with consequent layoffs.

Last Thursday, the administration announced a voluntary petroleum allocation system which leaves the key decisions to the major oil companies. On April 30, in the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1973, Congress gave the President authority to allocate petroleum supplies. It did not give this authority to industry.

In effect, the administration's voluntary system condones market sharing, in violation of the Anti-trust Act. The plan gives priority to eight large categories, such as State and local governments and public transportation systems, but leaves the precedence among these groups to be determined by the major oil companies.

The administration has declared that if a company fails to comply with the new guidelines, the Department of the Interior's Office of Oil and Gas can "impose mandatory allocation on the supplier." We cannot afford to wait and see if the Government will administer its so-called voluntary program as though, in fact, it were mandatory.

In proposing its allocation plan, the administration declared that Government regulation and control are unnecessary in an industry "where there is every evidence of intense and healthy competition." I do not believe that this is an accurate assessment of the petroleum industry, in which some 20-odd companies tightly control production, distribution, and marketing. The Federal Trade Commission has been studying possible antitrust enforcement action against the major oil companies for some time.

I urge Congress to proceed with legislation to establish a mandatory oil and gasoline allocation system which will insure that equitable allocation is left neither to the altruism of the big oil companies nor to the good intentions of the executive branch.

I call attention of Members to the following editorial in Monday's Washington Post, which points out that instead of preserving competition as it purports

to do, the administration's new allocation system abets the monopoly situation in the oil industry:

AT THE BOTTOM OF THE GAS TANK

Given the gasoline shortage that the country has now got itself into, the administration's new allocation plan is a realistic and useful response. In the seller's market that is developing, the allocation plan warns refiners against cutting off those geographical areas that are inconvenient to reach. It admonishes distributors to keep supplies flowing to vital services. It has its order of priorities exactly right, putting at the top of the list the farmers who are currently threatened with a lack of fuel for the spring planting.

But there is no need to be Pollyannaish about this allocation plan. In order to squeak past the immediate danger, the administration is deliberately running other risks that may eventually prove very costly. First of all, let us call this plan by its proper name: it is a cartel. It assigns fixed shares of a limited production to the various middlemen and consumers. It establishes those shares by a combination of historical practice and national need. As an immediate remedy to the immediate shortages, it is doubtless unavoidable. But the country ought to be under no illusions regarding the nature of this remedy.

Ironically, the gasoline allocation plan is being defended here and there as a device to preserve competition and keep prices down by protecting the independent retailers. In fact, not for the first time, we are seeing federal anti-trust policy create just the opposite, an obvious and highly conventional market-sharing agreement. It will help the independents survive, but it will do nothing for price competition.

The price of gasoline is now rising, and the only real question is the rate at which it rises. One reason is the ferocious effectiveness of another cartel, the economic alliance of Middle Eastern countries that export crude oil. As for our domestic producers, they are reaching for increasingly expensive sites and techniques of extracting our own oil.

Oil company profits are currently high. With most of the producers running as close to full capacity as they are able, they are reaping very substantial economies of scale. It costs very little more to run an oil well, or a highly automated refinery, at 95 percent of capacity than at 70 percent. Strained capacity is good for the producer, at least in the short run. It makes a difference to this country how the oil companies spend these profits.

Consumers need an adequate and assured supply of gasoline. That will require heavy capital investment by the companies to expand their refining plants, to build pipelines, to pursue technical research and exploration for new deposits. Some companies say that, to meet fully their rising responsibilities in these fields, they will need to invest even more than they are earning. But are they actually going to invest where they ought? In the past, some of the oil companies have shown a lamentable tendency in their fat years to dribble away great amounts of money on excessive and redundant merchandising. The public would like some assurance that the present high profits will mean more production for the future, rather than more marginal and heavily subsidized filling stations on every other street corner.

Gasoline consumption in this country ran about 5 percent higher in the first three months of this year than in the same period of 1972. Stocks on hand, in contrast, are about 10 percent lower, mainly because of federal pressure on the refiners throughout the winter to correct the earlier shortage of fuel oil. The full magnitude of the shortfall in gasoline will presumably appear with the peak of the summer vacation season, around the

Fourth of July. Both the administration and the oil industry are very apprehensive, for good reason, about the reaction of the American motorist when he discovers that he really cannot buy as much gasoline as he wants.

It is a picture that invites reflection: The American consumer, enjoying more money and more leisure than ever before, is now threatened with an empty gas tank as he sets off on his vacation. The American oil companies, rolling in profits, cannot find enough crude oil at any price. And a Republican administration, hoping to prevent even worse misfortunes, imposes a cartel on the gasoline market. For those readers of a philosophical inclination, it might provide apt commentary on the nature of the nation's new prosperity.

WELFARE SCANDAL—XX

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our present welfare system encourages irresponsibility among recipients due to the shoddy mismanagement of the programs and their susceptibility to fraud.

One of the problems is that recipients take aids earmarked for such essentials as housing and renege on their common obligations to spend the money for rents. In Milwaukee right now the Milwaukee housing authority estimates that welfare clients in public housing projects are \$12,000 in arrears in their rents. This is not because the taxpayers have not ladled out the moneys for the rent checks. They have. But the recipients think they might like a new TV or a new car or a night on the town instead. Until this type of abuse is corrected by tightening up the administration of our welfare programs, this utter waste of our tax dollars can be expected to continue unabated.

Today I am inserting the 20th segment of a series of articles from the Milwaukee Sentinel exposing the shocking waste and fraud which characterize the operation of the Milwaukee county welfare department. It is my hope that exposing this situation will speed congressional action on welfare reform legislation.

The article follows:

CLIENTS OWE \$12,000 IN PROJECT RENT

(By Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk)

Welfare clients living in city housing projects owe the Milwaukee Housing Authority \$12,000 in unpaid back rent, and the housing authority wants either to collect the money or evict the clients.

The \$12,000 is the total back rent owed by 118 of the 1,021 welfare clients living in the city's five public, low income housing projects.

After several months of nonpayment of rent, the welfare department can put a client on voucher payments, paying rent directly to a landlord rather than giving the money to the client and trusting him to pay his rent with it.

However, in a meeting last month, representatives of the Department of City Development were told by welfare department officials that voucher payments to the housing authority are prohibited by federal regulations.

Edward J. Hayes, commissioner of city development and secretary of the housing authority, said that Arthur Silverman, county welfare director, said that voucher payments could not be made to a federally subsidized body such as the housing authority.

DIRECT PAY ASKED

Hayes said that representatives from his office met with Silverman Feb. 5 to ask that welfare clients owing back rent be put on vouchers allowing rent payments to be made direct to the housing authority.

"We were turned down. We were told that the federal HEW (Department of Health, Education and Welfare) programs would not allow it," Hayes said.

NOT FOR ALL

Silverman told a reporter Monday that what he had told Hayes was that "there cannot be payments for all individuals living in housing projects by voucher, but that those who have been involved in mismanagement could be paid" by voucher.

"That's my recollection," Silverman said. He pointed out that neither the federal government nor the state government would share in payments for back rent—which would constitute duplicate payments.

But "if a client has not paid rent for two months or more, voucher payments can be made," Silverman said. Voucher payments are being made to the housing authority in some cases, he said.

A HEW spokesman in Chicago also said voucher payments could be made.

"There is no distinction between voucher payments to a public agency or a private landlord," Miss Rosella M. Hart, deputy regional commissioner for state programs for HEW, said Monday.

The fact that public housing projects are operated with a combination of federal and local funds has nothing to do with the propriety of voucher payments, she said.

"We're going to have to get up there and look into the situation," Miss Hart added.

Hayes, who was appointed commissioner of city development last October, said he did not know how much money the housing authority might have lost over the years through the nonpayment of rent by welfare clients.

When he took over as commissioner, he said, he noticed from monthly reports submitted to him that a lot of welfare clients in the housing projects were not paying their rent.

NOTICED ARREARS

The \$12,000 in unpaid rent is only the amount now owed by welfare clients living in the housing projects, Hayes said. Some of them have not paid their rent in three or four months, he said.

During any given month in the past there would have been others with unpaid rents, he said. He declined to estimate the amounts.

"We want to remain solvent. But if this grows, you can't remain solvent in a situation like this," Hayes declared.

The rent money received, he said, is used to pay the operating costs of the housing projects, which are funded with two-thirds federal and one-third local funds.

The nonpayment of rent is a problem, he said.

"Actually, it's a limited problem except in one of the housing projects—Hillside," Hayes said.

The Hillside project is bounded by N. 6th, N. 9th, W. Galena and W. Villet Sts.

At Hillside, 80 of 373 welfare clients owe back rent totaling \$9,000, Hayes said.

In the other four housing projects, a total of 38 out of 648 welfare clients owe back rent totaling \$3,000, he said.

RENTS IN PROJECTS

Rents in the projects, he said, are not set flat rates but are based on ability to pay and

cannot exceed 25% of a family's income. They vary from as little as \$6 to as much as \$190 a month, Hayes said.

A recent federal court case, he said, established that a welfare client cannot be evicted from a housing project for nonpayment of rent.

Instead, Hayes said, they must be given a hearing by an administrative review board before any action is taken.

The required administrative review process has been established and hearings on individual cases will start soon, he said.

He estimated that hearings on the 38 cases in the four projects other than Hillside probably will be completed within one month.

Each case will be considered individually and any extenuating circumstances will be taken into account in deciding the action to be taken, Hayes said.

Holding the hearings, he said, will enable the housing authority to follow up with the action that any private landlord would take—either obtain payment or proceed with eviction.

"I think, with the exception of those in the Hillside project, payment will result," Hayes said.

A MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving on a Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee which is involved in the complex works of revising the rules of evidence.

There has been some controversy surrounding the procedures involved in the development, promulgation and consideration of these rules.

Chief Justice Warren Burger, writing in the April, 1973 issue of the Third Branch, Bulletin of the Federal Courts, explains very well the process involved in the rule making.

Our subcommittee has held hearings on the proposed Federal rules of evidence and is now involved in a line-by-line scrutiny of the proposed rules. Following this deliberation additional hearings will be held.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman and members of the subcommittee have made it clear that we are anxious to have as much input from Members of Congress, the courts, the bar, and the general public as we possibly can. It is important that these comments be received as soon as possible since we are attempting to complete our arduous task of revision as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Speaker, because he clearly explains the process underway in connection with revision of the new rules of evidence for the Federal Courts, I request that Chief Justice Burger's article be printed in the Record at this point:

A MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE

Congress has postponed, pending further action, the effective date of the Rules of Evidence promulgated by the Supreme Court last fall. These Rules were developed by an Advisory Committee, appointed by Chief Justice Warren in 1965 and acting under the rulemaking power Congress delegated to the judiciary. Some lawyers and District Judges

have expressed concern over this action by Congress. There is no occasion for concern on this score for the rulemaking process is working as it should.

It is important to recall the history of rulemaking. In 1934, Congress vested civil rulemaking power in the Supreme Court, and subsequently Congress granted broader authority including rulemaking for criminal procedure. This process of rulemaking includes, as a first step, the appointment of a Judicial Conference Advisory Committee. That Committee conducts studies and develops rules; circulation of drafts to bench and bar follows. When the rules have been developed the Advisory Committee submits them to the Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure. If approved by the Standing Committee, the rules then go to the Judicial Conference of the United States. If the Conference approves them, they are submitted to the Supreme Court. If the Court in turn approves them, they are then transmitted to the Congress. Absent negative action by that body, the rules become law 90 days later, although a later date for their taking effect may be set by the Court or by the Congress to permit more time for Congressional scrutiny. It will readily be seen that this four-stage "screening" as is thorough and comprehensive as any legislative process could be.

This is the mechanism the Congress devised nearly 40 years ago with the cooperation of the courts and the bar. It is a most effective one and certainly is as careful a technical screening as could be provided, especially given the multitudinous responsibilities with which Congress is burdened and the specialized nature of procedure in federal litigation.

After this extremely careful process of formulating rules, however, comes the time for review by the elected representatives of the people.

Thus, rulemaking is a partnership, a joint enterprise, between Congress and the Judicial Branch. It was first carried to successful conclusion in 1938, with the adoption of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; then came the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Later on Appellate Rules were adopted. All of these rules are under constant scrutiny of Judicial Conference Advisory Committees.

The rulemaking enterprise has been one of the most successful and fruitful of any joint effort between branches of government in history. But, we must always remember that it is a joint enterprise, and while Congress has rendered us the compliment of general approval in the past, it does not mean that the Congress should accept blindly or on faith whatever we submit. Nor does the action of Congress in extending the time for consideration of the rules now submitted indicate more than an appropriate desire to give careful study to an important development in the law.

The current Rules of Evidence have been under study for a total of eight years. They were completed more than two years ago by the Advisory Committee, approved by the Standing Committee, on Rules of Practice and Procedure and the Judicial Conference, and then submitted to the Supreme Court. After initial consideration, the Supreme Court "remanded" them to the Rules Committee for further consideration and consultation with the bar. After this additional screening, certain of the rules were revised and resubmitted to the Supreme Court. The Court approved them in late 1972 and submitted them to the Congress in early 1973.

It is well known that District Judges have been applying many of the proposed rules, very often as persuasive authority, while they were in the draft stage. This is not surprising since these rules are largely a codification of long-established and tested rules of evidence that state and federal judges have been using and developing for generations.

I return to my basic point: the rule-making

process is functioning as its designers intended. The Congress is, as always, overwhelmed by many problems of an urgent nature, and is entitled to adequate time to study carefully any proposed rules submitted. The House Judiciary Committee is proceeding with this review in a subcommittee chaired by Congressman William L. Hungate of Missouri. The system is working and will do so as long as each component performs its assigned role.

ONE MORE MARK AGAINST THE POSTAL SERVICE

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to again share with my colleagues a letter which I received from one of my constituents complaining about U.S. Postal Service. Unfortunately, letters of this type are all too frequent and as Mr. Doonan points out some of it may not even have been delivered yet. It is time for us in the Congress to take more positive action to correct the present postal conditions which have come about since the establishment of the U.S. Postal Service. Mr. Doonan's letter follows:

FAIRFIELD BAY, ARK.,
April 18, 1973.

Hon. BILL ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ALEXANDER: I'm writing you about the U.S. Postal Service.

When we had 3 cent letter postage, there were two city deliveries daily, full Saturday service, and unparalleled efficiency. The Department was proud of the service, and so were we, but not now!

Some time ago, when we were living in Des Moines, Iowa, I ordered a film from Portland, Oregon, well in advance of the date of a Saturday night meeting. And when did the film arrive—you guessed it—on the Monday following the meeting, although it had been sent a week earlier, by Air Mail, Special Delivery! This inexcusable, sloppy service caused me considerable trouble and embarrassment, as you can well imagine.

Just recently—on Sunday, April 8th., to be exact, I mailed an important business letter from Dallas, Texas to Des Moines, Iowa. I received a complaint that it hadn't arrived yet on Saturday, April 14th. It seems the more important the mail, the more likely it will be fouled up. I could go on with countless other examples of slow, inadequate and undependable service, but I feel sure your other mail accurately reflects the picture—providing that it has been delivered yet!

Then there's Parcel Post. If U.P.S. can deliver packages quickly, safely, efficiently and make money too, why can't the Postal Service do it too? As I see it, one big trouble is in the American Postal Workers Union. Every time there is an increase in rates, the Union promptly "milks" the increase into the pockets of the workers. Then too, unionism tends to protect, even perpetuate the lazy, inefficient worker, while making sure the more efficient ones are not properly rewarded. You know, "only so many bricks per hour." I see that the Union is lobbying for legislation which would give them the right to strike. I wonder when they found out they didn't have the right? I recall there was a strike, despite the oath which each employee takes when he is sworn in!

Furthermore, I don't like the cancelling stamp, which eliminates the point of origin

of letters, nor does it give the time of mailing, as it used to do. Sir—something drastic needs to be done about bettering the service from the U.S. Postal Service, and I don't mean in 1974!

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS DOONAN.

P.S.—We are new citizens of Arkansas, as of Nov. 1, 1972. We "immigrated" from Iowa.

MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD each month the Monthly Calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The May Calendar of Events follows:

MAY AT THE SMITHSONIAN

EVENTS

Thursday, May 3

Creative Screen: Award-winning films produced or sponsored by federal agencies. Conducted Tours, National Park Service: *Time of the West*, National Park Service, *The Design Necessity*, Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities. Complete program begins 11:15 a.m., 12:15, 1:15 and 2:15 p.m. Renwick Gallery.

Films: Bienville Gallery Cut. *Torn Signs*, Room 333, *Big Bayou Black*—three rarely shown films by artist Ralston Crawford. 12 noon-2 p.m. National Collection of Fine Arts.

Seminar in Neurobiology: *Evidence for Molecular Coding of Information in the Nervous System*. Lecturer: George Ungar, Baylor University. Graduate level lecture on current research in neurobiology, sponsored jointly by the Consortium of Universities and the Smithsonian Institution Radiation Biology Laboratory. Question and answer period follows the lecture. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Final lecture: May 10.

Friday, May 4

Exhibition: *Views of the Earth*. Twenty large dye transfer color prints by Robert Buchnam, photographer and pilot. The abstract and the concrete are combined in aerial views to show "whats happening on earth. National Collection of Fine Arts through July 1.

Saturday, May 5

Films: *Bienville Galley Cut*. Repeat. See May 3.

Concert: *Sonya Monosoff*, violin, with chamber orchestra, presenting music of Haydn and Mozart. Evening concert, Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. For ticket information call 381-5398.

Museum Lecture: *Dentistry in America in the 17th through 19th Centuries*. Speaker: Everett Jackson, Museum Specialist, Division of Medical Sciences, 2:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Sunday, May 6

Tallulah, A Memory. Eugenia Rawls creates a vivid stage portrait of Tallulah Bankhead with recollections of both her personal and professional lives. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$4 general admission; \$3 Associates. Call 381-5157 for tickets.

Monday, May 7

Exhibition: *High School Graphics III*. Third annual exhibition of graphics by students of the District of Columbia public high schools. Sponsored by the National Collec-

tion of Fine Arts, District schools, and the Washington Print Club. Prizes will be awarded, NCPA, through June 11.

Tuesday, May 8

Lecture: *My Twenty Years of Kinetic Construction*. Internationally-known sculptor George Rickey lectures on his work and the pioneering achievements of the early Constructivist sculptors. 12 noon, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Wednesday, May 9

American Aviation Historical Society. Monthly meeting and program. 8 p.m., Room 1169, Arts and Industries Building. Open to the public. Call Mr. Wood, 381-5791 for further details.

Thursday, May 10

Seminar in Neurobiology: *The Role of the Membrane in Sensory Excitation*. Lecturer: Richard A. Cone, Johns Hopkins University. See May 3 for seminar details.

Anthropological Film Conference. Three-day conference and film program designed for filmmakers and educators, sponsored jointly by the Smithsonian Institution and the Anthropological Film Research Institute. For registration information calls Ms. Frazier, 381-6484. \$10 general, \$5 students and Associates.

Friday, May 11

Exhibition: *American Coverlets*. Beautiful, utilitarian art form shown in 15 American coverlets, 13 color reproduction and text panels. Includes three color slide presentations on weaving, spinning, and dyeing relating to the production of coverlets, with a background of taped folk songs sung by a master weaver at Williamsburg. The Renwick Gallery, through September 13.

Saturday, May 12

Museum Lecture: *Development of U.S. Army Uniforms from the Revolutionary War to World War II*. Speaker: Mr. Donald E. Kloster, Museum Specialist, Division of Military History. 2:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Sunday, May 13

Lecture: *It Ain't Necessarily Soul*: Ger-shwin's *Porgy and Bess* as a symbol. Rich Crawford, member of the music faculty at the University of Michigan, presented by the Division of Musical Instruments. 7:30 p.m., "Music Machines—American Style" exhibit hall, History and Technology Building. Free.

Baroque Betwixt Brunch. Baroque music performed on original instruments of the period with informal talk by Helen Hollis of the Division of Musical Instruments. Brunch served before or after the concert. \$8 general admission; \$7 Associates. Call 381-5157 for tickets.

Exhibition: *Man-Made Crystals*: A spectacularly colorful exhibit explaining the role of these newly developed materials, the technology that produces them and their relationship to natural materials. Featured are actual crystals grown in laboratories, and everyday products that incorporate them. Some of the largest and finest cut man-made gems are displayed along with natural gems showing the differences and similarities between them. Museum of Natural History, through Labor Day.

Monday, May 14

Concert: *Judith Norell*, harpsichord; *Bruce Brewer*, tenor. Cantatas of Mondonville, Campra, and music of Rameau. 7:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. Free.

Wednesday, May 16

Lunchbox Forum: *What Can You Do With a Planetarium*. Informal lecture by Jerry Barberly, of the National Air and Space Museum. 12 noon, National Air and Space Museum building.

Thursday, May 17

Creative Screen: Award-winning film, produced or sponsored by federal agencies. *The* CXIX—998—Part 12

Eternal Forest, U.S. Department of Agriculture; *The Endless Chain*, Atomic Energy Commission; *The Design Necessity*, Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities. Complete showings begin 11:15 a.m., 12:15, 1:15 and 2:15 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

Friday, May 18

Radio Concert: *Brazilian Church Music of the 19th Century*. National Gallery of Art Orchestra, directed by Richard Bales and 50 voices from the Catholic University Acapella Choir, directed by Dr. Michael Cordavanna. Recorded earlier this year at the Smithsonian's Renwick Gallery. 8:30 p.m., WETA-FM (90.9).

Saturday, May 19

Children's Day. Fourth annual all-day do-and-see festival for the young at art. Events include monoprinting, artist demonstrations, marionette theater, strolling musicians, films, magicians, treasure hunts, improvisational tours, mime theater and videotaping. Children's Day is designed for children aged 4 to 12 (young visitors to be accompanied by adults) and will be held both in the museum and in the courtyard. 10 a.m.—4 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts. Free.

Museum Lecture: *Quilts and Slumber Throus in the National Collections*. Speaker: Doris M. Bowman, Museum Specialist, Division of Textiles. 2:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Sunday, May 20

Soul Vibration Band and Show. Seven piece all women band. 2 p.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. Free.

Tuesday, May 22

Memorial Lecture: *Georg Scheutz* (1785-1873). In commemoration of the Swedish auditor, inventor, writer and publisher. Scheutz's difference engine, the first fully operable printing calculator, is on display in the Museum of History and Technology. Speaker: Dr. Uta C. Merzbach, Curator, Section of Mathematics. 2:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Concert: *Carole Bogard*, soprano; *Catherina Meints*, viola da gamba; *Jacqueline Anderson*, baroque violin, and assisting artists. Works by Handel, Rameau and Marais, all performed with historic instruments. 8:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. For ticket information call 381-5398.

Wednesday, May 23

Concert, by Port Authority, a portion of the U.S. Navy Band, and featuring a female vocalist. 10 a.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. Free.

Thursday, May 24

Films: *Bienville Gallery Cut*. Repeat. See May 3.

Saturday, May 26

Museum Lecture: *Women's Bathing Dress in the United States*. Speaker: Mrs. Claudia Kidwell, Associate Curator, Division of Costume and Furnishings. 2:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Films: *Bienville Gallery Cut*. Repeat. See May 3.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The Freer Gallery of Art

An exhibition of Japanese "Ukiyoe" paintings begins a series of special exhibitions and symposia to take place during the coming year. Ukiyoe, meaning floating world, is a school of Japanese painting of the late 16th century, that recorded the brilliant pageant of life in Edo and Kyoto, including the courtesans, samurai, merchants, peddlers and actors. More than 100 examples from the Freer collections follow the development of Ukiyo from its beginnings to later periods that included artist Hokusai. Begins May 3.

RECENTLY OPENED EXHIBITIONS

Henry R. Luce Hall of News Reporting. A new exhibit hall that provides a multi-media

chronicle of news gathering and dissemination from colonial times to the present days of instantaneous satellite reporting. Areas of the exhibit will feature working teletypes, cartoons, tribute to newsboys, photography, evolution of newspapers, Trans-Lux Newreel Theater, early days of radio and the impact of television. Museum of History and Technology.

Experimentarium. An experimental adaptation of the spacearium. The half-hour demonstration programs, entitled *New Born Babe*, are presented weekdays at 4 and 4:30 p.m., and touch briefly on three subject areas: an introduction to the experimentarium and what it can do; the history of air and space flight; and future study in astrophysics. National Air and Space Museum. Schedule changes will be announced on Dial-A-Museum, 737-8811.

The Magnificent West: American Heritage. Photographs by Milton Goldstein capture the majesty of some of our national parks—Yosemite, Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, the Tetons, Zion, Bryce, Sequoia and King's Canyon. Museum at Natural History, through May 15.

Masterpieces of Eskimo Ivory Carving. Small display of Alaskan Eskimo carvings. Rotunda. Museum of Natural History.

Foreign Study Tours.—For further details write Miss Schumann, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

African Safari: July 17–Aug. 8. Waiting list only.

Mexico and Guatemala: Aug. 27–Sept. 14. International Aerospace Tour: Sept. 17–Oct. 3.

Copernicus: The cities in Poland and Italy where he lived and worked. Oct. 1–23.

Domestic Study Tours.—For further details write Mrs. Kilkenny, Room 106-SI, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Skylab Launch: May 11–17.

Folkcraft and Musical Instrument Makers, Kentucky, North Carolina and Virginia: April 23–29.

Vanishing Indian Crafts: May 11–19, May 18–26, May 25–June 2.

Haiti Skin Diving on the Santa Maria site: May 13–23.

Olympic National Park: June 24–July 1. Alaska Float Trip: July 18–Aug. 1. Waiting list only.

New Hampshire Archaeology Dig: One week, Aug. 5 or 12. Students only, Aug. 19.

Acadia National Park: Sept. 9–15.

California Colonial History: Sept. 16–23.

Sea and Shore Laboratory: Oct. 11–18.

PUPPET THEATER

Alice in Wonderland. Lewis Carroll's dream fantasy featuring all the favorite characters insulting, advising and delighting Alice as she tumbles after the White Rabbit into an incredible dream world of eternal tea time. A new production for children by Allan Stevens and Company, presented by the Division of Performing Arts. Performances Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, 10:30 and 1:30 a.m., Saturdays and Sundays, 11 a.m., 12:30 and 2:30 p.m. Admission \$1 children; \$1.25 adults. Group rates available. For reservations call 381-5395.

MUSEUM WALK-IN TOURS

Museum of History and Technology

Highlights of the Collections: Monday, Wednesday, Friday—10:30, 11:30 a.m.; Tuesday, Thursday, 10:30, 11:30 a.m., 1:30 p.m.; Weekends—10:30 a.m., 12, 1:30 and 3 p.m.

First Ladies Gowns: Same times as Highlights.

The National Portrait Gallery

Highlights: 11 a.m., 1 and 2 p.m., seven days a week.

Mini-Tours: Noon.

SUMMER HOURS

Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History, Arts and Industries

Building, National Air and Space Museum—10 a.m.—9 p.m., seven days a week.

Freer Gallery of Art, National Collection of Fine Arts, The Renwick Gallery, National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution Building—10 a.m.—5:30 p.m.

National Zoo buildings—9 a.m.—6 p.m., seven days a week.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum—10 a.m.—6 p.m., weekdays; 1—6 p.m. weekends.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Museum of History and Technology

Steam Engines. Wednesday through Friday, 1—2:30 p.m. 1st floor.

Machine Tools. Wednesday through Friday, 1—2 p.m. 1st floor.

Spinning and Weaving—Tuesday through Thursday, 10 a.m.—2 p.m. 1st floor.

Hand-Set Printing Presses. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 2—4 p.m. 3rd floor.

Musical Instruments. A selection of 18th and 19th century instruments, and American folk instruments. Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor, 1:30 p.m., Mondays and Fridays—keyboard instruments; Tuesday—wind instruments; Wednesdays—lutes and guitars; Thursdays—folk instruments.

Music Machines—American Style Mechanical and electronic music machines. Monday through Friday, 1:00 p.m., 2nd floor. As part of this exhibit, excerpts from musical films are shown continuously:

May 1—3—Highlights from Disney II; 4—10—Highlights of MGM Musicals; 11—17—Highlights from Disney I; 18—24—Disney II; and 25—31—Highlights of MGM Musicals.

Dial-A-Phenomenon—737-8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

Dial-A-Museum—737-8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, June 3, 1971.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9—9:30 p.m. The program schedule for May:

6th—*The Energy Crisis: Is There One?* A discussion featuring Roger Carlsmith, Director of the Program in Energy Studies at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Dr. George Szego, President of Inter-Technology Corporation, and William Eilers, Director of the Smithsonian Office of Environmental Sciences.

13th—*The Nature of Scientific Discovery.* Highlights from the symposium held in Washington last month to commemorate the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus.

20th—*Concert*—Harpichord James Weaver performs music by J. S. Bach and Louis Couperin.

27th—*Dissecting a Mummy.* Dr. T. Aidan Cockburn, Research Associate at the Smithsonian, and Dr. J. Lawrence Angel, of the Museum of Natural History, describe what they learned by opening up an Egyptian mummy; *The Smithsonian's Gunboat.* Philip Lundberg and Howard Hoffman tell the story of the "Philadelphia," the only surviving man-of-war of the American revolution.

Radio Smithsonian can also be heard over WAMU-FM (88.5), Fridays at 2 p.m.

OTHER EVENTS

Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. For reservations call 381-5157.

Theatre Series. Four evenings of musical comedy, opera and dance at Wolf Trap Theatre and four evenings of discussions on the productions. A meeting with Mrs. Jouett Shouse is also part of the series. June 14—Aug 30.

Women at Work. *Fashion: A Front Row Seat*, with Eleni Epstein, Fashion Editor, Washington *Star-News* May 2. Monthly luncheon/lecture series.

Tours, classes and workshops are also offered by the Smithsonian Associates. For a complete schedule of available activities, call 381-5157.

FURTHER THOUGHTS ON INVESTIGATIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, during this unprecedented crisis, we in Congress ask ourselves what we can do to get at the truth of the Watergate scandals, to insure the stability of government, to make certain that no such excesses occur again.

An editorial in the *New Republic* for May 12 suggests that:

Congress does not have to sit on its hands. It can give the GAO subpoena power and authority to enforce the election campaign act. Or it can set up a federal elections commission as an independent agency, one that could assume the GAO's responsibilities under the Federal Election Campaign Act for receiving campaign fund reports, reviewing them and investigating discrepancies or allegations of improprieties. Such a commission could be empowered to hold immediate public hearings on allegations, subpoena witnesses and information and take testimony under oath.

It is a thought worth considering, and I insert the editorial in the *RECORD* at this point:

THE PRESIDENT BUYS TIME

The President's April 30 television performance was only the latest in a line of carefully drafted, deceptive "explanations" that began to flow from the White House and the Committee for the Re-election of the President within days after five men were arrested inside Democratic Party headquarters in the Watergate building. Some of the President's most conservative supporters had been urging him to say it wasn't so. He could not do that. He could only plead ignorance and accept responsibility. But responsibility for what? His ignorance?

A heart string was plucked when Mr. Nixon mentioned that on the day of the Watergate arrests, June 17 last year, he was "in Florida trying to get a few days' rest after my visit to Moscow." In truth he had returned from the Moscow trip June 2 and had already taken "a few days' rest" in Florida before flying to Key Biscayne again June 16. Then, solemnly, he told his audience, "I was appalled at this senseless, illegal action and I was shocked to learn that employees of the re-election committee were apparently among those guilty." Delayed shock. On June 19 Mr. Nixon's press secretary, Ron Ziegler, announced in response to questions, "I am not going to comment from the White House on a third-rate burglary attempt." The descriptive word around the White House then and for some time later for Watergate was a "caper."

We are now informed, however, that on learning of the break-in, Mr. Nixon "immediately ordered an investigation by appropriate government authorities." In truth the FBI had entered the case hours after the burglars were discovered and well before news reports were out—a fact worth noting since the President says he first learned of the Watergate "from news reports." Former

acting FBI Director L. Patrick Gray III testified at his Senate confirmation hearings that he ordered a full investigation the afternoon of June 17. He never mentioned any order from the President. By "appropriate government authorities," does the President have in mind the investigation run by former presidential counsel John Wesley Dean III? We doubt it.

Mr. Nixon's toughest problem is persuading the public he knew nothing of his staff's complicity in the political espionage and sabotage—before or after the Watergate arrests. "As the investigation went forward," he said on April 30, "I repeatedly asked those conducting the investigation whether there was any reason to believe that members of my administration were in any way involved." Was John Mitchell a "member of his administration"? Mitchell at the time of Watergate was Nixon's campaign director, and has since stated that, while attorney general, he sat in on three meetings at which political espionage, sabotage and wiretapping were discussed (he says he opposed the latter). When he resigned as campaign manager, did he fail to share his knowledge with the President? Was he asked to do so? Was it just chance that the President, on August 29, "categorically" absolving anyone on the White House staff or in the administration from blame, added "presently employed"?

Acting FBI Director Gray was conducting an investigation. Was he one of those consulted? Gray testified he never spoke with the President. Yet it was the FBI investigative material leak to Washington Post newsmen that formed the stories linking administration and White House aides to Watergate. Did those not include Dean, who was reading FBI reports and thus could verify the truth of the news stories? The President said the other night, "... because I believed the reports I was getting, because I had faith in the persons [who else besides Dean?] from whom I was getting them, I discounted the stories in the press..."

How much else did he discount? An FBI interview last September with Nixon's former personal lawyer, Herbert Kalmbach, linking White House appointments secretary Dwight Chapin to political saboteur Donald Segretti, was given to *The Washington Post* and *Time* magazine and published October 15. Chapin denied the story. On March 1 this year acting FBI Director Gray produced a summary of the Kalmbach FBI interview confirming the previously printed stories. Nevertheless, at a subsequent news conference, the President implied that his personal lawyer's statement represented "charges... hearsay... guilt by innuendo." In short Mr. Nixon repeatedly refused to acknowledge facts, even when officially presented to him in an FBI report—hardly the attitude of a man searching for the whole truth but misled by others.

Toward the end of his April 30 talk, the President sought to dull the sharp edges of espionage and sabotage by calling them "shady tactics" adopted by "well-intentioned people" who, "under the intensive pressures of a campaign" decide "that what is at stake is of such importance to the nation that the end justifies the means." At another point he equated Republican violations of law to "ugly mob violence and other inexcusable campaign tactics... in the past including those that may have been a response by one side to the excesses or expected excesses of the other side... Both of our great parties have been guilty of such tactics." These may have been the justifications his aides gave him for condoning or even planning what occurred in 1972, but there is no evidence that the Democrats did anything to match it. This spreading scandal is not simply a commonplace example of the cynicism we have come to associate with the word "politician." It is a Republican

scandal, a White House scandal. The public and the democratic process have been slapped in the face by Republicans who behaved not only improperly but criminally. And the President adds to the insult by his suggestion that the Ervin Select Committee should "conduct its investigation in an even-handed way, going into charges against both candidates, both political parties."

This urge to bring the Democrats into the Watergate by the back door came to the fore with the President's lofty appeal to "all of you everywhere—to join in working toward a new set of standards, new rules and procedures to insure that future elections will be as nearly free of such abuses as they possibly can be made." No new standards, rules or procedures are needed. What is needed is tough, non-partisan investigation and enforcement of present law. While the President was asking for new election laws, the General Accounting Office was for the fourth time since August of last year releasing a report urging the United States attorney general "in the strongest terms to take the initiative with regard to these reported violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act and with the investigative resources available to his department, determine the full extent to which officials of the Committee to Reelect the President may have failed in their responsibilities under the Act in their dealings in cash funds." The President ought to read the GAO report which details the refusal to cooperate of present and past employees of the President's reelection committee. Some of those committee officials would not even meet with GAO investigators.

While waiting for the grand jury to act and the Ervin committee hearings to unfold, the Congress does not have to sit on its hands. It can give the GAO subpoena power and authority to enforce the election campaign act. Or it can set up a federal elections commission as an independent agency, one that could assume the GAO's responsibilities under the Federal Election Campaign Act for receiving campaign fund reports, reviewing them and investigating discrepancies or allegations of improprieties. Such a commission could be empowered to hold immediate public hearings on allegations, subpoena witnesses and information and take testimony under oath.

It was through control of the FBI investigation, the Department of Justice and therefore the Federal prosecutors that the White House was able not only to delay a trial in the Watergate arrests until the 1972 campaign was over, but also to cover up the full extent of the sabotage and espionage and shield key men who were involved. An independent, hopefully non-partisan but at least bipartisan election commission with authority and power to act immediately—while the campaign is on—could serve as a deterrent to future scoundrels.

GOVERNOR REAGAN PROPOSES TAX LIMIT

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, any plan which has a reasonable chance to reduce taxes without eliminating or drastically curtailing necessary services, and does it in an equitable manner for all classes of taxpayers is welcomed by all of us.

California Governor Ronald Reagan has prepared a plan which, under the California initiative-referendum system,

is expected to be presented directly to the electors of the State.

With congressional concern over budget control, this measure is well worth the reading and consideration of all Members of the body, and I reproduce its text herewith:

INITIATIVE MEASURE TO BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO THE ELECTORS

The Attorney General has prepared a title and summary of the chief purposes and points of the proposed measure, as follows:

Tax and Expenditure Limitations. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Limits State expenditures; restricts use of defined surplus revenue to tax reductions, refunds, or emergencies. Eliminates personal income tax for lower income persons; reduces others' 1973 or 1974 tax up to 20%, from surplus, and subsequent year rates 7½%. Requires two-thirds legislative vote for new or changed State taxes. Limits local property tax rates except school districts. Requires State funding of new programs mandated to local governments. Provides for tax and expenditure limit adjustments when functions transferred. Contains special indebtedness obligation provisions. Allows local tax rate and expenditure limit increases upon voter approval. If the proposed initiative is adopted undefined additional financing from State sources in the approximate amount of Five Hundred Sixty Eight Thousand dollars (\$568,000) on a one-time basis and Two Hundred Thirty Six Thousand dollars (\$236,000) annually thereafter will be required for State administrative costs.

To Honorable Secretary of State of California:

The undersigned hereby proposes that the Constitution of the State of California be amended by adding Article XXIX and petitions the Secretary of State to submit this proposal to the electors of California for adoption. The text of the proposed measure is as follows:

"The People of the State of California do enact as follows:

"The Constitution of the State of California is amended by adding Article XXIX, to read:

ARTICLE XXIX—REVENUE CONTROL AND TAX REDUCTION

Section 1. Declaration of Purpose.

The people of the State of California declare it is in the best interests of the State to effect an orderly reduction of their tax burden, without shifting costs to local government, by enacting this Constitutional provision to:

- Limit and reduce State taxes.
- Provide for refunds to the taxpayers of surplus State revenues.
- Limit Local Entity property tax rates.
- Establish funding procedures for Emergency Situations, and
- Require voter approval of taxes which exceed the limits set forth in this Article.

Section 2. State Tax Revenue Limit; Tax Surplus Fund; 20% Tax Refund.

(a) There is a State Tax Revenue Limit determined as provided in this Article.

(1) If State Tax Revenues for any fiscal year exceed the State Tax Revenue Limit for that fiscal year, the excess shall be transferred to the Tax Surplus Fund, which is hereby established.

(2) The Tax Surplus Fund shall be used only for one or more of the following purposes:

- For tax refunds or reductions;
- For approved Emergency Situation appropriations under Section 6 of this Article.
- The Legislature shall minimize accumulations within the Tax Surplus Fund by making periodic tax refunds or reductions as permitted by this Article.

(b) On the effective date of this Article, the Controller shall determine the amount of

surplus in the General Fund as of the end of fiscal year 1972-73 and shall designate such portion of the surplus as is necessary and available to effect the refund of subdivision (b) (1) hereof.

(1) The surplus so designated shall be utilized for a refund by means of a credit of 20% of personal income taxes for the calendar year 1973, excluding taxes on capital gains on assets held for more than one year, items of tax preference, estates and trusts, or in such lesser percentage as the Director of the Department of Finance shall certify is available for such refund. Single individuals whose adjusted gross income is less than \$4,000.00 and married couples and heads of households whose adjusted gross income is less than \$8,000.00 shall bear no personal income tax. If this Article is effective on or before December 31, 1973, then this paragraph shall apply to the 1973 taxable year. If this Article becomes effective after December 31, 1973, then this Section shall apply to the 1974 taxable year.

(2) If prior to the effective date of this Article, a statute is enacted providing the refund as set forth in subdivision (b) (1) of this Section, such statute shall be deemed compliance with the requirements of this subdivision (b) to the extent such refund is provided.

(3) The Legislature shall, by statute, implement the tax refund required by subdivision (b) (1) as to application to non-resident and fiscal year taxpayers and as to credits in computing liability.

(4) State Tax Revenue for purposes of computing the State Tax Revenue Limit as here defined shall not be reduced by refunds made pursuant to this subdivision (b).

Section 3. Appropriation Limit.

No appropriation shall cause an expenditure during any fiscal year of State Tax Revenues for that fiscal year in excess of the State Tax Revenue Limit for that fiscal year, other than for tax refunds or, pursuant to Section 6 of this Article, for Emergency Situations. Subject only to such exceptions, any such expenditure in excess of the State Tax Revenue Limit is prohibited. The Legislature shall, prior to any other appropriation, first make provision for the payment of the principal and interest on the indebtedness of the State.

Section 4. State Tax Adjustments: Personal Income Tax Reduction.

(a) The imposition of any new tax or the change in the rate or base of any tax by the Legislature shall be by statute passed by roll-call vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, except for tax refunds or reductions by appropriations specifically declared to be out of the Tax Surplus Fund which shall be by statute passed by a vote of the majority of the membership of each house.

(b) For 1974 and thereafter, the State personal income tax liability of taxpayers shall be determined at rates no higher than those in effect on January 1, 1973, less a credit of 7½%. Single individuals whose adjusted gross income is less than \$4,000.00 and married couples and heads of households whose adjusted gross income is less than \$8,000.00 shall bear no State personal income tax. The Legislature shall, by statute, implement the tax reduction required by this Section as to application to non-resident and fiscal year taxpayers and as to credits in computing liability. The provisions of this subdivision (b) may be modified by statute passed by roll-call vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring. If this Article becomes effective after December 31, 1973, then this subdivision shall apply to 1975 and thereafter instead of 1974 and thereafter.

Section 5. State Tax Revenue Limit Adjustment by Election.

The State Tax Revenue Limit may be increased or decreased by a designated dollar

amount by a majority vote of the people at a Statewide election approving a measure placed on the ballot by the Legislature by a roll-call vote entered into the journal two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, or placed on the ballot as an initiative statute pursuant to Article IV of this Constitution. A measure so approved shall take effect the day after the election, unless the measure provides otherwise.

Section 6. Emergency Fund and Emergency Appropriations.

(a) A Special Emergency Fund of not more than 0.2% of the State Personal Income shall be established and maintained by the Legislature. Money appropriated to the Special Emergency Fund shall be from State Tax Revenues and shall be subject to the State Tax Revenue Limit.

(b) Upon the Governor's declaration of an Emergency Situation and the exhaustion of such emergency funds as may be available from the Federal Government, the Legislature may make appropriations to meet the Emergency Situation from the Special Emergency Fund or, if that fund is exhausted, either from the Tax Surplus Fund or from State Tax Revenues derived from a specific tax increase or a specific new tax designated for the Emergency situation and enacted in accordance with Section 4 of this Article. Any tax so enacted shall remain in effect no longer than two years, unless its continuation is approved by a majority of the votes cast for and against its continuance at a Statewide election.

Section 7. Local Taxes.

(a) The Maximum Property Tax Rates of each Local Entity are set at the rates levied for the fiscal year 1971-72 or for the fiscal year 1972-73, whichever is the higher. The Maximum Property Tax Rates for a Local Entity created after the effective date of this Article shall be established by the electorate of the Local Entity at the time of its creation.

(b) To permit adjustment of the Maximum Property Tax Rates set in subdivision (a) of this Section, the Legislature shall enact statutes, within the general intent of this Article, to permit:

(1) Maximum Property Tax Rates to be increased or decreased to reflect cost variations due to cost-of-living or population changes not offset by assessed valuation changes or to allow for other special circumstances creating hardship for individual Local Entities.

(2) Maximum Property Tax Rate to be increased or decreased when authorized by the electorate of the Local Entity, or if there is no electorate, then as provided by the Legislature.

(3) Maximum Property Tax Rates to be increased by a four-fifths vote of the governing board of a Local Entity, to secure revenue to defray the costs of an Emergency Situation affecting the Local Entity, but any such increase shall remain in effect no longer than two years, unless its continuation is approved by the Local Entity's electorate.

(c) All property taxable by Local Entities and School Districts, except personal property specially classified for the purpose of assessment and taxation pursuant to the provisions of Section 14 of Article XIII of this Constitution, shall be assessed at a uniform percentage of full value established by the Legislature. If that percentage is any figure other than twenty-five, the maximum rates prescribed in subdivisions (a) and (b) of this Section shall be converted into new maximums by multiplying them by twenty-five and dividing them by the new assessment percentage. Full value, as used herein, means fair market value or such other standard of value as is required or authorized under this Constitution.

(d) No Local Entity or School District shall impose, levy or collect any tax upon or measured by income, or any part thereof, except as authorized by the Legislature by a statute passed by a roll-call vote entered in the jour-

nal, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring. This subdivision (d) shall not be construed to prohibit the imposition, levy or collection of any otherwise authorized license tax upon a business measured by or according to gross receipts.

Section 8. Protection of Local Entities and School Districts from State-Imposed Costs.

(a) After the effective date of this Article, no new program, or increase in level of service under an existing program, shall be mandated to Local Entities or School Districts by the State until an appropriation has been made to pay to the Local Entities or School Districts the costs of the mandated program or service, but no appropriation for payments to Local Entities or School Districts shall be required if such program or increase in level of service under a program is determined by the Legislature to be applicable generally to private entities or individuals, as well as to Local Entities or School Districts.

(b) The Legislature shall enact statutes to establish procedures for implementing this Section consistent with the following principles and directives:

(1) The performance of functions or services not required to be performed prior to a mandate to the Local Entity or School District shall be considered a new program or increase in level of service.

(2) The increased workload under an existing program, the implementation of statutes existing at the effective date of this Article or the definition of a new crime or change in the definition of an existing crime by statute shall not be considered a mandated new program or a mandated increase in level of service.

Section 9. Maintenance of Local Property Tax Relief.

(a) If the State reduces local property tax relief by decreasing the specific unit amount, rate or percentage established by statute for payments made under formula to Local Entities or School Districts from that in effect upon the effective date of this Article, the State Tax Revenue Limit shall be decreased by an amount equivalent to the decrease in payments to Local Entities or School Districts.

(b) The adjustment to the State Tax Revenue Limit required by this Section shall be made in the first fiscal year of the decrease of payment described in subdivision (a) of this Section. Such adjustment shall remain in effect for each subsequent fiscal year.

Section 10. Adjustments for Program and Cost Transfers.

To maintain a balance between the tax burden and the cost of specific government programs at the State and local level, and to further accomplish the purposes of this Article, the Legislature shall enact statutes consistent with the following principles and directives:

(a) If the Legislature enacts a specific property tax relief measure funded by State Tax Revenues or if, by order of any court, the costs of a program are transferred from Local Entities or School Districts to the State, the State Tax Revenue Limit may be increased, providing the Maximum Property Tax Rates of affected Local Entities or the then existing tax rates of affected School Districts are commensurately decreased.

(b) If the costs of a program are transferred from the State or Local Entities or School Districts to the Federal Government, the State Revenue Limit or the Maximum Tax Rates of affected Local Entities or the then existing tax rates of affected School Districts shall be commensurately decreased.

(c) If the costs of a program are transferred to or imposed on existing or newly created Local Entities by Federal Law or the order of any court, the Maximum Property Tax Rates of affected Local Entities may be commensurately increased, pursuant to such specific conditions of State approval in each case as the Legislature may impose.

(d) If the costs of a program are trans-

ferred between existing or newly created Local Entities or School Districts, the Maximum Property Tax Rates or the then existing tax rates of each shall be commensurately adjusted.

(e) If Federal taxes are reduced on condition that the State increase expenditures by an amount equivalent to the Federal reduction, the State Tax Revenue Limit may be increased by such amount.

(f) The adjustments required by this Section of the State Tax Revenue Limit, the Maximum Property Tax Rates or the then existing tax rates in the case of School Districts shall be made in the first fiscal year of transfer or operation. Such adjustment shall remain in effect for each subsequent fiscal year.

Section 11. Economic Estimates Commission.

(a) There shall be an Economic Estimates Commission consisting of the State Comptroller; the Director of the Department of Finance or an appointee of the Governor as designated by him; and a designee appointed by the Legislature who is not a member of the Legislature, selected in a manner provided by the Joint Rules of the Legislature. The Commission shall act by a vote of two-thirds of its membership. The Commission Chairman shall be designated by the Governor. The Commission shall utilize the resources of existing State agencies in carrying out its duties.

(b) The Commission shall determine and publish, prior to April 1 of each year, the State Tax Revenue Limit for the following fiscal year by making and publishing all necessary estimates and calculations as provided in this Article. If this Amendment is not effective prior to April 1, 1974, the Commission shall determine the State Tax Revenue Limit for fiscal year 1974-75 as soon after enactment as it can act. If it does not act prior to July 1, 1974, the State Tax Revenue Limit for fiscal year 1974-75 shall be the amount of the State Tax Revenue as here defined for fiscal year 1973-74. The Commission shall also determine and publish such estimates of the State Tax Revenue Limit as are necessary for the orderly and proper development of State budgets. If the Commission does not act to determine the State Tax Revenue Limit before July 1 of a fiscal year, the State Tax Revenue Limit for that fiscal year shall remain the same as for the previous fiscal year.

Section 12. Computation of State Tax Revenue Limit.

(a) The State Tax Revenue Limit for a fiscal year shall be computed as the dollar sum of

(1) the greater of the following:

(i) the dollar amount derived by multiplying together the State Tax Revenue Limit Income Quotient for the specified fiscal year and the State Personal Income for the calendar year in which the specified fiscal year commences; or

(ii) the dollar amount derived by multiplying together the State Tax Revenue Limit Population-Inflation Quotient, the State Population for the calendar year in which the specified fiscal year commences and the Consumer Price Index; plus

(2) the dollar amount increase or decrease to the State Tax Revenue Limit authorized for that fiscal year pursuant to Sections 5, 9 and 10 of this Article.

(b) Beginning with the fiscal year 1989-90, or with a fiscal year in which the State Tax Revenue Limit Income Quotient is no greater than 0.0700, the Legislature, by statute passed by roll-call vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, may terminate further reduction in the State Tax Revenue Limit Income Quotient. Thereafter, the State Tax Revenue Limit Income Quotient shall be maintained at the level reached in the fiscal year in which such statute is enacted; however, an-

nual reductions may be reinstated by statute passed by roll-call vote, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring.

(c) If the statistical series used to determine the Consumer Price Index, State Personal Income and State Population, as defined in Section 16 of this Article, are recomputed by or succeeded by new series reported by the United States Department of Commerce or the United States Department of Labor or a successor agency of the United States Government, the State Tax Revenue Limit Income Quotient or State Tax Revenue Limit Population-Inflation Quotient shall be redetermined in accordance with the recomputation of new series, and the redetermined quotient shall be used in computing the State Tax Revenue Limit for the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year in which the quotient was redetermined.

Section 13. Bonds and Pensions.

(a) Nothing in Section 3 or in any other provision of this Article shall limit the taxes levied or otherwise to be levied or appropriations made for the payment or discharge of any indebtedness of the State and the interest thereon heretofore or hereafter authorized by vote of the electors, or State notes or other securities issued in anticipation of the collection of taxes, and all bonds or other indebtedness of the State shall be payable from taxes of any kind or character which may be levied by the State without limitation of rate or amount.

(b) Nothing herein contained shall limit any indebtedness or liability of Local Entities or School Districts which has been duly authorized by a vote of the electors there. All taxes or assessments required to be levied or collected for the payment of indebtedness so incurred may be levied upon all property subject to taxation or special assessment by the Local Entities or School Districts without limit as to rate or amount, and the Maximum Property Tax Rates applicable herein shall not apply to the payment of indebtedness so incurred. The Maximum Property Tax Rates applicable to Local Entities shall not be applicable to obligations to levy taxes under the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 or to the authority of Local Entities or School Districts to levy and collect taxes to pay for Local Entities or School Districts retirement and pension benefits pursuant to laws which have been, or may in the future be, approved by the voters.

Section 14. Severability.

If any portion, section, subdivision or clause of this Article, or the application thereof to any entity, person or circumstance, be declared unconstitutional or held invalid or deemed unenforceable for any reason, the remaining portions of this Article and the application of such portions to other entities, persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Section 15. Implementing Statutes.

(a) The Legislature, by statute, shall establish procedures for elections required by this Article, shall appropriate funds for any Statewide special election called pursuant to this Article and shall enact any other statutes necessary to carry out the provisions of this Article.

(b) The Legislature, by statute, may determine the fund or funds from which transfers to the Tax Surplus Fund, as established by subdivision (a) of Section 2 of this Article, shall be made, unless this Constitution restricts the use of a designated fund to other specified purposes. In the absence of statutory provisions, transfer to the Tax Surplus Fund shall be from the State General Fund.

Section 16. Definitions.

(a) "State Tax Revenue" means the revenue of the State from every tax, fee, penalty, receipt and other monetary exaction, interest in connection therewith, and any transfer out of the Tax Surplus Fund other than for tax refund, except Excluded State Revenues are not part of State Tax Revenues.

(b) "Excluded State Revenues" means

- (1) The following receipts:
 - (i) Intergovernmental transfer payments;
 - (ii) contributions and deposits to, receipts of, income of and proceeds of capital transactions of Employment Trust Funds;
 - (iii) revenue derived from a specific tax levied as permitted in Section 6 to the extent such revenue is used to meet an Emergency Situation;
 - (iv) proceeds from the sale or issuance of State bonds or notes;
 - (v) grants and contract income for projects or research sponsored and funded by non-governmental agencies;
 - (vi) internal fund transfers such as inter-fund or inter-agency transfers, revenue, reimbursements, abatements, advances, loans, repayment of loans;
 - (vii) proceeds from the sale of investments and the redemption of matured securities;
 - (viii) proceeds from the sale of real and personal property;
 - (ix) gifts, donations, bequests to the State;
 - (x) endowment income;
 - (xi) service fees and charges derived from projects which are financed by revenue bonds secured solely by the revenue of such projects to the extent that such fees and charges are used for the payment of principal and interest on such bonds.

(2) The following fees:

- (i) proceeds from the activities of the University of California and the State University and College System, including, but not limited to, student tuition and fees and post-secondary education income derived from housing, parking, food service, students union fees, book stores or similar enterprises;
 - (ii) non-commercial fish and game fees, assessments and other revenues;
 - (iii) service or use fees levied by the Department of Parks and Recreation;
 - (iv) income from environmental license plates;
 - (v) revenue derived from State-owned parking lots and garages.
- (3) Fees which meet all of the following criteria:
- (i) the service or product for which the fee is paid is generally available from a non-State source, or the fee is collected solely to regulate a non-commercial, non-professional, non-criminal activity other than those referred to in Article XXVI;
 - (ii) the fee collected is used to defray all or part of the costs of the State in providing the service;
 - (iii) the payer of the fee receives the benefit derived from payment of the fee; and
 - (iv) are designated by statute as Excluded State Revenues.

(c) "Intergovernmental Transfer Payments" means dollar amounts received by the State of California from the Federal Government or any Local Entity or School District except those taxes, fees and penalties imposed by the State and collected by the Local Entity or School District for the State.

(d) "Employment Trust Funds" means the Unemployment Fund, Unemployment Administration Fund, Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund, Old Age and Survivors Insurance Revolving Fund, Uninsured Employers Fund, State Compensation Insurance Fund, State Employee Contingency Reserve Fund; and the Public Employees Retirement Fund, Teachers Retirement Fund, Judges Retirement Fund, Legislators Retirement Fund and other similar retirement funds.

(e) "Expenditure." As used herein, an expenditure occurs at the time and to the extent that a valid obligation against an appropriation is created. For the purpose of capital outlay in connection with this Article, a valid obligation shall be considered to have been incurred when the Legislature appropriates the funds.

(f) "Emergency Situation" means an extraordinary occurrence requiring unan-

icipated and immediate expenditures to preserve the health and safety of the people.

(g) "Maximum Property Tax Rates" means the property tax rate or rates and ad valorem special assessment rate or rates for any Local Entity.

(h) "Local Entity" means any city, county, city and county, chartered city, chartered county, chartered city and county, taxing zone, special district or other unit of government encompassing an area less than the entire State, or any Statewide district, or any combination thereof in existence on the effective date of this Article or any such entity established thereafter. Local Entity does not include a School District.

(i) "School Districts" means the entities specified as parts of the Public School System in Article IX, Section 6, of this Constitution and includes Community Colleges but does not include the State University and College System.

(j) "Estimated State Tax Revenues" means the dollar amount of State Tax Revenues as estimated by the Economic Estimates Commission.

(k) "State Personal Income" means the estimate made by the Economic Estimates Commission of the dollar amount that will be reported as Total Income by Persons for the State of California for the specified calendar year by the United States Department of Commerce or successor agency in its official publications.

(l) "State Tax Revenue Limit Income Quotient" means:

(1) For the fiscal year 1974-75, the number derived by:

(i) Dividing the sum of Estimated State Tax Revenues for the fiscal year 1973-74 by the State Personal Income for the calendar year 1973, and

(ii) Subtracting 0.001.

(2) For each fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year 1974-75, the number derived by:

(i) Dividing the State Tax Revenue Limit for the previous fiscal year by the State Personal Income for the previous calendar year, and

(ii) Subtracting 0.001.

(m) "State Population" means the estimate made by the Economic Estimates Commission of the number that will be reported as Total Population of the State of California for the specified calendar year by the United States Department of Commerce or successor agency in its official publications.

(n) "Consumer Price Index" means the number reported as the Consumer Price Index for the United States (Base year 1967=100) by the United States Department of Labor, or successor agency of the United States Government, for the most current month in its latest official publication.

(o) "State Tax Revenue Limit Population-Inflation Quotient" means the number derived by dividing:

(1) The Estimated State Tax Revenue for the fiscal year 1973-74 by

(2) The State Population for the calendar year 1973 as multiplied by the Consumer Price Index available to the Economic Estimates Commission at the time it computes the State Tax Revenue Limit for fiscal year 1974-75.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of, the Private Calendar. I hope this might be of some

value of the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the five House calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all private bills are referred. Private bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions and so forth, as distinguished from public bills which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only five were private laws. But, their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress—1885-87—the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available—passed 1,031 private laws, as compared with 434 public laws. At the turn of the century, the 56th Congress passed 1,498 private laws and 443 public laws—a better than 3-to-1 ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee of the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62d Congress changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause 6, which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932 and then adopted in its present form on March 27, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills: first, those authorizing the payment of money for pensions; second, for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims procedure; third, those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream; or, fourth, those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising post-war and cold war flood for private immigration bills. The 82d Congress passed 1,023 private laws, as compared with 594 public laws. The 88th Congress passed 360 private laws and 666 public laws.

Under rule XXIV, clause 6, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesdays of each month. The consideration of Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Private Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained. Bills unobjected to are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month

the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection.

Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph, and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matter so stricken out shall not again be included in an omnibus bill during the session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved into their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed severally.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follow the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order. When the previous question is ordered on a Private Calendar bill, the bill comes up for disposition on the next legislative day.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the official objectors system the House has established to deal with our great volume of private bills.

The majority leader and the minority leader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar objectors during a Congress. The objectors are on the floor ready to object to any private bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Seated near them to provide technical assistance are the majority and minority legislative clerks.

Should any Member have a doubt or question about a particular private bill, he can get assistance from the objectors, their clerks, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The great volume of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. Those rules limit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the calendar is called. The agreement is as follows:

Reaffirming the policy initially adopted on June 3, 1958, the Members of the majority and minority Private Calendar objectors committees have today agreed that during the 93d Congress they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of 7 calendar days, excluding the day the bills are reported and the day the Private Calendar is called.

It is agreed that the majority and minority legislative clerks will not submit to the objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

This policy will be strictly observed except during the closing days of each session when House rules are suspended.

The agreement was entered into by the majority objectors—the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentle-

man from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS)—and the minority objectors.

I feel confident that I speak for my colleagues when I request all Members to enable us to give the necessary advance consideration to the private bills, by not asking us to depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

A CLARIFICATION ON MAGNOLIA LIQUOR CO.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1972 a report was furnished the Select Committee on Crime by Mr. Aaron Kohn, director of the Metropolitan Crime Commission in New Orleans, and he testified before the panel with respect to this report.

Certain portions of this report were reported in the press and certain of these stories effected Mr. Malcolm Woldenberg, Mr. Stephen Goldring and their firm, Magnolia Liquor Co., Inc., of New Orleans.

The impression received by some persons because of this publicity was that these individuals and their firm were the subject of the investigation. This, combined with the name of the Select Committee on Crime, was harmful and detrimental to Mr. Goldring and Mr. Woldenberg and to their business activities, particularly through Magnolia Liquor Co., Inc.

As a result, Mr. Moise S. Steeg, Jr., representing them, paid a visit to Mr. Joseph Phillips, chief counsel of the Select Committee on Crime. Mr. Steeg explained all the circumstances concerning the various matters to which Mr. Kohn testified and the correspondence I am inserting at this point in the RECORD is the result of this discussion. In the interest of fair play and in order to give the matter some clarification, I include the following correspondence:

AUGUST 3, 1972.

Mr. STEPHEN GOLDRING,
Mr. MALCOLM WOLDENBERG,
Magnolia Liquor Co., Inc.,
New Orleans, La.

GENTLEMEN: As you know, on August 2, 1972, I met with the Chief Counsel for the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C. I had a very frank discussion with him concerning the testimony of Aaron Kohn before the Committee insofar as it related to you individuals, as well as Magnolia Liquor Company. I left with him full documentation of each of the transactions mentioned in this testimony.

Mr. Phillips explained that the purpose of the Committee is to investigate such evidence as comes before them to determine first whether any further investigation is necessary and second whether such investigation will provide the basis for legislative action.

He further explained that the Committee does not give, in effect, a "No True Bill" as does a Grand Jury. All that the Committee can do is determine whether or not it will proceed with further investigation. I will re-

port to you as soon as I have heard from Mr. Phillips.

Very truly yours,

MOISE S. STEEG, Jr.

AUGUST 11, 1972.

Mr. STEPHEN GOLDRING,
Mr. MALCOLM WOLDENBERG,
Magnolia Liquor Co., Inc.,
New Orleans, La.

GENTLEMEN: As I wrote on August 3rd, I have discussed the testimony of Aaron Kohn with the Chief Counsel of the Select Committee on Crime. He has now advised me that the Crime Committee has concluded its inquiry in relation to Jefferson Downs and does not intend any further investigation of Messrs. Stephen Goldring, Malcolm Woldenberg and Magnolia Liquor Company, Inc. and their transactions with Magnolia Park, Inc. or its successor, Jefferson Downs, Inc.

I am very gratified with this result and with best personal regards, I remain

Very truly yours,

MOISE S. STEEG, Jr.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON
EDUCATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, I joined with Congressman JOHN ERLBORN in sponsoring a bill calling for a White House Conference on Education in 1975. I today urge its immediate and favorable consideration.

At this time, approximately one out of every three Americans is actively involved in the education process—either as a student or as a teacher. This is a remarkable level of participation and it underscores the high value which our citizens assign to education as well as to emphasize the great importance of education to the general well-being and continued progress of our Nation.

In 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower provided the inspiration and leadership which culminated in the first White House Conference on Education. President Eisenhower asked for the "most thorough, widespread, and concerted study the American people have ever made of their educational problems." President Eisenhower explained:

This study is necessary, I believe, to make citizens realize the importance of immediate and continued action if we are to have agencies that contribute to a well-educated Nation.

This first White House Conference on Education was held in Washington in 1955 and proved to be an important milestone in American educational history and a most significant forum for the exchange of ideas on the improvement of American education.

Ten years after the first conference, Washington again hosted a White House Conference on Education. Convening in the summer of 1965, the second conference came at a time when a major expansion of the Federal role in education—through such legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—was in process. In his message concerning this conference, President Lyn-

don Johnson framed some of the important questions it was to consider:

How can we bring first-class education to the city sium and to impoverished rural areas? Today the children of five million families are denied it.

How can we stimulate every child to catch the love of learning so he wants to stay in school? One million children now drop out of school each year.

How do we guarantee that new funds will bring new ideas and new techniques to our school system—not just simply expand the old and the outmoded?

How can local and state and federal government best cooperate to make education... the first among all of the nation's goals?

Year 1975 will mark the 10th anniversary of the second White House Conference on Education and the 20th anniversary of the first Conference on Education. Today many of the significant questions raised and discussed in these previous conferences remain with us. But we have also made important progress, and, I am convinced, 1975 would be an excellent time to take stock of what has been accomplished within American education over the past two decades as well as to identify what areas need renewed attention and effort.

In addition, since a Conference on Education in 1975 would occur just 1 year before the Bicentennial Year, such a conference could provide a broad forum for the discussion of what ought to be our national education goals and plans as we begin our third century as a strong and independent people.

I therefore hope, Mr. Speaker, that 1975 will mark the occasion for the third White House Conference on Education, and that all Members of both Houses of Congress will join in the support and rapid passage of H.R. 7461, which will help achieve this goal.

NO GROWTH IS ANOTHER WAY OF
SAYING URBAN SPRAWL

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, land-use legislation is an issue that will most likely be addressed by the 93d Congress. In fact, extensive hearings have already been held on a number of land-use bills that have been introduced.

There are many different views regarding the amount of control that different levels of Government should be permitted to exercise in regulating the use of land. I would like to call to my colleagues' attention some thoughts on this subject as expressed by Mr. Bernard H. Siegan in an article that appeared in the March 11, 1973, issue of the Baltimore Sunday Sun. Mr. Siegan is a specialist in real estate law and is the author of the book, "Land Use Without Zoning," which has received a number of excellent reviews. The article by Mr. Siegan follows:

"NO GROWTH" IS ANOTHER WAY OF SAYING
"URBAN SPRAWL"

(By Bernard H. Siegan)

CHICAGO.—Laws to regulate the use of land should recognize at least three objectives: First, land is a precious and scarce resource

and should not be wasted. Second, when and as used, it should be used to satisfy the most or more pressing needs of society. Third, it should be utilized for the benefit and advantage of all people as distinct from any special class or group.

There should be little difficulty in finding consensus on these issues, and many new laws and regulations are continually being proposed and adopted seemingly to achieve the stated objectives. The problem is that these or virtually any laws will generally obstruct and deny them. The fact of the matter is that these objectives are much more likely to be accomplished in the absence of laws than in their presence. In other words, I submit that the best land-use regulation usually is no regulation: No zoning is the best zoning!

LAWS ARE SUPPOSED TO CONSERVE LAND, NOT
WASTE IT

Let me explain this conclusion by discussing in detail the issues in the order presented. With respect to the first objective, there is presently an appalling trend throughout the country to pass laws in the cause of conserving the land that will operate to waste it. I refer particularly to two kinds of zoning regulations: first, those that reduce density, that is, the amount of living units, single family or multiple family that will be allowed on an acre of land, and second, those that prohibit high-rise or low-rise multiple-family construction. To require one house on two acres of land when the potential occupants would be pleased and delighted to have the opportunity to live on a fraction of that amount usually is nothing more than a waste of the land and their money.

Similar reasoning applies to density limitations on multi-family buildings (apartments, condominiums and townhouses) or the prohibition entirely of these structures. (Each floor of an apartment building in effect adds to the supply of land.) There is no surer means for consuming needlessly the land than by forcing persons who prefer to live in apartments or townhouses to live in homes. Frequently, sites for homes for the same number of families will occupy five or even ten times as much land as low-rise apartments do, and the figure is much higher with respect to high-rises.

This trend toward reducing density and forbidding multi-family structures may waste hundreds of square miles. If some of the dire predictions for our environmental future are even partially correct, we will need someday all of this land just to feed ourselves.

LIMITING GROWTH WOULD BAR THE POOR FROM
BETTER HOUSING

Despite this waste and exploitation of a precious natural resource, the environmentalists and conservationists are not storming city halls and burning zoning ordinances. On the contrary, they tend to approve of measures that restrict land use in the belief that this will provide for more open space and green and wooded areas. They want more of nature retained as it is and left undisturbed by development and people. Apparently they only want their kind of earth saved. And this raises the second of the objectives of regulation: use of the land to satisfy our most pressing needs, one of which obviously is for a better environment.

While there is certainly some environmental merit in a "no-growth" or a "controlled growth" position, each is but one approach, favoring and promoting a minority interest at best, and then likely overall to deteriorate rather than improve environmental conditions for many more people. Prohibiting or limiting development will injure the portion of the environment that is unquestionably the most important, that which houses the people and supplies their material needs.

For most people, the home is where the major part of life is spent. It is the place that occupies the time and attention of the wife and children most of each day and where the husband spends most of his time when

not at work. Its characteristics greatly influence the quality of one's life. Similarly, a better neighborhood and greater convenience to work and shopping are most significant environmental goals.

One direct consequence of these anti-development policies will be to deny those who would occupy the new and excluded housing an opportunity to better their environment. Another is that the living conditions of the many dependent on the construction and related industries for their livelihoods will suffer temporarily if not permanently by the resultant curbs on production.

The indirect effects will be considerably more pervasive. Environmental conditions throughout a housing market will suffer. (An entire metropolitan area may constitute a single housing market.) These practices will (a) curtail the filtering process upon which great numbers of people are dependent for better housing conditions, (b) raise generally the cost of shelter, (c) cause worse environmental conditions for many or most apartment dwellers within that housing market, and (d) cause greater spreading and scattering of housing accommodations, something popularly condemned by environmentalists and planners as "urban sprawl."

Filtering in housing occurs when new homes and apartments are constructed and families move into them, vacating their former residences for occupancy by others. The others, in turn, may vacate still other units and the process continues through a number of sequences. A study of this process in 17 metropolitan areas made by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan has shown that on the average, the construction of one new unit makes it possible for a succession of 3.5 moves to occur to different and more likely better housing accommodation. New construction thus benefits more people indirectly than it does directly; 2.5 moves to existing housing and only 1 move to new housing.

The survey shows that more than one third of all those who move are likely to be in the lower and moderate-income categories, and that while most new construction occurs in the outer portions of the metropolitan area, these moves extend to older areas near the center of the city. The nation's worst environmental conditions exist for these income levels and in these areas, and conditions will further deteriorate if housing production is reduced. The housing subsidy programs have done little to alleviate these problems, and improvement necessitates greater housing supply in the private market. Those of higher income who are ineligible for subsidized housing and cannot afford new housing are similarly dependent for better housing on the filtering process induced by new construction. The survey makes it clear (if ever there were doubt) that prohibiting new construction seriously harms the groups that are most in need of a better environment.

When construction in a housing market is curtailed, owners of existing rental properties will be among the primary beneficiaries. Prices increase and competition decreases when production is not allowed to respond to demand. In the case of apartments, rents will be increased either directly through the amount actually charged or indirectly, through reduction in services, repairs, maintenance and improvement, or probably in many instances, through a combination of all or most of these. Higher rents will cause more doubling-up, increasing density within areas containing these buildings. These conditions will be intensified as the filtering process is halted. The end result will be much poorer housing conditions for a great many people and further deterioration for marginal and older buildings and areas. Buildings will remain in service that otherwise would be removed. More people will be paying more for the same or a lesser quality of housing.

Demand will continue

Although the anti-development pressures will curtail much construction, they cannot stop it all. The demand for new housing will remain largely unabated, and it will be forced to locate in the places of least resistance, where opposing political pressures are absent or limited. The most likely areas for this to occur will be those of small population, principally the more rural and outlying sections, areas which otherwise would not be in demand. The result will be a greater proliferation or scattering of housing and all of the problems and detriments which come with "urban sprawl." This includes the cost of installing new or extending existing sewer and water facilities, and building new or wider roads and highways. More telephone poles and utility lines and generating stations will have to be installed. The cost of schoolbus transportation will increase. More people will be spending greater amounts of time driving to and from work and shopping. And much open space and green and wooded areas will be disturbed or destroyed by this intrusion of housing and related facilities.

Similarly, more severe density restrictions will cause housing to spread out, also necessitating the installation of more streets and other facilities and creating greater burdens and inconvenience for more people. Obviously a two-acre minimum lot size will require generally the installation of more lineal feet of road than a one-acre restriction. An apartment or townhouse project containing many more times the number of residents will require only a fraction of the lineal footage of pavement needed for a single-family development. This raises the interesting question as to whether horizontal or vertical construction is more incompatible with or damaging to nature and the wild.

ZONING LAWS FAVOR THOSE IN POWER, FROM THE SUBURBS

We come now to the third objective of laws regulating the use of land: they should not operate in a discriminatory manner. The land should be utilized to enhance the human condition of all, rich and poor alike. However, zoning laws do not and cannot operate indiscriminately. Zoning laws are controlled through the political processes of government, and therefore serve the interests, values and standards of the most politically influential people in the community.

As a result, zoning laws have been used deliberately to exclude would-be tenants and less affluent home-owners from much of the suburbs and many parts of the cities. Development has been curtailed and made more expensive. This is not only harmful to the interests of those who would like to move in, but also, as I have indicated, to a great many others in our society.

Nor have the exclusionary practices arisen as a consequence of recent environmental concerns. They have existed since the advent of zoning, and have been promulgated and defended under a succession of holy banners: sound planning, aesthetics, property rights and values, fiscal stability, home rule, etc. The reasoning and pretexts have varied over the years and among communities, but the results have been basically the same.

Not rich, not poor

Zoning on a state level is not likely to solve the problem of exclusion because most state legislatures are suburban-rural dominated. Legislators from these areas frequently represent the same point of view as the local politicians who adopt zoning ordinances. The state will probably provide token recognition for the housing problems of the less affluent through some provision for subsidized housing for moderate and low income families. It is doubtful, however, that such tokenism will accomplish little more than to assuage the consciences of the law makers. It certainly will not serve the large numbers of

people not poor enough to qualify for subsidized housing and not rich enough to afford new housing. Massachusetts enacted legislation in 1969 to overcome suburban intransigence towards subsidized housing, and its experience to date suggests that very few of those who would be eligible will ever benefit from such laws.

Some may contend that only chaos and instability will result in the absence of zoning. There is a clear and pragmatic answer to this argument: it is the land use experience of Houston, Texas, the nation's sixth largest city in population and third or fourth in area. That city has never adopted zoning. In its place, it has adopted a very limited number of specific land-use ordinances designed to cope with specific land-use problems, such as requiring a minimum lot size for single family (5,000 square feet), street setbacks, off-street parking, location control for slaughter-houses and a few other uses, and density limitations on mobile homes. (The city does have building, subdivision, traffic and minimum housing regulations.) Houston has no density controls on rental units (other than the provision for off-street parking) and few location restrictions.

Restrictive covenants

These regulations together with the competitive forces of the market place and the use of restrictive covenants by land and property owners (which are enforced by the city) control the use of property in Houston. Restrictive covenants are private legal agreements that generally prohibit multi-family, commercial and industrial uses within a single-family subdivision. Real estate is certainly no less stable or valuable in Houston than in other major cities. Nor is land necessarily utilized to maximum density. (If it were, only high-rise apartment buildings would go up and there are relatively few in Houston.) Some people live on big sites, others on small sites, depending largely on income and how they choose to spend it. And probably overall, there is no more proliferation of different uses than elsewhere, residential sections remain about as devoid of factories, gas stations and hamburger franchises as they would under zoning.

There is a minimum of political control over land use in Houston. The local councilmen cannot impose or remove restrictions on any land or property for the benefit of those politically influential. No individuals or groups, therefore, can through the political process dominate either directly or indirectly, the environment of others. Why should they?

PEOPLE'S LOBBY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written recently by Robert S. Allen for *Hall Syndicate* concerning a very questionable instance in the most recent Democratic administration. The column follows:

PEOPLE'S LOBBY

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, April 28, 1973.—John Gardner unquestionably would indignantly deny it, but apparently he is not above the pharisaical practice of "do as I say, not as I do."

As the militantly liberal head of Common Cause, multi-million dollar self-styled "people's lobby," Gardner is a highly vocal and aggressive crusader and reformer. Particu-

larly, he and the organization he founded and rules are inveterately anti-Nixon Administration and pro-Democratic.

But as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the Johnson Administration, Gardner permitted some amazing fund juggling to finance a study of doubtful value—if any at all.

Evidence indicates it was a gross waste of taxpayers' money—and a shocking instance of bureaucratic chicanery.

The backstage story is a jolter. It involves Gardner, then-Education Commissioner Harold Howe and other HEW officials—all up to their eyebrows in this astonishing affair.

In substance, what they did was to divert \$500,000 appropriated by Congress for one purpose to something entirely different.

In addition, the deal included two other savory tidbits: \$15,000 manipulated from Office of Education funds for another purpose; and a junket to Paris for one of the high-flown Ph.D. participants.

Intricacies of this eye-popping operation are detailed in a report based on a comprehensive investigation initiated by Representative Edith Green, D-Ore.

For years as ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee and now as an influential member of the Appropriations subcommittee on education, the one-time schoolteacher has vigorously assailed and exposed Office of Education mismanagement, waste, illegal backdating of contracts totaling tens of millions of dollars, and other malodorous practices.

The unpublished investigative report says evidence points to then-HEW Secretary Gardner as having "made the decision" authorizing the highly improper, if not illegal, fund juggling.

BALD AND BRAZEN

As uncovered by the investigation, following is what happened in this astounding instances of blatant bureaucratic skulduggery:

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, Title III, stated, "Secretary of HEW is authorized to conduct . . . a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio . . ." But while authorizing that, Congress didn't vote the money for it.

Whereupon, Education Commissioner Harold Howe, undeterred by the lack of such an appropriation, decided to proceed with the study anyway—by the simple device of using funds appropriated for Title VII of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA).

Simple, all right, albeit wholly improper—if not outright illegal.

Says the report, it is "not clear who really decided to fund the Title III study with Title VII funds." But Commissioner Howe, in a memorandum to Gardner "implied Gardner made the decision."

Adds the report pointedly: "There is no record of consultation or correspondence with members of Congress or with key committee chairmen concerning this switch of funds . . . Throughout the duration of the contract, there is ambiguity as to whether this was a Title III (Public Broadcasting Act) or a Title VII (NDEA) study."

Also caustically noted by the report is that the files of the contract "contain no records of any meetings of the Commission set up to make the study (by Gardner) and we have no way of knowing whether this Commission did anything at all during its existence."

Similarly significantly noted is that when Gardner established this "Commission on Instructional Technology," no mention was made of Title III. Instead, "the entire matter was viewed as an NDEA Title VII project."

But a few days later, HEW Undersecretary Wilbur Cohen wrote to Representative Daniel Flood, D-Pa., chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee on HEW, presenting the study as taking place under Title III. From then on, declares the report, "this was clearly

the presentation of a flat accomplish, a fitting symbol of the Office of Education's stance throughout this affair toward congressional intent."

MORE GALL—AND DUPLICITY

Previously, Gardner had been plainly informed about the fund juggling.

He was told about it in a "briefing memorandum" from Donald Simpson, Assistant Secretary for Administration, who stated clearly, "Title III authorizes you to conduct a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio. . . . Funds have not been provided under Title III of the Public Broadcasting Act; therefore the study will be conducted using funds under the National Defense Education Act (Title VII)."

Indignantly comments the report: "That statement is exceptional for its boldness. 'No funds have been appropriated under Title III, therefore the study will be funded in another way.' Not therefore that there will be no study! But therefore we will use other funds appropriated for something else."

Another jolting revelation of the probe is that the director of the study was paid "for 90 percent of his time during the 14 months of the project at a full per annum rate of \$36,000." Also that two others working only part-time got \$20,000 a year; another even less time, \$18,000; and four others still less, \$16,000 a year.

In May 1970, five weeks after the last extension of this extraordinary contract, a form letter was sent to the \$36,000 project director acknowledging receipt of the study—which is described as consisting of a "massive compendium of papers filling over eight volumes and 3,000 pages of typed script."

Strangely, however, none of this voluminous material "is in the files nor could it be located anywhere in the Office of Education." Adds the investigative report:

"This is the more remarkable inasmuch as part of the material was subsequently published as a committee print of the House Committee on Education and Labor—although there is no record at all in the files as to how the material got to the Committee or why the Committee published it."

Capping even that enigma is the following: Eight days after the submission of this huge study, the project director was officially informed it had been found "satisfactory;" in other words, it was formally approved.

Sardonically comments the investigative report, "Eight days to evaluate that material and declare it satisfactory! Obviously, no one read it; certainly not a single word of a written review or evaluation can be found in the files. The project had thus come to a 'successful' conclusion."

But that isn't all. One last vignette serves as a fitting close.

An "international workshop on educational technology" to be held in Paris was called to the attention of the Office of Education. Whereupon a memorandum was sent "to the proper authorities" recommending participation in the meeting at OE expense—the money to come from the "planning budget, a heretofore untapped source." Three OE officials, all Ph.Ds., were suggested as junketeers.

"When the smoke cleared," concludes the report, "only Dr. C. Ray Carpenter seems to have attended the Paris sessions . . . at the expense of the Office of Education."

It is noteworthy that in all of Gardner's wide-ranging fusllading and pot-shotting as head of Common Cause, not a word has ever been said about the Office of Education backdating of contracts running into the tens of millions of dollars and various other bureaucratic hijinks.

It's very strange how he has somehow managed to miss these costly antics.

PEACE IS NOT AT HAND IN THE TV WAR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to announce that a young man from my home town, Mr. John Frost, a senior at Peoria High School won the American Legion's National Oratorical Contest on April 12, 1973 at Queens College, Charlotte, N.C. As a result John was awarded an \$8,000 scholarship and will address the national convention of the American Legion to be held in Hawaii in August.

Interestingly, this is only the third time in 36 years that a contestant from Illinois has reached the finals. However, on all three of those occasions the contestant from Illinois won the competition.

The contest consists of a 10 minute prepared oration on the Constitution and a citizens duties under the Constitution. There is also a 5 minute extemporaneous discourse on a phase of the Constitution which is chosen at the site of the contest and for which each contestant has 5 minutes to prepare.

Needless to say all of us in Peoria are tremendously proud of John Frost since this is the first time that a contestant from Peoria has ever reached the finals, and it is a tribute to his ability that he was able to come out on top in his first effort.

I insert a copy of his award winning speech in the RECORD at this point.

PEACE IS NOT AT HAND IN THE TV WAR

(By John Frost)

There is a war going on in this country. The sides are firmly drawn and each is armed by some of the most powerful forces man has ever unleashed. Each day the armies fortify and re-fortify their trenches. Strafing runs and shelling are hazards well known to these antagonists. Casualties are mounting, and week upon week brings a new offensive where one faction attempts to out-manuever, out-flank, and crush the enemy. The bloody conflict drags on. Peace is not at hand.

The war I speak of is not that of nation against nation, ideology against ideology, or culture against culture. Rather it is a conflict which matches today's electronic media bolstered by the First Amendment, against the federal government, supported by the powers implied in the U.S. Constitution. Both sides possess a huge stockpile of inventive and are quite expert at creating smoke screens that cloud the vital issues at stake. Only a public that can see through the haze will be able to correctly judge this Constitutional fracas.

Let's take a look at TV as a combatant. Yes, television is the great sorcerer of our time. It has the ability to attract a man's eyes and captivate his attention for hours on end. The hypnotic effect of the electronic media is its source of power over our society.

Its fantastic intensity probably would have forced Will Rogers to change his observation that what he knew was what he read in the newspapers, because today, according to the Harris Polls, for millions of Americans knowledge is what they see or hear on their television sets. Whenever networks broadcast news, editorialize, produce documentaries, or even carry political announcements, they can be-

come the presiding judge in the national trial of controversial issues.

As the late President Lyndon Johnson said in a speech delivered to the National Association of Broadcasters, "You of the broadcasting industry have enormous powers in your hands. By your standards of what is news, you can cultivate wisdom or you can nurture misguided passion."

One must concede that the television industry has not been immune to the danger of "nurturing misguided passion." A contempt citation investigated by the House of Representatives against CBS revealed that in a network documentary concerning the Pentagon Papers deceptive editing was used in the printed texts of interviews.

Another example of poor judgment exhibited by television is the constant use of violence in its programming. Each evening acts of violence have been piped into our living rooms. Scenes of murder, riots and even the Viet Nam War can be viewed over dessert. We have yet to determine the incalculable damage done to our children who have been eye witnesses to this murder and mayhem.

Partially due to television's lack of self regulation, the Nixon Administration, led by Vice President Agnew, has taken the offensive. In his initial blast the Vice-President said, "A small group of anchormen, commentators, and executive producers enjoy a free hand in selecting, interpreting, and presenting the great issues in our nation—a concentration of power over American public opinion unknown in history."

To reduce the power of the electronic media Clay Whitehead, a top administration aide, authored a plan that would hold local stations responsible to the FCC for the networks' programming. The proposed legislation was designed to eradicate alleged bias in network newscasting by giving the FCC the right to indirectly censor the networks.

So we see that the federal government in its fight with the electronic media is trying to strengthen its position by using the powers implied in the Constitution.

But from behind the shield of the First Amendment another great hue and cry is heard. It emanates from our nation's newsrooms. Has the Administration in its rage against verbal indignities molested the letter and the spirit of the Constitution?

Well, in 1786, Thomas Jefferson wrote, "Our liberty depends on freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost." Jefferson's beliefs were echoed by our founding fathers, men who intended to create a fourth estate with the press an equal power to the executive, legislative, and the judicial branches. Indeed, the First Amendment clearly states that Congress shall pass no law abridging the freedom of the press.

Through the FCC and its control of licensing the U.S. government is actually acquiring levers through which it can control television and deny the freedom of the press.

A case in point is a Jacksonville, Florida station's attempt to get a license renewal. You see, WJXT had a hand in blocking the Supreme Court's nomination of G. Harold Carswell by uncovering his endorsement of segregation. WJXT's application to the FCC was challenged by a group headed by President Nixon's former Florida campaign manager. If the Administration had wished to do so, it might have pressured the executive-appointed Federal Communication Commission into refusing WJXT's application and thus eliminated its flow of information to the public.

This type of federal action in which the FCC becomes a mere extension of the executive branch is in clear violation of the spirit of the First Amendment and contrary to the intentions of our founding fathers.

Here then a dilemma emerges: should we have an adversary media with little control, or should we have tightly governed television at the mercy of the executive branch?

Nicholas Johnson, FCC commissioner, indi-

cated a plausible solution when he said, "This is a do-it-yourself nation, with a government to match. Ordinary citizens can influence administrative decisions concerning television." Johnson's comments come from the fact that the FCC maintains a file on all licensed stations. Periodically complaints in this file receive attention from the commission. If a citizen writes a letter to the FCC detailing specific instances in which a local station has used poor taste in programming the FCC will have grounds to tell the offending station to reform or lose its operating license.

Such individual action has in the past worked. The practice of broadcasting anti-smoking commercials in tandem with smoking commercials arose from a detailed letter written by a New York lawyer. The proposed takeover of the ABC television network by ITT was stopped by a group of individuals.

By filing complaints to deny license renewals, the individual or groups of citizens can through the FCC solve the existing television crisis.

In the final analysis the people's right to know must reign supreme. The quarrelsome relationship between media and administration must be recognized not as a liability but as a crowning achievement of our forefathers. This interplay can be preserved by insuring that federal control of television reflects not the government's feelings but rather the thoughts and objections of ordinary citizens.

To those in high public office we can only say as Harry Truman once said, "If the means of communication don't like what you do, let them say what they want to say, and if you're in my disposition, you'll get up and tell them where they're wrong."

And on the other hand we must impress upon the television industry that free journalism under the First Amendment does not mean irresponsible journalism completely free of criticism from a concerned public.

It is not necessary that the networks and the government hold a verbal disarmament conference. For indeed, behind all the poisonous words, the anti-personnel phrases, and inflammatory sentences used by the warring sides lies one of the greatest assets of our Constitution.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, if there is one issue that unites the residents of the communities in my district, it is the question of continued funding for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Recently the North Adams Transcript of North Adams, Mass., published in its columns an excellent two part series on the Neighborhood Youth Corps program in its community. The author of this series, Stanley W. Robbins, approached his assignment from the standpoint of what the program has meant to the youngsters who have been participants. Mr. Robbins' story is revealing. The youngsters told about NYC as it is and Mr. Robbins recorded it. At this time, I would like to insert this series into the RECORD:

YOUTH CORPS WORKERS PRAISE PROGRAM— PART I

(By Stanley W. Robbins)

It's easy to determine the immediate financial effect on a community when a federal program is discontinued. It's a simple post mortem to collect a series of quotes from

officials either praising or abusing the dropped program.

What is not very simple or easy is to gauge the effect the program has had on the lives of the people it serviced. All too often the people whose lives have been affected, either for good or for ill, aren't even asked what the program meant to them.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is scheduled to die this June by presidential decree, is a program which enabled many area youths to earn money working on a variety of local, state, and non-profit agencies.

The program is restricted to people between the ages of 18 and 22, all of whom qualify for assistance under federal anti-poverty guidelines.

There are more than 25 youths employed on a year-round basis and more than 200 enrolled in the summer program in Northern Berkshire. All of the jobs pay a minimum wage of \$1.85 per hour and the young people work from 10 to 26 hours each week.

Patricia Cross is 18 years old. She left Freeman School after the 8th grade. She has been with the Youth Corps since then.

"When I left school it gave me something to do," said Patricia. "I like it very much."

"I did leave the Youth Corps once to try and make it myself but it didn't work out. If it goes out I won't know what to do for another job because jobs are hard to get today," she added.

Patricia has worked at the Day Care Center on Summer Street, helping prepare meals. Today she believes she has found a direction for her future career through her work in the kitchen.

Susan Millis is a 17-year-old sophomore at St. Joseph Regional High School who has also been working at the Day Care Center.

"I like it a lot," she said. "Working with children is something I really like, and if it wasn't for the Youth Corps I wouldn't be there."

"I really wish it wouldn't end," she added, "I want other people to get a job too and experience the same thing I have."

"It's got me ready for a full-time job when I get out of school," said Carla Daugherty, a senior at Drury High School.

"I've been working with the Youth Corps since I was 14 and it's really helped me see what I want to be," she said.

Carla has been a secretary in the Youth Corps office since she started with the program. Now she plans to pursue a secretarial career at Berkshire Community College.

She plans to use the money she earned through the Youth Corps to pay for her college education. "It's helped my mother because we have a large family," she said.

"Some of the kids are going to have an awful hard time going to college without the Youth Corps," she said.

"When the Youth Corps goes it's going to be really bad: there'll be kids hanging around all over the place," she added.

"It's given me a steady job and money coming in every week," said Robert Valliers, who is also a senior at Drury High School.

"It's helped me stay in school. There were a lot of times when I felt like leaving, but the fact that I had to go to work meant that I had to go to school too," he said.

Robert has been doing custodial work at the high school for the past four years.

"Now I don't mind going to work and doing work," he said. "Four years ago I would not even think of working."

Regarding the demise of the Youth Corps he said, "There's going to be a lot of kids hanging around doing nothing."

Rose Elmer is planning a career as a pharmacist when she graduates from St. Joseph High School this June, because of what she learned in the Youth Corps.

"You have ideas about working, but when you really work the change," she said. "It just opened up a whole new world of things I never understood or heard about."

Rose has been working in the pharmacy at North Adams Regional Hospital under the guidance of the hospital's pharmacist.

"It gave me a responsibility I had never had before," she said. "I guess it gave me a chance to do things on my own."

"A lot of people kind of look down on the Youth Corps because it's for poor people," she said, "but if it's gone, a lot of kids will be out of a job, and the people who have kids working for them are really going to feel it."

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS LAUDED BY MAYOR—PART II

(By Stanley W. Robbins)

"I think that of all the programs I've seen, my association with this program has been the most favorable," Mayor Joseph R. Biaco told The Transcript in reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which will lose its funding June 30.

"Not only did the program give the kids a chance to earn money, but it gave them the opportunity for a degree of respect—self and otherwise," said the mayor.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided youth in Northern Berkshire with 25 year-round and more than 200 summer jobs over the past year. The youngsters range from 18 to 22 years old and all of them qualify under federal anti-poverty guidelines.

For the moment it appears as if the Youth Corps will die this June without federal funding.

How do the young people who take part in the program feel about the loss of the Youth Corps?

Eugene Shook, a McCann freshman who has been doing maintenance work at Historic Valley Park, said, "It gets you ready for when you want to get a full-time job and it keeps you off the streets."

"When you're working you don't have to borrow," he said. "I give a little to my mother every week," he added.

"If they're going to shut it off kids could get in a lot of trouble," he said.

"It's a good program."

"I can be on my own now," said Patricia Anton, a Drury senior who has been working in the Clerk of Courts office.

"I learned to plan for a career really," she said. "Also I think I saved the city a lot of money for the court office."

"I was hoping my little sister would be able to get jobs like that," she added.

"I know the Youth Corps has kept me out of trouble for a couple of years," said Peter Rarick, a freshman at St. Joseph Regional High School.

"I've had money in my pocket and I don't steal," he said, adding, "When I'm working I don't have time to take and hang around the streets and get in trouble."

Peter has done janitorial work at South Forty Alternatives, Emergency Trips, the YMCA, and most recently at Greylock school.

"I bought myself a new bike, and all my clothes for the past three years," he said. "If it wasn't for the Youth Corps I wouldn't be able to go bowling on weekends like I like."

"I know I'll always support the Youth Corps," said Peter. "They pay us a minimum wage and you can't do better about that."

Bonnie Parsons, who is attending night classes at McCann School to earn a high school equivalency diploma said, "It was my only chance."

"I was married at 18 and my husband couldn't get a job. He just got back from Vietnam and he couldn't find work, she said.

"Now I have a chance to finish my schooling and I have a chance to do work I enjoy," she added.

Bonnie has been working as a secretary at the Youth Corps office for the past two and a half years.

"It's not only good for me but all the other low-income families," she said. "If the Youth Corps stops it will hurt me completely."

Stephen Monette, who is also working toward his high school equivalency diploma at night, has done janitorial work for the past three years at the Armory, Brayton School, and starting this week at the North Adams Police Station.

"People always say there's not a lot of custodial work, but there is," said Stephen. "I enjoyed a lot of the custodial work. It taught me not to quit."

"My father's deceased and my mother's not working and the money's been very helpful at home," he said.

Regarding the demise of the Youth Corps, he said, "Without the Youth Corps there'd be nothing. A lot of people will be out of work and a lot of people appreciated the work that was done by the Youth Corps."

"We have nine kids in my family and my father's been laid off all winter," said Bonnie Dargle, a sophomore at Hoosac Valley High School.

Bonnie has been working in the school's secretarial office for the past two years.

"If the Youth Corps goes, I won't have any money," she said. "And I'll tell you a lot of people appreciated the Youth Corps, especially me."

"Without the Youth Corps I wouldn't have been able to afford clothes, a class ring, and my class picture," said Darlene Marshall, a senior at Hoosac Valley.

"I think it's bad if it goes because I know there are lots of kids who can't get jobs. I don't ask my mother for money any more," she added.

Dennis Mazza has been doing janitorial work at Hoosac Valley for the past three years. He is a junior at the school.

"It's given me quite a bit," he said, "It keeps me busy and it keeps me out of trouble."

"When I heard President Nixon was taking \$200,000 from the program I got real upset," said Dennis. "It helped me spend money wisely and now I'd like to stay with custodial work."

"It definitely made me stay in school because it gave me a great opportunity," he said. "The Youth Corps gave all these kids a chance to see what it was like to work and to earn money without running to mommy and daddy for more money," he added.

"I hate to see the Youth Corps go, that is all I can say."

NIXON ADMINISTRATION HOUSING POLICIES WREAK HAVOC ON HUMAN LIFE IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, now that the freeze on congressionally authorized Federal participation in subsidized housing has moved into its fifth month, I felt certain my colleagues and the Nation would like to know the kind of damage it has caused the overall housing program in New York City.

While we have learned that we cannot appeal to the conscience of the Nixon administration, I hope that the specter of the needless waste of millions of dollars combined with the irreparable damage to millions of lives will begin to sway the White House to totally lift the freeze and allow an orderly phase-in of the needed improvements of the Federal role in housing.

Following is the article:

HOUSING: MONEY IS THE KEY
(By Joseph Kahn)

Q. What is the city's housing picture?
A. In a word, bleak, certainly for new construction.

Q. What are the facts?
A. This is the year of the big freeze and left out in the cold is 90 per cent of the city's population—our low and moderate-income families. According to Housing and Development Administrator Andrew Kerr, only 9000 units of new construction for low income families will be underway this year and none thereafter because of the federal subsidy freeze. And with 15,000 units a year abandoned, another 13,000 demolished, there isn't much to cheer about.

On the other hand, for the middle and upper income wage-earners (\$20,000 a year and over for a family of four, comprising 10 per cent of apartment dwellers) the housing supply is increasing substantially. Last year, 7000 fully private units and 20,000 under the city's partial tax exemption program were started and in the very near future there will be a surplus of such units.

There is another discouraging factor lower income groups must face. The state's almost two-year-old vacancy decontrol law, which decontrols an apartment when it is vacated, has snatched 144,000 units out of the rent range of poorer families. With rent increases on the average up 90 per cent, the city administration and tenant organizations have joined forces and are now attempting to get the Legislature to repeal the law.

Q. If new construction is a lost cause for the near future, what about rehabilitation?

A. Officials agree the major task is to maintain existing rent-controlled housing for lower income families and to work for a reversal of the federal freeze so the 35,000 units already approved by the federal government and in the pipeline can get built.

Despite mounting criticism of the Maximum Base Rent system, which gives a landlord who keeps his building in good shape a 7½ per cent increase yearly until a computer-set increase is reached, Rent Commissioner Nathan Leventhal is convinced it is a sensible and feasible program and it will eventually work out to the advantage of both tenants and landlords.

There were 400,000 violations removed by landlords in order to qualify for raises under the MBR program. In addition, the city has expanded code enforcement, the emergency repair program, the housing repair and maintenance project, and has improved the complaint bureau. Last year, 500,000 violations were listed in response to almost 500,000 calls from tenants and many were corrected.

The City Council, under tenant pressure, is repealing MBR, but the measure will probably be challenged in the courts on the ground the action violates a state law forbidding local interference on rent control. The tenants claim that many landlords are not properly maintaining their buildings with MBR funds allocated for the purpose.

The city also has broadened its receivership program, which allows a takeover of abandoned buildings where tenants remain and use rents for repairs and maintenance. There are 114 buildings in the program with another 200 expected this year.

In addition, the reorganized Municipal Loan rehabilitation program has been expanded and the city is now attempting to get banks and lending institutions to participate, both to increase the leverage of city money and to protect their own investments in various communities.

A new co-op conversion program which allows tenant-ownership of buildings in low or moderate income areas, is going ahead and looks very promising. Finally, the city is pushing legislation to enable speed-up of ex-

isting programs, including taking title to a building after one year of tax arrears instead of the present three years. Also, new bills would allow rehabilitation loans for one and two family homes (restricted to multiple dwellings now) and permit the conversion of unused ground-floor commercial space for apartment use.

Q. What's happening with Mitchell-Lama, the city's major tool for housing middle income families?

A. Last year new construction under the tax-abatement program reached an all-time high, with starts of over 6,400 units. Many of the projects had the federal Section 236 subsidy mortgages attached which cuts interest from about 7 per cent to 1 per cent, thus reducing rents from \$90 a room a month to approximately \$40.

But, with the federal freeze, it is unlikely there'll be much Section 236 money around.

Q. How are the existing projects doing?

A. Unfortunately, not too well. They are still the biggest bargains in town, but many of them are having money troubles and face rent increases. Operational and financing costs are going up and some buildings have fallen into arrears. Others are in the red because they are not collecting surcharges from residents over the income limits.

The HDA found in a survey of 300 tenants that 38 per cent were under-reporting their incomes. Surcharges are important because one-half goes into the building's operating fund and helps alleviate rent increases. The other half is used to subsidize elderly tenants.

To verify incomes, the HDA asked tenants for permission to automatically inspect their city tax returns, but a City Council bill last month said no. The agency, however, may continue to demand income verification on an individual basis, and, of course, may take legal and administrative action against housing companies which do not comply with surcharge regulations.

The city administration has proposed in its legislative package in Albany several benefits to Mitchell-Lama buildings: 1. Tenants whose incomes rise more than 50 per cent above admissions levels, now required to leave, be allowed to stay if they continue to pay proportionate surcharges 2. Tenants be allowed to deduct, when computing gross income, all medical expenses above 3 per cent of gross income. 3. The age of eligibility for a subsidy be reduced from 65 to 62 and the maximum income requirement be cut to \$4500 from \$5000.

Q. Is there a chance of any money for housing coming into the city? What about revenue sharing and President Nixon's community development program?

A. The city has received about \$300-million from revenue-sharing, but not a dime goes for housing. It has been allocated for capital projects. As for Nixon's community development block programs, even by his own schedule, they can only start by July 1, 1974.

Keer says the funds, which will be below the total the city is now receiving under categorical grants can only be spent on acquiring land and not to build housing.

Most of the city's rehabilitation efforts come out of city monies, specifically from the city's debt incurring capacity and the capital budget. Involved primarily are the Municipal Loan, co-op conversion, and the Mini-Loan programs which are self-sustaining, and for this reason, the city can commit unlimited amounts of money.

Over the next few years, the city's rehabilitation programs will be aimed at self-sustaining projects. The city's Housing Development Corp. also has substantial debt incurring capacity; however, it too cannot provide the interest subsidies necessary to build housing to serve the low and moderate income families.

The city also has proposed to the Legis-

lature a local FHA-type mortgage insurance agency for rehabilitation in slum areas. An initial capital of \$7.5 million would insure up to \$150 million worth of mortgages.

Q. Can private builders do more?

A. Sure, but without subsidies, they can't rent what they build. They are overstocked with upper-income apartments and are playing a waiting game. But there are some who are doing something. The impetus has been the city's partial tax abatement program. To qualify, owners must rent new units at 15 per cent below comparable market rents and put them under rent stabilization for 10 years. This city is seeking renewal of this legislation in Albany this year.

The city also has a new zoning provision which permits the construction of three-family houses instead of two-family ones. It is anticipated at least 10,000 units will be started in the next two years.

Q. Is relocation a problem?

A. Yes, and city housing officials say it has gotten worse under vacancy decontrol. But the need for relocation units will drop to some extent due to the federal freeze on subsidies for urban renewal developments which will have to be cancelled. This means instead of relocating families, the city will have to maintain the run-down buildings on the renewal sites.

At the same time, emergency relocation work continues for families who are forced to move because of fires and to make way for public improvements such as schools and police stations. Relocating large families is still very difficult, and will become worse as new public housing comes to a virtual halt.

Q. What can be done about the demolition of basically sound rehabilitable housing?

A. It is crucial that the city limit as much as possible the demolition of existing low and moderate income units. Last year in Manhattan, 4400 units were torn down for new construction, rehabilitation and conversion of units at higher rents. The city now closely scrutinizes requests for evictions to make sure there is no harassment of tenants and that the new construction is marketable. In cases where certificates of eviction were not granted, the courts have sustained the city.

Q. Will the new housing court help code enforcement?

A. Yes, even with several defects in the law, by taking housing violations out of the Criminal Court, it is expected the backlog of 700,000 violations will be disposed of faster and with better results. In the past, landlords were only fined about \$13 per case on the average after months of delay. Now, fines can go up to \$100 per violation for each day it exists.

The city's housing officials also point out that state funding is inadequate to provide for cyclical inspections of buildings. Instead of providing 50 per cent of enforcement cost, the state is only contributing one-third.

Q. Is there no solution to the housing crisis? What can be done?

A. The key to decent living quarters is money. Everybody knows it, but the question is where is it to come from. HDA head Andrew Kerr says the money is in Washington, but it is not being used for housing!

"The Federal Housing and Urban Development budget was cut in half, from \$4-billion to \$2-billion, while the Defense budget was increased. It may seem a tired refrain, but the priorities are simply wrong."

Obviously, the President must be convinced. Two years ago, it was suggested a massive public works construction program be started which would produce 500,000 units a year. Minority workers could be recruited for the work, and in this way not only would housing be built, but unemployment would vanish.

In the meantime, while the vacancy rate remains low in the city and apathy continues in Washington and new construction for the

lower income families remains a dream, the city must put all of its resources and ingenuity into preserving its existing housing.

CHAIRMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN PRAISES COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND PRESENTS AUGUST A. BUSCH, JR., BOATING SAFETY AWARD TO ONE OF ITS LEADERS, RALPH W. WRIGHT OF BOCA RATON, FLA.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my most pleasant assignments as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was to participate Saturday night in the annual spring conference of the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, held in Memphis, Tenn., and discuss the important work of this all-volunteer organization as a defense auxiliary in World War II and as an invaluable aid to the Coast Guard during the past 34 years in developing an understanding and appreciation among millions of boatowners of the rules of recreational boating safety.

It was also my privilege to present to an outstanding leader in the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, Mr. Ralph W. Wright of Boca Raton, Fla., the impressive and beautiful August A. Busch, Jr., Boating Safety Trophy originated and awarded by the chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Anheuser-Busch of St. Louis as a form of recognition for unusual contributions by individuals to the cause of boating safety. Among those who have received the Busch award in the past are Admiral Chester R. Bender, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and Rear Adm. Austin C. Wagner, chief of the Coast Guard's Office of Boating Safety.

When the Coast Guard Auxiliary was organized in 1939, there were only about 300,000 motorboats operating on the waterways of the United States. Today, the number exceeds 8,000,000 and is expanding daily, as more and more Americans of all ages and occupations develop an interest in this form of recreation. Their very number and the diversity of their equipment would create safety problems of incalculable dimensions if it were not for the work of the Coast Guard in enforcing laws passed by Congress to regulate boating practices, and if the Coast Guard did not have the dedicated assistance in education, inspection, and accident prevention—and in rescue operations, too—of private boatowners who have joined the Auxiliary and contributed their time and effort and equipment to help make the waterways safer.

Because of the widespread interest among so many American families in recreational boating, I submit herewith the remarks I made Saturday night at the spring conference of the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, followed by the presentation of the August A. Busch, Jr., Boating Safety Trophy to Mr. Wright:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN (DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI) CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, AT ANNUAL SPRING CONFERENCE OF U.S. COAST GUARD AUXILIARY, HELD AT MEMPHIS, TENN., SATURDAY, MAY 12, 1973

Thank you for inviting me to be with you here in Memphis tonight, and for affording me the distinct honor of speaking to you on the occasion of your Annual Spring Conference. I am pleased to join you not only because of your dedicated involvement in matters of interest to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, but also for the very personal reason that you are meeting here in the State of Tennessee, which, together with my own State of Missouri, occupies an important segment in the Great Mississippi River inland waterway system.

I am particularly glad of this opportunity since it allows me to express to you my admiration and appreciation for all the many things that you have done—are doing—and which you are yet to do—in lending your talents, your time, and your resources to the cause of boating safety.

As I was considering what might be appropriate for me to discuss here tonight, I was reminded of a story of a former Chairman of my Committee, who was invited to give the commencement address at the Coast Guard Academy some years ago—before the days of air conditioning. The story goes that he decided to select a topic that he could be sure would be of interest to his audience—so he spoke to the new graduates—for about two hours—on "The History of the Coast Guard". I am certain that the new ensigns received no special pay for "extra hazardous duty", but I am equally certain that they began their new careers with some reservations about Committee Chairmen!—And that hot, humid June afternoon in Billard Hall must have made the phrase "carrying coals to New Castle" even more pungent in their minds.

So—don't be worried that I intend to give you a lecture on the history of your very fine organization—even though that history is well worth relating. I hope you will forgive me, however, if I may occasionally refer to some facet of that history as I speak tonight.

I think that most people who have an interest in recreational boating are generally aware of the activities of the Coast Guard Auxiliary in the promotion of boating safety—and the expansion of those activities in recent years.

FROM 300,000 TO MORE THAN 8 MILLION

No longer is the ownership of a recreational boat limited to the privileged few, wealthy enough to maintain yachts with permanent crews, or who, living a life of leisure, can indulge themselves with extended cruises on their own vessels. Today, recreational boating has expanded so that it is enjoyed by the masses of citizens, many of whom are anxious to obtain temporary relief from the hectic nature of their daily lives by a quick retreat for an evening or weekend of boating, whether they have in mind fishing, traveling, sightseeing, or simply relaxing on the water, away from the "madding crowd". The very attraction of boating, however, with the chance to "get away from it all", is threatened as more and more people, with increased incomes and more leisure time, become aware of its availability. Even those with average means have found that such activities are within their reach.

Unfortunately, we see evidence every day of the fact that too many new boaters think that all they have to do is get a boat, fill up with gas, load it down with as many people as they can squeeze on board, add the weight of their food and gear, crank up the engine, and sail away!

In 1939, when your organization had its beginning, there were about 300,000 motor boats operating on the waterways of the United States. Today that number has expanded to over eight million and continues to increase daily. With increasing numbers come increasing problems, and those of us who are most concerned must make certain that those problems do not "swamp" us for lack of attention.

There are several outstanding organizations which are interested in fostering better knowledge of the marine environment in order to promote boating safety. Among these are such organizations as the U. S. Power Squadron, the American Red Cross, and the National Safety Council, but none shines more brightly as the beacon to novice boatmen than yours, the Coast Guard Auxiliary. I would hesitate to think what chaos might exist on our national waterways if it were not for your dedicated efforts in both prevention and cure!—If you did not already exist, someone would have to invent you.

INVITATION TO TRAGEDY

As the boating public rapidly expands, many people are not aware of a changed environment—from that of their daily lives—when they get out on the water. They know perfectly well that before they can drive an automobile, they must take lessons, learn the traffic laws, obtain a driving license, gain experience gradually, and above all, use good judgment and common sense whenever they are on the road.

Somehow, the lure and novelty of operating a boat often seem to lead beginners to think that they need neither experience nor preparation. It is then that tragedies occur, and it is in this area of ignorance that your organization with its training program and its many promotions of safety practices can make its greatest contribution—to protect the recreational boater against the foolhardy, including himself, and thereby to insure the best possible atmosphere for the safety and enjoyment of all.

The development of recreational boating in this country has some things in common with the development of the country itself. As our nation expanded westward in its early days, it was quite often man against nature, and survival depended on being prepared against the natural dangers of the unsettled frontier. In boating, in its infancy, survival was generally dependent only upon being prepared against the natural dangers of storms and uncharted waters.

Today, problems are somewhat different. Our country and its survival now depend not so much upon being prepared for natural dangers, but upon resolving the conflicts which arise from increasingly crowded conditions in our society and from conflicts between individuals. Similarly, in boating, in addition to the continuing natural dangers of hidden reefs and sudden storms, more likely sources of danger arise from the increasingly crowded conditions of our waterways, and the threats to each other as boaters vie for space. To be really safe, we must recognize both sources of danger, and we must as we can, eliminate them.

LAWS TO PROMOTE BOATING SAFETY

Over the years, the Congress has attempted to face up to the problems of boating safety. In advancing steps, for instance, the Motor Boat Act of 1940, the Federal Boating Act of 1958, and the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, have each declared specific national policy and set certain standards to be followed. The Coast Guard has been given the important responsibility for implementing and enforcing those, and similar, laws.

In carrying out its implementing responsibility, the Coast Guard has long been aware that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," and has generally tailored its boating safety programs consistent with that basic approach. It should be no surprise, therefore, that as far back as the 1930s, there was active initiative to create a volun-

tary auxiliary to the Coast Guard, which could carry the message of boating safety directly to the boating public and by educating that boating public in safe practices, could promote the enjoyment of recreational boating without the imposition of unnecessary restrictions and without many of the tragedies which could otherwise follow. In the Coast Guard, Admiral Russell R. Waesche, then Commandant—whose son, incidentally, also a Coast Guard admiral, recently served in my city of St. Louis—was most responsible for pushing this concept, and he was inspired, and supported in his efforts, by some of the concerned citizens who themselves later took an active role in the formation of the Auxiliary.

The birth of the Coast Guard Auxiliary took place with the Coast Guard Reserve Act of 1939, and because many people are not aware of the early activities of the Auxiliary and its membership, this is one facet of your history that I would like to touch upon.

SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II

With the outbreak of World War II, which found our country relatively unprepared, both in equipment and trained manpower, many additional responsibilities were assumed by Coast Guard personnel. As the war threatened our own national security, the Coast Guard undertook expanded patrol work, port security activities, explosive loading supervision, and other similar responsibilities—and the rapidly expanding Auxiliary assumed its share of the load. After Pearl Harbor, and the later submarine threat off our shores, over 1,000 Auxiliary vessels were taken into the Coast Guard Reserve and many Auxiliarists enrolled in the Temporary Reserve in order to man those vessels. The wartime contribution of the so-called "Corsair Fleet" and the Coastal Picket Patrol were in large part due to the dedication of the Auxiliarists who volunteered their services until the expansion of the regular Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve was sufficient to accomplish the tasks assigned. That part of your history is, at least to the general public, a relatively unknown one and yet one for which the nation owes this organization its deep appreciation.

With the end of the war, the Auxiliary regrouped and began anew—to carry out its fundamental mission in boating safety—and over the years, it has continued to make its valuable contribution.

PURPOSES OF THE AUXILIARY

The basic purposes of the Auxiliary are listed in the original law and are continued today in Chapter 23, Title 14, of the U.S. Code. Because they were well conceived in the beginning, they still persist in their original form, with only minor changes in wording. If I may paraphrase them, they include the promotion of safety and the effecting of rescues; the promotion of efficiency in motor boat operation; the fostering of knowledge of, and compliance with, boating safety laws and regulations; and facilitation of other operations of the Coast Guard. In all those missions, you have been very successful. Consistent with them, you have inaugurated your courtesy motor boat examination program; you have instituted training programs both as to equipment and as to operations; you conceived and were primarily responsible for the institution of an annual National Safe Boating Week, thereby publicizing safety programs to the public; you have conducted routine safety patrols on the waterways of the country; you have sponsored marine safety broadcasts; you have successfully completed many rescues; you have contributed your assistance and your vessels at times of natural disaster in the aftermath of hurricanes, earthquakes, and tornadoes; and what is most timely as we meet here tonight, you have rendered sorely needed assistance to those who have suffered personal danger and property loss through periodic floods.

I will not attempt to place a specific value on your efforts—how can I?

AID TO THOSE IN DISTRESS

How can I quantify the benefit of a life saved, of personal distress relieved, of personal danger averted? What is the value of your sponsorship, as I am told, of over 300,000 training courses, and over 300,000 courtesy motor boat examinations given in just the past year? And, all these things are in addition to the protection afforded to actual property which has been preserved.

I am told that the Auxiliary has assisted over 38,000 persons in distress, and that almost 400 lives have been saved as a result of your efforts. And, what results can we attribute to the more than 30,000 safety patrols and the almost 8,000 support missions which have been accomplished by your dedicated members?

In any case, for all the reasons which I have referred to, I am very happy to be here to express to the 35,000 men and women of the Auxiliary, from the newest recruit to the National Commodore, the thanks and appreciation of a grateful public for your noteworthy deeds and your outstanding achievements over the years, most of which have been accomplished at great personal expense and personal effort—often at the risk of your own lives. What is most impressive to me is the fact that you have done these things because of your genuine concern for your fellow man.

To Admiral Bender, and to the other officers of the Coast Guard, I commend you for your support of the work of the Auxiliary.

I strongly urge the entire Coast Guard, wherever there is a unit, to cooperate closely with these volunteer citizens, and with their assistance to encourage a greater effort in promoting the safety of our waterways and in protecting the people who use and enjoy them.

I know that you will all understand my feeling, and I am sure the feeling of other Members of the Congress concerning the importance of the work which is being accomplished by this group of dedicated citizens. We ask of the Coast Guard continuing reports on the activities of the Auxiliary, and we solicit any suggestions to us as to how we in the Congress may contribute to the betterment of this splendid organization.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you again for permitting me the pleasure of joining you on this occasion.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I submit the remarks I made in presenting the award to Mr. Ralph W. Wright, of Boca Raton, Fla.

PRESENTATION BY CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN OF THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE OF THE AUGUST A. BUSCH, JR., BOATING SAFETY TROPHY TO RALPH W. WRIGHT

I have dual roles here tonight and in now presenting this beautiful August A. Busch, Jr. Trophy to Mr. Ralph W. Wright, I am representing Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Anheuser-Busch and its Chief Executive Officer. This highly prized and beautiful award signifies the appreciation that one of America's major corporations has for the outstanding leadership which Mr. Wright has exhibited to promote, to encourage, and to carry out one of the world's outstanding safety programs in connection with boating.

Mr. Wright joined the Auxiliary on 25 November 1965 and has served nobly in each of the four cornerstones of the Auxiliary. He has been a qualified Courtesy Examiner since 1966, a qualified Instructor since 1966 and attained the high rank of an AUXOP in 1971.

He held the elected position as Flotilla Commander of Flotilla 36 and under his excellent leadership, the Flotilla won the exclusive Gold Cup Award for the greatest contribution towards boating safety in the nation in 1969, and was, additionally,

awarded the National Board Trophy by the Auxiliary National Board in 1969.

He was the recipient of the Coast Guard's Certificate of Administrative Merit for excellent services in furthering the aims of the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary.

He was appointed to his current high National staff office in May 1971 and has certainly extended great zeal and professionalism to the National Public Education Program. While in this office he contributed to the supervision and writing of part of the booklets that now are a part of the successful twelve lesson public education course.

His continued drive has produced additional slides for the seven lesson sail and 12 lesson courses. Recently, under his direction, the new educational material presented at this Conference became a reality.

He is a gentleman in every sense and has added immensely to the lofty goals of the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

Mr. Wright, no one knows better than you do how much work needs to be done and it is the sincere hope of all of us that you will continue your efforts in this direction. On behalf of Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., I express the thanks and deep appreciation of his company and all of the thousands of people throughout the United States and present to you the August A. Busch, Jr. Trophy.

THE RESTRUCTURING OF OEO BENEFITS THE COUNTRY

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1973 an article appeared in the Albuquerque Tribune in which Mr. Howard Phillips, head of OEO, explains his policies and goals during the restructuring of OEO.

Mr. Phillips comments are very interesting and I include them to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

DISMANTLING OF OEO SEES NEED TO RESHAPE DOMESTIC POLICIES

(By Lee Stillwell)

WASHINGTON.—Howard Phillips, the man in charge of dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), sees his role as helping President Nixon reshape the nation's domestic policies.

Phillips says the public controversy surrounding him these days doesn't affect him or his goal of closing OEO's doors at the end of June.

"It honestly doesn't bother me . . . to me, the reality of things is more important than the appearance of things. In five years most of the accounts of what happened will be forgotten but the reality of what happens will speak for itself."

YOUTH CHAIRMAN

Phillips first worked for Nixon as his Massachusetts youth chairman during the 1960 campaign while still a Harvard student. He believes the "Domestic Nixon Doctrine" is of revolutionary proportions.

"More generally known as the New Federalism, this doctrine will in my view prove even more consequential in the history of human liberty than his achievements in foreign policy," Phillips said.

This belief has given Phillips the determination to achieve the deadline of dismantling OEO by June 30, sending programs the Nixon administration believes are workable to other agencies while killing those it feels are not.

REALLY CONVINCED

A tall, intense man of 32 who wears conservative suits and keeps his hair neatly

trimmed, Phillips says: "I really am convinced that what I am doing is the right thing."

He sees the elimination of OEO and its policies as a way of reversing the power flow, giving it back to the people while taking it away from what he calls "bureaucrats."

"People have a right to decide for themselves," he says. "Why should a bureaucrat have the right to make your mistakes for you . . . ? You should be able to make your own mistakes or your own successes. It's a mistake to think all the talent in this country lives on this side of the Potomac River."

LOCAL AUTHORITY

"If you are going to get good people in local government, you have to give them the authority to make decisions of greater significance than what color do you paint the fire truck."

Phillips said the transfer of OEO programs to other agencies should provide better efficiency and more self-determination for communities:

"What we are doing is not a negative thing . . . it is a positive thing. We're not ending the federal government's federal poverty program . . . we're giving it new life by giving it a chance to be effective."

DEFENDS CUTBACK

Phillips defends one of the more controversial aspects of the plan, eliminating the one-third federal funding of the nation's 907 Community Action Agencies this fiscal year.

"We're not in a position to say which Community Action Agencies are good and which are bad; we are saying local people have to make that decision," Phillips said, pointing out that local governments have the option of funding good programs fully.

He said a legislative committee in Massachusetts just appropriated \$8 million to continue CAA programs.

LEGAL SERVICES

And he contends the legal services program will be more effective if Congress approves legislation creating a separate federal legal assistance corps.

The current OEO legal services programs employ more than 2,200 lawyers and in many cases they don't merely represent clients, Phillips charged, contending:

"They have been encouraged by OEO to organize groups, publish newsletters, assist lobbying activities, and otherwise engage in advocacy on issues of public policy in ways which do not arise out of the representation of specific clients."

MAY 10—RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to note the historic commemoration of the 10th of May, a joyous occasion for thousands of Americans of Rumanian descent who celebrate this Rumanian Independence Day.

The Rumanian National Committee, like many organizations dedicated to preserving national celebrations of genuine freedom, has maintained an awareness of landmarks in Rumanian history that have taken place on May 10.

On that date in 1866, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania, and thus founded the Rumanian dynasty. Exactly 11 years later, the Principality of Rumania severed her ties to the Ottoman

Empire and proclaimed her independence; and on May 10, 1881, the people of Rumania made their country to the rank of kingdom by crowning Charles I King of Rumania.

That the Rumanian people should celebrate this holiday with all the tributes and reminders of their glorious national past is perfectly understandable. For there is a common quality in each human being that compels him to look to his national past and to identify himself with those moments of national glory. And what is more meaningful, what event is more full of satisfaction, than when a nation asserts its right of national independence from an oppressor and achieves that independence.

Rumania today is playing an increasingly important role in world affairs. The Rumanian people, who once served as a bridge between the Roman and Slavic worlds, are now an important meeting ground between two equally disparate worlds: Western democracy and Soviet communism. For those who believe bridges can and should be built between the two worlds, the example of Rumania is heartening, indeed.

It is, therefore, fitting that those who hold the cause of freedom in high regard should pause at this time to pay respect to the brave Rumanian people.

TRIBUTE TO A POLICEWOMAN

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as one who has always been opposed to discrimination of any kind, whether based on race, religion, age, or sex, I am very pleased to pay tribute at this time to an outstanding police officer who happens also to be a woman.

Diane Hofferty of the Boston Police Department has been cited for bravery beyond the call of duty in the daring apprehension of an armed robbery suspect.

She has been selected along with a number of other exceptional women for excellence in male-oriented jobs. Among the other distinguished Boston women to be so honored are: Muriel Snowden, founder of Freedom House in Roxbury; Sister Suzanne Kelly, dean of student affairs at Stonehill College; Mrs. Edgar C. Bacon, senior graphic illustrator for Bolt, Beranek, & Newman, Inc.; Heidi Mover of Massachusetts General Hospital's endocrinology labs; and Vicki Barletta, president of Travel Castles, Inc. The award winners in the communications field are Natalie Jacobson, co-anchor woman of channel 5's mid-day news; Marilyn Salenger, co-anchor woman of channel 7; and Gretchen Wortham, director of community affairs of channel 5.

They will be honored at a luncheon to benefit Horizons for Youth, the only completely free camp for disadvantaged New England youth. It was founded in 1938 by Julius Stone to bring together boys of varied backgrounds, races, and religions to teach them democracy in

action. This summer about 2,000 boys and girls from 167 different communities will enjoy the benefits at Kiddie Kamp Horizons for Youth in Sharon, Mass.

Policewoman Hofferty will also receive an outstanding woman's award from Boston Federal Executive Board's Women's opportunity committee at a special ceremony in Boston on May 18.

The 24-year-old Boston policewoman grew up in South Boston and was a sixth grade teacher before joining the force in April of 1972.

She is assigned to Boston's District 4, covering the Back Bay and South End areas. Recently, while driving a police cruiser, she spotted the robbery suspect moments after he had allegedly robbed a Newbury Street jewelry store. She chased the man into a South End house where she caught him hiding in a basement laundry room.

Diane Hofferty comes from a family with strong ties to the police department. Her husband, Stephen Hofferty is assigned to the tactical police force; her grandfather was a police officer; her grandmother, a police matron; and she has several cousins who are also policemen.

It was an exploit of daring and courage and Policewoman Hofferty well deserves her public commendation.

More than that, it is reflective of the kind of service given by women in all walks of life. In recognition of the accomplishments of such remarkable women as honored here today, I think it is especially important that the equal rights amendment be enacted. Now more than ever it is essential to affirm our common humanity under the Constitution.

RSVP LENDS PURPOSE TO LIVES OF OLDER AMERICANS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, despite the passage of several important and vital initiatives by this and the 92d Congress, I am and remain deeply concerned about the plight of our older Americans. This extends to services available to them, financial assistance to help them meet the ever-rising cost of living while struggling with a fixed income, and more to the point, in finding ways to lend dignity and purpose to retirement years.

There is nothing "golden" about the "golden years" if they are spent in a constant, futile search for monetary relief and everyday pursuits which would add meaningful activities to one's existence.

One such activity is the retired senior volunteers program—RSVP—operated in conjunction with the Federal Government's ACTION.

How this program is set up and conducted is best described in an article which appeared in the April 1973 issue of Carnegie magazine, published monthly by the Carnegie Institute and Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh, part of which is in the 18th district I represent.

It was written by Mr. James L.

Swauger, assistant director of the museum and because it is self-explanatory, I would like to insert the text of Mr. Swauger's article in the RECORD at this time.

The text follows:

RSVP LENDS PURPOSE TO LIVES OF OLDER AMERICANS

Conversations opened months ago between Walter J. Burke, international secretary-treasurer of the United Steelworkers of America, and me, associate director of Carnegie Museum, now bear fruit in the launching by the union and the museum of a pilot program of union-museum cooperation providing for volunteer participation by retired Steelworkers in the work of the museum. The project is operated in conjunction with the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, one of the Federal government's ACTION programs.

Agreement for joint action came from matching needs. Steelworker officials continually search for interesting, meaningful, and satisfying activities for release of the energies and absorption of the interests of retired union members. Carnegie Museum badly needs (as do all other museums) paraprofessional laboratory and office help for whose employment funds are not available. To Burke and me it seemed logical that union and museum could be of great service to each other.

There are specific basic rules that apply to joint action. Vital to Steelworker decision to associate with the museum is assurance by museum officials that no volunteer will replace a man at a paying job nor prevent a paying job from being established.

The museum's premise is that it seeks and will accept only volunteers whose interest in the work of a particular museum section already exists. The museum does not propose to develop such interest. It seemed to Burke and me that among the retired union people in the Pittsburgh region there must surely be one or two who all their lives had wished they could work with birds or fossils or plants or Indian arrowheads; but who, under the pressure of earning a living, could find neither time nor opportunity to explore and enlarge their interest. Retired, they have the time. The museum proffers opportunity in return for volunteer service providing much needed help to the museum.

Neither union nor museum believes retired people should have to spend money to help the museum. The trail to a source of funds to cover day-by-day ordinary expenses for volunteers, transportation, lunches, and the like, led first to James W. O'Brien at Steelworker headquarters in Washington, D.C. Responsible to Burke's office for Steelworker retiree programs, O'Brien had called Robert W. Baron of Glassport, who works with Steelworker retiree groups in this area, to meet with the two of us to explore funding possibilities. Through Baron's sources, we learned that the Retired Senior Volunteer Program was seeking stations for volunteer services and had funds to cover out-of-pocket expenses for volunteers working at such stations.

Arrangements were thereupon made with Mrs. Bea Miller to accept Carnegie Museum as a station so that volunteers working at the museum are assured their out-of-pocket expenses are covered. Mrs. Miller administers the Federal grant made to the Information and Volunteer Services of Allegheny County for operation of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program in the county.

The program is not a panacea for the needs of all retirees, let alone all retired steelworkers. The museum can probably handle at the very most no more than fifty volunteers. But fifty is fifty more than none, and interesting tasks are at hand.

Opportunities exist for participation in the work of many museum sections: Minerals, fossils, plants, insects and spiders, birds,

mammals, man, environmental studies, exhibits, library, and director's office. Volunteers will soon be needed to man an Information Desk in a new Orientation and Information Hall.

Sample jobs include general laboratory assistance; preparation of fossil specimens; fleshing, skeletonizing, and tagging mammal specimens; preparation of working drawings for exhibit construction; repair and maintenance of spinning wheels and models; collection cataloging; general office work to include typing, filing, and the care of records of various sorts; and many others. Volunteers may come to us with special skills we had not thought of as applicable to one or another of the jobs we've always wanted to do but had never been able to get to. While volunteers will have to possess basic skills for some tasks, others can be learned on the job.

Although the volunteer retiree program is being implemented primarily through the Steelworkers, neither the Steelworkers nor the museum desires to restrict it to Steelworkers. Any retired person can investigate and be considered for a volunteer post at the museum. Initial discussions were held with the Steelworkers because of excellent Steelworker-museum cooperation in programs in the past, and we at the museum know the union has an established communication network through its retiree units so that dissemination of invitations to help the museum will be rapid and efficient. It is through the Steelworkers that the museum readily reaches other formal retiree organizations on a national basis because Baron is a board member of the National Council of Senior Citizens.

Implications of Steelworker-museum cooperation are international. Established here as a pilot project, the retiree program is an example to the more than five thousand museums in the American Association of Museums in the United States, Canada, and Mexico, and for the forty-two hundred Steelworker locals throughout the United States and Canada.

Volunteer service of great value is nothing new to the museum world. Most frequently, volunteer service is a personal affair—a friend of the director or of a staff member, or even (and this is heartening) someone with training, interest, and desire who exhibits initiative by approaching the museum without any personal pre-association and asks to be given work to do. The Steelworker-Carnegie Museum association injects another factor into this picture: the mode of recruitment is institutional. The union as an organization is working with the museum as an organization for mutual benefit. We believe it will result in greater service to both retired people and to the museum.

Inquiries relating to the program should be addressed primarily to Robert W. Baron, Local Union No. 2227—District 15, United Steelworkers of America, 1301 Philip Murray Road, West Mifflin, Pennsylvania, 15122; and to Mrs. Bea Miller, RSVP, Information and Volunteer Services of Allegheny County, 200 Ross Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15219. The museum contact, in instances where neither Baron nor Miller is available, is Mrs. Helen P. Swauger (herself a volunteer), administrative assistant, Volunteer Retiree Program, Carnegie Museum, 4400 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15213.

A FREE MARKET

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in this

Congress about the problem of high prices and what actually is the cause of these high prices in the marketplace. An article recently appeared in America's Future, a fortnightly review of the news, dated April 27, 1973, the comments from which I believe the Members of this House could well benefit.

I encourage review of this article as a matter of course because, in my opinion, many Members of this House have fallen into a "go-along-with-the-drift-of-the-times" attitude by being mesmerized into the belief that the free marketplace can no longer operate with any degree of equilibrium or balance for consumer products. This same me-too philosophy then tells us that the only alternative, is massive Government regulation or control.

This article in America's Future, which was also covered by America's Future Mutual Network Broadcast April 15, 1973, is a searching and thoughtful commentary of this whole issue and I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

A FREE MARKET

INEVITABLE HANGOVER

We seem to be on a national scapegoat-hunt these days—looking for somebody to blame for high prices. In the process, there are all sorts of demands for all sorts of governmental action which, no matter how well-intentioned, will only make matters worse. As we explained recently, high prices are the result of governmental actions and interferences in the free market, and the only way to return to some degree of equilibrium is to let the market operate freely once more.

That isn't yearning after "a nostalgic conception that has gone down the drain," as one reader accused us of doing. It is a fact of economic life in a free society if we wish the society to remain free. And it does no good to blame high prices, as this reader does and as many other uninformed Americans do, on a nonexistent "meat cartel" or "the greedy rush of the food industry to make a killing." Using the word "cartel" in connection with the meat or food industry in America is about as far from the fact as one can get—the food industry being one of the most competitive in our system. And the industry, including what he calls "super-marketism" is a long, long way from making a killing from high prices because its costs have increased tremendously and because, in the case of the super-markets, their margin of profit (about one percent) is so thin that they suffer losses with any decrease in volume.

It cannot be repeated often enough that the cause of high prices is inflation, and that the cause of inflation is deficit spending by governments. It is a fact of history that in periods when government deficits rose, so did prices; when government surpluses appeared, prices adjusted to saner levels. This is particularly so in periods following wars, going all the way back to the Civil War, because wars usually are fought in whole or in part with borrowed money instead of on a pay-as-you-go basis out of taxes. This was most glaringly the case with the Vietnam war, when our people, led by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, thought we could have both guns and butter—that is, fight a war and at the same time spend on all sorts of social projects at home.

Now we are suffering the inevitable hangover. The quickest and safest—but not the least painful—way to get over it is to let the free market have its way. Demands for more rather than less governmental interferences and controls not only will prolong the hang-

over but make recovery from it far more difficult to achieve.

PRICES AND DEFICITS

One does not have to be an economist or fiscal expert to see the connection between government deficits and high prices. We need only heed the lessons of history. In the more than one hundred years since the Civil War, we have had four major periods of rapidly rising prices—some of them, incidentally, far more painful than the present one. Each occurred during and following a war, and each was accompanied by government deficits.

At the end of the four years of the Civil War, the national government's deficit was 40 times greater than at the beginning. During that period prices approximately doubled—that is, rose 100 percent. Then, up to and after 1870, the national government had surpluses instead of deficits—and the price index fell to half of what it had been in 1864.

During and immediately after World War I, the federal government ran great deficits—and again prices doubled. But by the early '20s, the government once more was showing surpluses—and the wholesale price index dropped 74 points from its high in 1919.

The third and fourth major periods of price rise were during and following World War II and the present one during and following the Vietnam war. In both cases they were accompanied by tremendous government deficits.

The price rise during and following World War II was approximately 50 percent, peaking during 1948. Then it began to ease off, concurrently with two years (1947 and 1948) during which the federal government did not have a deficit.

The present price rise—about 32 percent since 1965—is so far the lowest of them all. But it should be pretty obvious from this bit of fiscal history that it will become higher, or begin to ease off, depending on whether we continue to have government deficits or whether some degree of fiscal sanity makes its way into federal government spending.

There is another aspect of government deficits, their inflationary effect and thus high prices, which hardly anyone save a few sound economists ever mentions these days. Those deficits get piled one upon another and become part of the public debt.

We came out of the Civil War with a federal-government debt of about two and a half billion dollars. It was progressively reduced, with a few ups and downs, to a little over a billion dollars until World War I. At the end of that war, it stood at about 25 billion dollars, but again it was progressively reduced, getting down to 16 billion dollars until the early '30s.

Then, with the advent of FDR's so-called New Deal, it started up again, and with World War II wound up at the unbelievable figure of 245 billion dollars.

But the deficits have grown each year since, with a few pauses now and then, and so the debt today has reached the practically incomprehensible figure of around 430 billion dollars.

Advocates of unending government spending and borrowing, of course, tell us that's all right, because the economy has grown, and that the debt really doesn't matter because, to use their favorite phrase, "we owe it to ourselves." They ignore the fact that the interest on that debt is now more than 20 billion dollars a year—an amount which must be paid out of taxes which in turn add to the cost of everything we buy.

MORE, OR LESS CONTROLS?

Believers in a government-managed economy think the solution to all this is more rather than less government controls and interferences, despite the fact that it was these which produced the problem in the first place. However, the dislocations thus produced make proper solutions not only difficult but painful and, of course, politically unpopular.

So far as controls are concerned, they may have a temporary effect, but in the end they only make the problem worse because they interfere with the productivity of the free market and, if not accompanied by governmental fiscal sanity, actually produce shortages.

But most important, a free economy is the only type, whatever its ups and downs, that ever has or can produce the greatest amount and variety of goods at the lowest prices. In such an economy there can be no defense of governmental controls except, perhaps, in wartime. Wars bring dislocations in a free economy because so much energy must be directed to producing destructive rather than productive goods. Therefore, temporary controls, including rationing of goods, may be necessary. Older citizens can remember such an experience during and immediately after World War II. But they also should remember that even in wartime, the controls produced black markets, shortages and rising prices despite the controls.

But controls in a free economy—provided always we want it to stay free—during peacetime are indefensible from the standpoint of long-range correction of economic maladies as well as from the practical standpoint. One does not necessarily have to defend the present high price of meat, for example, to think back to the year following the end of World War II when in many places housewives who did not get to the market early in the morning could not find even a few hotdogs or a half pound of chopped meat; when in other places there was no meat of any kind available; when even institutions and hospitals couldn't buy it for love nor money.

If we can't remember those days, all we need do is look at one of the most controlled economies in the world—that of Soviet Russia, a rich agricultural nation which throughout its communist history, up to this very day, suffers shortages of the most basic food products.

BILL PITTS DEPARTS FROM CAPITOL HILL

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during my 16 years in Congress I have become well-acquainted with many of the able and dedicated people who work on Capitol Hill. Some of them are employed by the individual Members, some by the committees, and some by the leadership.

One of the employees who has labored here diligently and conscientiously for many years is William R. Pitts, more familiarly known as Bill. He worked for several Members, including Thomas C. Cochran of Pennsylvania, Charles Halleck of Indiana, and three Illinoisans, Ralph Church, Charles S. Dewey, and LESLIE C. ARENDS. Bill put in a quarter of a century as an aide to ARENDS, the Republican whip.

Dr. Pitts retired at the expiration of the 92d Congress, but I am sure that he finds plenty to occupy his mind and exercise his numerous talents. My best wishes accompany him as he departs from the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a story that appeared in the De Kalb, Ill., Chronicle:

STORIES A CONGRESSIONAL AIDE CAN TELL

WASHINGTON.—Bill Pitts, longtime aide to house minority whip Leslie C. Arends of Illinois, is retiring from Capitol Hill to his old books and a new pool table.

"I'll miss the hill," says Pitts, a small compact, gray man of 65 whose heavy glasses let his warmth and wisdom shine through. "You feel you're on the inside of momentous decisions. But there are frustrations when your ego has to work in anonymity."

Dr. William R. Pitts, "The old professor" to some of his friends, has a right to an ego, though he'd probably be the last to take an ego trip. For all his college degrees, he's as easy to talk to as your best neighbor.

Bill started out as the "Boy Wonder of Sharon" back in Pennsylvania where he was born in 1907, the son of a steel worker in the rolling hills.

In high school, Bill was bookish and ill at ease with small talk but he was a demon on the debate platform. He made it to the Chicago finals in the national scholastic championship and walked off with the \$2,000 scholarship top prize.

"I was small and slim," Bill recalls. "My stature entered into it a little bit, but I also had a capacity to talk with feeling."

Bill's debate scholarship got him into Brown University, a small Ivy League college for boys in Providence, R.I. By waiting on fraternity tables, working as a night librarian, and picking up some of the endowment money as a debater, he earned his way. He left Brown with a bachelor of arts and a masters in history.

He returned to Sharon during the depression and wangled a job at a "Scotch clergyman's stipend" from the editor of The Sharon Herald. Bill wrote editorials and by-line articles on foreign affairs. This soon led to the knife-and-fork circuit as a speaker at Rotary, Kiwanis and similar club meetings.

When his Methodist minister took a sabbatical and the pulpit replacement failed to arrive in time, Bill was prevailed upon to fill in as a lay preacher. He did so well, he never missed a Sunday in some pulpits in Pennsylvania, Ohio or Indiana.

Bill got to Washington when his editor told Rep. Thomas C. Cochran, a Pennsylvania Republican, he had a young man on the staff who wanted to study law. The editor suggested Bill work in the congressman's office and go to school at night.

That's the way it worked out. Bill attended Georgetown University for some eight years, winning a bachelor's, master's and doctorate in law.

"I wouldn't do it again," says Pitts. "I had an intellectual curiosity. I wanted to be a professor in government."

About the time Cochran decided to return to Pennsylvania to become a judge, Bill married Florence Graham in 1935. She was from nearby Niles, Ohio, just across the line from Sharon, and they had met on a blind date. They're still together as Bill goes into retirement.

With his new responsibilities, Bill wanted a congressman "with a safe district" so he went with Rep. Ralph Church of Evanston, Ill. He even took up residence in Evanston.

When Church lost in a senatorial primary, Bill decided to go into law, but Charles S. Dewey, a Republican running in Church's old neighboring district, said Bill should stay in Washington with him.

"It was too precarious, but he talked me into it," Bill grins.

World War II came and Bill went into the Navy as a deck officer under training for amphibious operations. He got orders to the Navy Department as a special assistant to the renegotiation board and handled all the board's appeals. He dealt frequently with the Navy Secy. James V. Forrestal, who gave him a commendation ribbon.

"I admired him greatly," says Bill. "He was one of the greatest men I ever came in contact with. He was fair and compassionate."

Dewey, Bill's former millionaire congressman boss, was meanwhile defeated for reelection. But when they met again after Bill was mustered out in the rank of lieutenant commander, Dewey persuaded his one time aid to join him at Chase National Bank in New York City where he was a vice president.

"I ended up with the bank as special legal officer attached to the hierarchy," says Bill.

He hadn't moved his family, so when he returned about a year later to pack for New York, he ran into Rep. Charley Halleck, newly-elected majority leader of the Republican 80th congress.

"Oh, great!" Bill said when Halleck asked him to be his aide. "I'd like that."

"The 80th was a great congress," declares Bill. "It passed the Taft-Hartley Act, it balanced the budget, it had a surplus, it initiated the Marshall Plan for Truman and he called it the "Do-nothing congress."

As Bill sees it, it won the enmity of the Democrats because Halleck bottled up in rules and cut back on more federal housing and aid to education and public works project on the premise the administration hadn't spent the money already appropriated.

Halleck he assesses as "an intellectual, impatient and brusque," a man calculated to give prima donnas and slow learners a hard time.

"Halleck was a great leader because he really led. He was also a great speaker. He could ad lib and give meaning to your words. He could adjust the manuscript to the situation when things were moving fast. It was said of him that he "absorbed knowledge through his skin."

His most "dramatic" time with Halleck was the GOP national convention when Halleck was in line for the vice-presidential nomination but Tom Dewey won it.

"The Dewey people, in my judgment," double-crossed Halleck," says Bill. "They promised him the nomination if he could deliver certain delegations. He filled his side of the bargain."

The Republicans lost the house and Speaker Joe Martin had to step back down to the minority leader's post, bumping Halleck. Halleck didn't want the whip post, held by his lieutenant Arends. He supported Arends' bid to keep it and Arends won.

Bill Pitts joined Arends, who has been whip longer than anyone in the history of the house.

Bill spent 25 years as the Illinoisan's whip aide.

Dramatics are not Arends' nature," says Bill when asked to highlight his experience. "But he's a great guy to work for."

Arends would never neglect his district for national affairs, says Bill, although by the same token he takes the whip assignment seriously.

Bill says his worst day came when the bells that call members to the chamber "kept clanging."

"We didn't know what was going on until the cloakroom told us there was shooting in the house and some members were hurt. We heard that a bullet had gone through the leadership desk."

This was where Arends sat. When the Puerto Ricans shot up the house that day, one bullet kicked up a splinter from the desk into his eye, but he was unhurt.

Arends returned to his office shaky and nervous, saying he just "couldn't understand it," Bill recalls.

Bill spent his last day in Arends office briefing his successor, Joseph H. MacCaulay, who had formerly worked for Congresswoman Charlotte T. Reid and other members of the house.

Bill says a good staff man should have a

motto. His has been: "Work unseen, be more than you seem."

EFFECTS OF ELIMINATING COMMUNITY ACTION AND LEGAL SERVICES IN GEORGIA

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the effects of liquidating Community Action Agencies and Legal Services in Georgia would be tragic and utterly inhumane.

Mrs. Merlyn E. Richardson, representing the League of Women Voters of Georgia, has prepared a moving and persuasive statement on the consequences of dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity and, in the process, ending community action programs and legal services.

The statement was prepared for hearings scheduled last month in Atlanta by the House Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities, of which our distinguished colleague, Congressman AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, is chairman. Unfortunately, the hearings had to be canceled when legislation on the House floor unexpectedly required a long session and prevented Members from leaving Washington.

However, this is an important statement and I want to share it with you by placing it in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY MRS. MERLYN E. RICHARDSON

I am Mrs. Merlyn E. Richardson, 755 Park Lane, Decatur, a member of the League of Women Voters of Georgia. I speak to the effect of the liquidation of Community Action Agencies and legal services under the dismantling of the Office of Equal Opportunity. I speak for the need for funding for the Community Action Agency programs and for legislation to establish an independent Legal Services Corporation as a strong national program for legal services.

As you know, the elimination of these programs hits the same level of income citizens in Georgia who have been hurt by the limitation of the amendment to the General Federal Revenue Sharing Act of 1972 which affected Title IV-A and Title XVI of the Social Security Act; people who have been hurt by the impoundment of funds for housing for 18 months—an estimated loss to economy of Georgia of \$380 million plus; citizens who will be hurt under the cuts in the proposed 1974 Administration Budget in medicare and housing, in manpower programs, in health, education and poverty programs; the same persons who will be hurt under limiting regulations governing social services' funding (in the last quarter of 1973, 65,000 people would be deprived and in 1974, 108,538 citizens would lose the helping services). All these cuts come at once with no time to prepare for interim help until other programs begin under proposed special revenue sharing acts.

Please hear now about just a few of the many who will be hurt from the cancellation of funds to Community Action Agencies.

"My children entered OEO Day Care in April of 1966. I have five children and still have two in the center. I am sole support for my children and myself. I feel proud to be able to do this but if it hadn't been for OEO, I would have had to go on welfare

which I do not want to do. Due to the wonderful training and guidance from the center, my children have been well prepared for school and even more important they have learned to share and to help each other and myself. Last year my home burned and my children and I lost everything we had except the clothes we had on. The wonderful people at OEO were a blessing. They helped me to find a house to live in and helped me to get so many things that I needed to start housekeeping again."

Mrs. O. doesn't know whether she is 78 or 100, but she is a senior citizen of limited income who receives \$2 an hour for nine hours of work a week to be a good neighbor and homemaker. She mops kitchens, does some grocery shopping, takes out garbage, makes beds, cleans yards for those unable to help themselves.

"Prior to Mr. B's employment with Operation Mainstream he had been released from several jobs due to his drinking. Thru months later after working on this program, Mr. B. has not missed a day on his job and has not reported to work drinking. He has stated that without the counseling and training he has gotten from Mainstream, things would have been hopeless for him. If this program can be kept in force many others such as Mr. B. could return to rolls of productive citizens."

On July 1, 1973, there will be an absolute loss of \$9.3 million to Georgia covering OEO account 221 grants under Community Action Agencies serving 82,000 persons. There are 21 plus areas which represent Limited Purpose Agencies where the county administers one or two programs such as Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps or Emergency and Medical Services. These 221 account grants range over many areas of needed services which are crucial for the existence of low income individuals and families.

As the people mentioned in the above true-life stories prove, these services allow potentially self-sufficient individuals to achieve independence. OEO has handled the funds for Head Start and \$7.7 million will be lost by end of August unless a new agency is formed. There is also \$600,000 each for summer food programs and for aging that will be gone. \$13.3 million will be lost under the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

There are two sisters whose father and mother are dead and they live with their grandfather who is on welfare. The girls keep house for the elderly man, do all the cooking, make all of their clothes and are excellent students. These girls are entirely dependent on the money they earn from the Neighborhood Youth Corps to buy cloth for their clothes and for school supplies. One girl works in a state-county office and the other works in a county office. Both are doing excellent work and are well liked by their supervisors.

There is a male enrollee who is dependent on the Neighborhood Youth Corps program to stay in school and help with family income. There are five in the family. His father was in an auto accident in the Spring of 1972. He is still unconscious in the hospital. It was learned about six months ago that his mother has cancer. The only income the family has to cope with this situation is a small welfare check, NYC income from enrollee's work and odd jobs enrollee can get on the week-end.

Some of our contacts made in preparing this statement revealed that in many respects, Community Action need is greater in the rural areas than urban parts of Georgia. In communities such as the Coastal Plain Area, 30% of the population is considered low-income and the agency reaches about 50% of these citizens. Resources are few and needs of the poor are seldom articulated without leadership and assistance from Community Action. "We do not try to be a panacea; we cannot cure all the ills but we can and do help the people that have the desire and ambition to get out of poverty and into the

mainstream of life. Our main concern is that an agency is available for those who are striving for a better life."

In one rural area CAA, for example, the following programs are serving the citizens: neighborhood service system, neighborhood youth corps, summer Head Start, community day care services, after school day care for school-age children, alcoholism rehabilitation, family planning, emergency food and medical services, hire-a-mother, operation mainstream, help communities help themselves, handicraft production and sales, business career preparation, nutrition program for elderly, senior opportunity center. The Work Incentive Program depends upon many supportive services to be effective, and these were available through Community Action only.

Mrs. W. lives in a county where there are no job opportunities except in farm labor. She tried to work in a clothing factory, but she could not meet production. She was placed in training by the CAA as a nurses' aide. Her supervisors worked very closely with her, getting her to work on time, helping with personal hygiene, working with her on every detail of her job. By the end of the six month training period she surpassed her peers and became the best mainstream worker in the hospital, and accordingly is currently employed there.

There are situations where only the staying power of the CAA has solved the problems—long drawn out negotiations for tenants of public housing, for eligibility for assistance and for help while such was going on. Everything starts at the Neighborhood Center, for services, referrals and activities. In proposed plans for transfers of some programs we can find no answers for where funding will come for this important focal point.

A phone call to a Neighborhood Center reported a family in desperate circumstances. The mother in the family was on the way to the hospital to give birth to her sixth child. The children in the family were inadequately fed and clothed; the father was seriously ill. The father had always done a good job of providing for his family, but within a few months he was stricken with two different health problems, requiring several months of hospitalization and later home confinement. The family's resources were drained. They turned to welfare and were receiving a monthly allotment by the time OEO came into contact with the family. The money was simply not sufficient.

Through the Neighborhood Center, the family came into contact with resources to help most immediate needs. These resources included the center's Citizens Neighborhood Advisory Council, a group made up of poverty area residents organized to work on issues, but who had an emergency fund for the kind of day-to-day problems that this family was facing—problems that are commonplace for the very poor. OEO's goals and the goal of the family now merge: self-help. Rehabilitation for the father, job training for the mother when the baby is old enough is planned. The mother said "We would have been completely lost without the Neighborhood Center."

As a further result of the termination of the Office of Economic Opportunity, 1181 Community Action Agency employees will be laid off in Georgia. Since the Community Action Agency serves as the umbrella agency for HEW, Department of Labor and other federal and state funds, there is another potential loss of \$33,139,077 in social service programs that employ nearly 1800 people. Many of these employees became employed for the first time in a community action program. They gained dignity when they left the welfare roles and pride as a reward for serving those less fortunate. Over 50% of the total CAA employment is black and about 70% is female.

Atlanta Legal Aid Society, operating out of many centers in the metropolitan area receives some \$670,000 from the Office of Eco-

nomic Opportunity. In 1972, 14,450 cases were handled in the areas of the consumer, civil procedure, landlord/tenant, social security, education and employment, administration of justice. There is also work done in community education, family law, summer internships.

Miss B., a double amputee, faced the possibility of eviction from her home before the intervention of Atlanta Legal Aid. She is 72 years old and not too skilled in reading and writing. Her legal troubles began when she signed a contract with a contracting company for home improvements.

One court decision on a Legal Aid case held that a landlord financed under 221 (d) (3) of the National Housing Act could not comply with procedural due process unless he alleged and proved "good cause" for evicting his tenant. A class action alleged that conditions in a jail for pre-trial detainees amounted to cruel and unusual punishment and denied them due process of law. The court ordered that the top floor of the jail be closed, the bottom floor be refurbished, an emergency exit be constructed. A new jail is now being built.

Thank you for your courtesies in listening and for the opportunity to speak at this regional hearing. The League of Women Voters of Georgia strongly urges you to consider funding for the Community Action Agencies and for legislation to establish an independent Legal Services Corporation.

WATERGATE AND OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this speech on the the Watergate incident and its impact on our political system:

On the night of June 17, 1972, Frank Willis, 24 years old, slim, black, Job Corps graduate, a bachelor, was working as a security guard in the Watergate complex. He noticed tape placed on the latches of two doors, so the doors would not lock when closed. He removed the tape and continued his rounds. He thought the maintenance men had left the tape on the doors, but just to be sure, he returned ten minutes later. This time he found the locks on the doors taped open.

He called the police. The police arrived and they found men, speaking with foreign accents, crawling on the floor of the 6th floor suite of the Democratic National Committee.

The police also found a shortwave receiver, door jimmies, walkie-talkies, cameras, films, tear gas guns, electronic eavesdropping equipment and \$300 in cash.

For eleven months now, the American people have been sent rocking and reeling with one disclosure after another from the Watergate mess.

From this event the variety of incidents known as "Watergate" have erupted, shaking the American people and their government to the very roots.

Consider what we know today, even at this early stage in the search for truth:

In October, 1972, The Washington Post revealed that FBI agents had established that the Watergate bugging incident stemmed from a massive campaign of political spying and sabotage, conducted on behalf of the President, directed by officials at the White House. These activities included:

Following members of the candidates' families,

Assembling dossiers on their personal lives, Forging letters and distributing them under the candidates' letterheads,

Leaking false information to the press, Throwing campaign schedules into disarray,

Seizing confidential files, Planting provocateurs, Investigating potential donors.

The President's campaign organization deluged the President with thousands of telegrams to create the impression that his war politics were enthusiastically supported.

The Attorney General of the United States discussed illegal wiretappings and burglaries and took no action against the persons who made those criminal proposals in his presence.

The President's lawyer and the head of his domestic policy staff discussed whether incriminating documents should be thrown into the Potomac River.

The acting head of the FBI burned documents.

The former Secretary of Commerce and chief fundraiser pressured shady businessmen for large sums of money, in cash.

A member of the White House staff directed the burglary of the psychiatric files of a defendant in a pending criminal case, Daniel Ellsberg. The help of the CIA was obtained for that operation, in direct violation of the law.

The chief domestic advisor to the President met twice with the federal judge presiding over the Ellsberg case, while it was going on, and offered him the directorship of the FBI.

A White House staff member sent one of the Watergate criminals to the State Department to copy diplomatic cables and fake one involving President Kennedy.

The Nixon administration, over a period of two years, placed wiretaps on phones of its own officials and on phones of reporters of 3 newspapers.

The White House repeatedly issued false statements about the Watergate affair, accused the Washington Post and other papers of printing charges they knew to be false, and later asserted that those "lies and slanders" are now to be regarded as "inoperative."

This handful of incidents, randomly selected, only begins to convey the effort of ruthless men to destroy the political opposition, violate the election laws, and alter the very nature of the American political and legal system.

Watergate has raised a variety of questions: Why did it happen?

Looking back at the 1972 election, which the President won so overwhelmingly, many people simply can find no reason for Watergate. These people have forgotten some recent history.

After the 1970 election, Richard Nixon was in trouble. The Democrats had retained solid control of the Senate and the House. They had erased the Republicans' 2 to 1 majority in the nation's governorships. The polls showed Senator Muskie beating him, and Senators Kennedy and Humphrey running even with him.

One of the President's intimates said lately, "The President was walking into a one-term Presidency in the summer of 1971, on almost every issue."

In a most revealing statement, the President was quoted as saying, "the guy who can hurt me the most is Muskie. The guy who can hurt me least is McGovern."

Beyond that, Nixon was surrounded by a group of disciplined, arrogant loyalists who were absolutely persuaded that they knew what was best for the country, and they would brook no criticism or dissent:

Listen to their statements: Charles Colson, a close confidant of the President, put it best: "I would walk over my grandmother, if necessary, to help the President's re-election."

Attorney General Kleindienst, testifying later, said that the President had the power to forbid 2.5 million federal employees from testifying before Congress under any circumstances.

H. R. Haldeman said, "The President is naturally concerned by the kind of criticism that can get in the way of what he is trying to do, and that would be unfair criticism."

These men exhibited an attitude of "anything goes" and utter disdain of the law and the American people.

Their underlying philosophy was that the ends justify the means, that the powerful people know best. Observing the tone of the Nixon men, the New York Times said that Watergate was the "characteristic, almost inevitable, scandal of this Administration."

Was the Watergate just another example of political skull-duggery, the kind of thing every politician does?

To be sure, our historical background in politics contains sleazy tactics, unethical standards in the use of money, dirty tricks, and character assassination.

In Muncie, Indiana, the local paper carried a letter from a reader who pointed out: "No lives were lost, no one harmed, no bank robbed, or large amount of money lost, and so far as we can detect, no one in particular was harmed. It is indeed getting boring."

Governor Reagan said that those responsible for Watergate should not be considered criminals because "They are not criminals at heart."

But Watergate was not politics as usual. It was a flagrant violation of law including:

- Wiretapping
- Burglary
- Breaking and entering
- Conspiracy
- Obstruction of justice
- Sabotaging opponents' meetings
- Putting spies in their offices
- Stealing material from their files
- Forging incriminating letters.

This was not a case of the misuse of power for the sake of acquiring money. It was using money for the sake of acquiring power.

The President may call it an "excess of zeal," but that is a peculiar description for man who:

- Perverted the public trust,
- Deformed the processes of criminal justice,
- Conspired to break the authority of the U.S. government and to break its laws,

And to cover up their crimes.

Watergate is the biggest scandal in American political history. Grant, Harding, Truman had their troubles and one or two officials resigned or were convicted.

So far in Watergate: 7 have been found guilty and at least 13 resignations and firings are related to Watergate;

One Attorney General resigned and has been indicted;

Another Attorney General resigned;

An FBI Director resigned;

An appointment secretary to the President resigned;

The President's two top aides resigned and are implicated;

A Secretary of Commerce resigned and has been indicted;

The President's personal lawyer was fired;

The President's White House counsel was fired.

And we can anticipate a number of indictments and convictions in the coming months.

Why did it take the public so long to believe?

This is one of the major puzzles of Watergate.

Any Democratic candidate in 1972 knew that the people were simply not interested in Watergate. Disclosure after disclosure poured forth between the time of the burglary and the election in 1972, but there was

no outcry from the public. In September, reporters would go for days without hearing a single person voluntarily mention Watergate.

Why?

The people believed the White House. They were not outraged. During the days of Dwight Eisenhower, they could get disturbed about a Vicuna coat. Maybe they were weary after Vietnam. Maybe they were turned off by George McGovern. Maybe their moral standards were not as high as they once were.

In any case, they just did not want to believe that the disclosures were accurate.

All that has changed today, but it took a long time before the American people began to believe the stories.

Was President Nixon himself involved in Watergate?

There is no evidence, either direct or hearsay, that the President understood the broad reach of Watergate before last March 21. On that date he said he heard serious charges and began his own new inquiry into the case.

Newsweek has related two incidents that Mr. Dean, the President's counsel, believes associate the President with the conspiracy, but these stories rest on Mr. Dean's assumptions not on the President's words.

Also, L. Patrick Gray has said that he warned the President on July 6 (3 weeks after Watergate) that some White House aides were meddling with the investigation.

Short of the President, the complicity runs to the edge of the President's desk, but none of the men of the President's inner circle have yet described what they did or what they told the President.

While most experts doubt that the President knew about Watergate in advance, there is much speculation that the President learned of White House involvement once the Nixon-Re-Election Committee had been linked with the wiretappers, and many think it is simply unbelievable that John Mitchell, a long time Nixon confidant, did not tell the President everything he knew about the wiretappers and their plans.

Some, like Senator Brooke of Massachusetts, say that it is inconceivable that the President did not know what his closest associates were doing. They point out that men like Haldeman never took any initiative the President did not want.

Did the President know about the activities of his close associates?

We do not know. But we do know that if he did not, he should have.

Nevertheless, no explicit suggestion has been made that the President was told of the cover-up.

What is the real harm of Watergate?

As the energies of this Administration have been focused on Watergate, a malaise has gripped the Administration. Appointments are unfilled; 59 of them by one count in sub-cabinet, ambassadorial and other top level jobs.

The President's design for his second term has been "disrupted." His chain of command has become unlinked. One White House official said, "The ship of state lies dead in the water." It is a government in turmoil.

Watergate deals yet another setback to the confidence of Americans in government and the integrity and future quality of the political processes in this country. Any right-minded American must ask himself, as he views the impact of Watergate on the already low status of politics and government in the nation today, how much erosion of confidence can our system tolerate and still survive.

What should the Democrats do?

Some Democrats are gleeful about the political fallout from Watergate. They are rushing to the attack, intent upon striking a crippling blow to their political adversaries, and already counting the political victories in 1974. That is the easy, perhaps instinctive, approach for Democratic politicians.

After all, the target is vulnerable, the characters are despicable, and we can attack with impunity from high moral ground. Some would say Watergate is a Democratic politician's dream. But in my view, such an attack is also the wrong approach to a national, and not a party, tragedy.

This is not the time for rejoicing because a political bonanza has been handed to us gratuitously, but rather a time for soul-searching and reflection about the integrity of the political process of this nation.

The appropriate course is to insist upon a careful and complete investigation of the Watergate affair and a full disclosure of the truth, and to join with all men and women of good will to restore confidence in the decision-making processes of the nation.

An independent prosecutor of unquestioned integrity and the highest professional ability should be appointed, and given the resources and the authority to conduct a thorough investigation. It is necessary that the prosecutor be removed from the influence of the presidency.

Impeachment proceedings, and references to them, should be silenced as premature.

For the future there are lessons to be learned from Watergate:

1) An open presidency.

Watergate simply would not have happened had Mr. Nixon conducted his government in public.

He and future presidents need to conduct an open presidency—open to the public, the Congress and the press. They need men around them who represent a broad philosophical base to insure a ferment of ideas. They need contact with the best minds in America and a cabinet composed of the ablest men in America.

The presidential news-conference must be reestablished.

The concentration of power in the presidency must be opposed, and we must return to a balance of the powers of government with a stronger Congress, as envisaged by the U.S. Constitution.

2) Elections.

A whole series of steps must be taken to protect the integrity of American elections.

They include:

Sharp limitations on the size of individual gifts;

Overall limit on expenditures for a given race;

An end to organized interest group giving; Complete reporting of contributions and expenditures;

The creation of a tough enforcement agency to ensure compliance.

3) Finally, we must keep faith in the American political system. At Watergate, some of the people within the system failed us—and that should not surprise or dismay us at any time under any party.

But the system worked—perhaps slowly, but it did work:

A federal grand jury brought the first indictments;

A Federal judge raised the first official doubts about the adequacy of an investigation and expressed his dissatisfaction in open court;

The Congress, much maligned in recent days, kept the affair from being buried;

Senator Ervin's investigation committee assured that Watergate would continue as a major public issue.

Individual members of the Congress played significant roles. Senator Goldwater demanded a full airing of the affair and other Republicans followed. Senator Byrd of West Virginia asked some penetrating questions.

Although much of the press forgot about Watergate, at least a few papers and a few reporters were not intimidated, kept digging in the face of harassment and other pressure, and played their full role as the 4th estate.

If we have learned these lessons—even Watergate may have been worth it.

JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, in March, our beloved former Speaker and distinguished Congressman from Massachusetts John W. McCormack was honored by the people of the city of Holyoke, Mass., by being named the 1973 recipient of the John F. Kennedy National Award. The award is bestowed by the committee planning the annual St. Patrick's Day Parade in that city and yearly recognizes an outstanding American of Irish heritage.

This year's award could not have been given to a finer man, I am sure all of my colleagues will agree. A measure of the esteem in which the Speaker is held in Holyoke was evident in the wide coverage given his parade activities in the city's daily newspaper, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram.

At this time, I would like to insert some of the articles that appeared in that paper about the Speaker and recommend them to my fellow Members of the House:

JOHN McCORMACK NAMED KENNEDY AWARD WINNER

(By Jim Griffin)

John W. McCormack, the son of Irish immigrants who rose to the most important legislative post in the world—the Speakership of the U.S. House of Representatives—has been named this year's John F. Kennedy National Award Winner, by the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee.

The 81-year-old retired congressman from South Boston will join a list of prominent personalities, including the man for whom the national award is named, in accepting the most prestigious presentation the local parade group makes.

42 YEARS

McCormack, who now resides in Jamaica Plain, served a total of 42 years in the House, and led the 435-member body through some of the most significant legislative action in the history of the Congress.

He retired as a Speaker, the successor to the late Sam Rayburn, having served for about a decade in the post. His successor was Carl Albert.

McCormack was the son of Irish immigrants and decided as a young man that he would become a lawyer. He clerked in Boston, and passed the Massachusetts Bar when he was 21.

McCormack continued in public service, but switched from the Army to politics.

He was elected to the Massachusetts legislature, and after serving one term as a representative, decided to become a candidate for the state senate. He did, and he won.

THREE TERMS

McCormack served a total of three terms in the state's senatorial body before running for what is now the Bay State's Ninth Congressional District.

Since then, he has served in the Congress. He became the Democratic Floor Leader in 1940, and the Speaker in 1961.

McCormack, a devout Catholic and eternally devoted to his late wife Harriet, loved politics, but never was a part of the Washington social whirl. He and his wife dined together each night in their hotel suite, and he never took part in various Congressional trips, since he wanted to be at her side.

In December of 1971, Harriet died, and the now-retired Speaker vacated his quarters in the Capitol, and came back to Massachusetts. He continues to work daily at the John W. McCormack Federal Building, in Boston, and has been doing some traveling (he was, for instance, spotted at the Inauguration in Washington last weekend).

The former Speaker now lives with his family, nephew Edward J. McCormack Jr., the former Attorney General, Mrs. McCormack, and their two sons.

COMMITTEE

Included on the selection committee are Dr. John J. Driscoll (the chairman), former Senate President Maurice A. Donahue, William G. Rogers, Atty. Maurice J. Ferriter, the Rev. John J. Mara and Michael J. Moran.

Dr. Driscoll said this morning that the House Speaker will be here on March 17 and will participate in the St. Patrick's Day weekend, receiving his award at the traditional mass at St. Jerome's Church and laying the wreath at the late President Kennedy's Memorial, as well as riding in the parade.

The distinguished award has been presented to President John F. Kennedy, Bishop Jeremiah J. Minihan, Boston Mayor John F. Collins, Bishop Christopher J. Weldon, syndicated columnist Robert Considine, actor William D. Gargan, Atty. James B. Donovan, James J. Shea, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, former light heavyweight boxing champion Tommy Loughran, Democratic National Committee Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Connecticut Gov. John N. Dempsey, actor Pat O'Brien and Air Force Major General Timothy J. Dacey Jr., since 1958.

JFK AWARD RECIPIENT MCCORMACK LAYS WREATH AT KENNEDY MEMORIAL

(By Paul M. Craig)

One of his happiest and most coveted honors is the selection here of former U.S. House Speaker John W. McCormack as the 1973 John F. Kennedy National Award recipient.

The award has been presented by the St. Patrick's Committee annually since 1958 to an outstanding American of Irish descent.

The first recipient was Kennedy in that year when he was also campaigning for reelection as U.S. Senator.

The award was renamed in his honor following the 1963 Dallas assassination.

Kennedy's memory was honored this year beginning at 4:25 this rainy afternoon with the wreath laying ceremony at the monument where Suffolk and Appleton Sts. converge.

McCormack, a long time friend laid the wreath and briefly commented on Kennedy's significance in history being "his decisive action in confronting Khrushchev in 1962 preventing the Soviet Union from installing in Cuba intermediate range missiles pointed at the United States."

FIRST RETURN

This is McCormack's first return to Holyoke in "about 15 years" with many friendships renewed.

Several telephone calls came into the Transcript-Telegram city editor from "long lost" friends asking when McCormack would arrive, his schedule and where he would stay.

Kennedy won his Senate seat in 1952; in that same year Atty. John S. Begley nominated McCormack for president and he carried the state primary then withdrawing so "Kennedy and the rest of the delegation could vote for Adlai Stevenson," McCormack recalled.

He said Begley's speech was "the greatest nominating speech of all the Democratic conventions."

When McCormack learned by phone relay from JFK committee chairman Dr. John J. Driscoll of his selection for the honor by

Holyoke, he thought himself to be "very very happy and highly honored. I never expected it; you don't even think of such things until they select you."

IRISH ACCOLADE

The local tribute is a harbinger of another Irish accolade when on April 12 McCormack will be bestowed an honorary doctorate from the National University of Ireland at Dublin.

He has also been selected man of the year by the secretary's club of House and Senate members, an award which will also be given in April.

Upon learning that he will share the parade route with at least one repatriated prisoner of war, McCormack echoed the returnees' concern for the men still in Vietnamese captivity.

"I'm very happy with their release," he said, and then added "we'll have complete happiness when all the men are brought back with their families."

McCormack will march in the first division, just after grand marshal Timothy J. Sullivan with his aides Daniel J. Reynolds and John K. Bowler, and past parade marshals.

In the second unit of this division, leading the St. Pat's membership will be Air Force Capt. Joseph E. Milligan, with his aide Dr. Francis J. Baker.

Milligan, who has attended both the Chicago and Holyoke coronation balls, arrived at Westover AFB on Feb. 21. He had been shot down over North Vietnam in his F4 fighter on May 20, 1967.

Arriving at 11 this morning at the Holiday Inn, McCormack himself was reunited with old friends in "one of the cities I like to visit. I like the people of Holyoke and their very fine contributions to our country."

Saying he is extremely glad to see old friends, he listed among these Cong. Edward P. Boland and Silvio O. Conte in the latter's case noting "friendship transcends party affiliations."

TV MASS

After his arrival, McCormack lunched at the Log Cabin and following his participation in the Kennedy Memorial, will be at St. Jerome Church where Bishop Christopher J. Weldon will present the National Award during the public televised mass at 6.

From there, McCormack will be guest of honor at the Bishop's reception at Wyckoff Country Club with dinner at 8.

Other recipients of the JFK Award indicate the diversity of the Irish contribution to American life.

They are, Auxiliary Bishop of Boston Jeremiah J. Minihan, D.D., 1959; Boston Mayor John F. Collins, 1960; Bishop Christopher J. Weldon, 1961;

Newsman Robert B. Considine, 1962; actor William D. Gargan, 1963; Atty. James B. Donovan, 1964, who negotiated the release of U2 pilot Francis Gary Powers;

Milton Bradley president, James J. Shea, 1965; Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, 1966; world light heavyweight boxing champion Tommy Loughran, 1967;

Democratic National Chairman Lawrence J. O'Brien, 1968; Archbishop of Boston Richard Cardinal Cushing, 1969; Connecticut Governor John N. Dempsey, 1970;

Actor Pat O'Brien, 1971; and last year Strategic Air Command Chief of Staff Maj. Gen. Timothy J. Dacey.

MCCORMACK FETED AT MAYOR'S RECEPTION AND RETURNED POW IS QUIETLY WELCOMED

Two honored guests made the traditional Mayor's Reception, Sunday morning at Gleason's Townhouse.

Their official guest of honor, of course, was JFK Award Winner, former U.S. House Speaker John W. McCormack, but a surprise and very welcome second guest of honor was Air Force Capt. Joseph E. Milligan, one of the recently released POWs who is cur-

rently stationed at Westover Air Force Base Hospital for de-briefing.

Milligan, in keeping with the low key set by government officials in welcoming POWs, was not greeted with fanfare. He circulated quietly among the gathering along with other Westover representatives. He talked freely of future plans.

The pair were officially greeted by the first family of Holyoke—Mayor William S. Taupier, his wife and children.

Both men proved to delight and excite the many people who attended the reception, which is the sixth such reception hosted by the mayor and his wife, Patricia. Also on hand to help welcome guests were the Taupier's five children.

SILVER HAIR

Erect, silver haired, 81-year-old McCormack was accompanied up the stairs to the "Emerald Room," site of the reception, by several members of the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee among them Leo Hickson and Atty. Maurice E. Ferriter. At the head of the stairs McCormack received a warm greeting by Mayor Taupier and his wife.

The former House Speaker was immediately surrounded by well wishers and many of the area's political leaders pressed in and around McCormack to lend their best wishes to the JFK Award Winner. McCormack appeared relaxed and wanted to shake hands with all the people he was introduced to or who just pressed forward to shake his hand.

GRAND NEPHEW

The Speaker's grand nephew was to have accompanied McCormack; he told friends, however, sickness in the younger McCormack's family prevented the state's former Attorney General, Edward McCormack from coming to the Paper City on Sunday.

Then, following close on the heels of the arrival of McCormack, confusion and excitement was heard downstairs.

Soon Capt. Milligan accompanied by Dr. Francis H. Baker of the parade committee was on the stairs coming up to the "Emerald Room."

The slight, quiet Air Force captain, a native of Annandale, N.J., was introduced to Mayor and Mrs. Taupier, who expressed their personal pleasure the captain had accepted their invitation to the reception and was going to march in the parade.

The 31-year-old former POW was relaxed and in good spirits and told the T-T he had taken in a number of Irish weekend events including the Holyoke's Brian Boru Club's concert held at the Highpoint Inn Saturday night.

The "Irish" Air Force captain ("only on my father's side") says his debriefing and medical exams are just about completed at the base hospital. He expects to be released from the hospital in a matter of a few weeks and then will enjoy a 90-day "convalescence leave in New Jersey with his parents."

The captain who was a prisoner for six years will follow up his 90-day leave with a two-week briefing program at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, especially for former POWs and then possibly 140 days of re-training in flying at Randolph Air Force Base, in Texas.

This is a "maybe" situation says Capt. Milligan who disclosed he has applied for a four-year course which would eventually lead to his becoming an Air Force veterinarian.

If he is accepted in this program of study he will give up his flying career with the Air Force; however he expects to make the Air Force his career and will go for a full 20 years.

Milligan entered the service in 1963 after graduation from college, was shot down over North Vietnam in 1967. All his years in prison will count toward his overall career time says the captain.

His interview with the T-T disclosed the

captain is quiet and very unassuming. He did admit he had some food cravings while in prison that he took advantage to get in the first weeks at the base hospital.

He said he just couldn't get "enough eggs, as well as milk, cottage cheese and ice cream." These cravings were in a way natural, as Capt. Milligan is the son of a dairy farmer.

Sunday was a real important day for Capt. Milligan because he ended his interviewing telling the T-T just one month ago, on Feb. 18, Capt. Milligan was released from his Hanol prison camp.

CEREMONIES AT KENNEDY MEMORIAL SATURDAY

Despite the impending rain which did shorten ceremonies Saturday afternoon at the John F. Kennedy Monument, Mayor William S. Taupier promised former U.S. House Speaker John W. McCormack "enjoyable days in Holyoke."

McCormack has revisited the city after about 15 years as the recipient of the John F. Kennedy National Award given by the St. Patrick's Parade committee.

Following the invocation by Msgr. John F. Harrington, McCormack laid the wreath at the monument escorted by Dr. John J. Driscoll.

WIND

The weather was windy and grey with lowering skies but about 150 people watched the brief tribute to the slain President.

While Willimansett American Legion Post 353 fired the salute, a gust of wind driven rain before it toppled the wreath which was set right by the dignitaries.

Several of the onlookers were youths, including some students from Sacred Heart School. After the ceremonies, McCormack took time to chat with several of the audience and many children, including those of parade president Russell J. McNiff.

McCormack also paused to listen while the Air Force Band of the East, with MSgt. Donald Upchurch conducting, played the Irish Regiment March.

Buglers from the band sounded taps.

HONORED

Following these ceremonies, McCormack was himself honored when he was presented the JFK Award during the televised mass by Bishop Christopher J. Weldon.

McCormack was the cynosure of all eyes at the Bishop's Reception held in honor of the JFK Award winner at Wyckoff Park Country Club.

Emcee was McCormack's long time friend Atty. John S. Begley. The association of these two goes back to World War One when they met while involved in state politics.

During his comments, the former U.S. House Speaker for more consecutive years than any man so far in the history of the country, told the audience of some 500 people that it is indeed "good fortune to be honored by my friends."

He was, he said "humbled and proud" to join the other distinguished JFK award winners.

TELEGRAMS

Besides the honor from the St. Pat's committee and the applause of the audience, McCormack received congratulatory telegrams from Cong. Silvio O. Conte, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and House Speaker Carl Albert.

On hand was Cong. Edward P. Boland, who gave a ringing speech of praise to McCormack. His sentiments were echoed in Albert's telegram praising the event which would "honor my beloved friend" whom he termed a man of "keen intellect and big heart."

Boland was acting as the spokesman for the U.S. House, especially for the Massachusetts delegation.

In introducing Atty. Begley, Dr. John E. McHugh noted his "rise to fame parallels the rise of the Irish race."

Begley quickly pointed out the combined life span of McCormack, parade grand marshal Timothy J. Sullivan and himself equalled 240 years.

Begley also introduced McNiff saying "Russ McNiff has measured up" to the hard job of his term as president.

McNiff pointed out the beginning of the Distinguished American of Irish descent award, now the JFK award, seven years after the parade was begun 22 years ago.

In his brief comments, Mayor Taupier praised the contribution of the Irish who "have managed to bring a community together" and then invited McCormack "to enjoy it with us."

Bishop Weldon gave the invocation and benediction.

SCHOOLBUS SAFETY

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on the important issue of schoolbus safety. While I was not able to appear in person before the committee to testify on behalf of H.R. 5633, the schoolbus safety bill I have introduced, I have submitted the following statement for the consideration of the committee:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HOWARD W. ROBISON FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, on January 3, 1973, three Vestal, New York, high school students lost their lives in a tragic bus accident near Owego, New York. The bus, carrying a junior varsity swimming team, skidded on the ice and turned over. Apparently, the three fatalities resulted from youngsters being thrown through the windows and the bus turning over on them.

This accident has focused the attention of parents, school administrators and other public officials on the entire issue of school bus safety. The tragedy prompted a rather exhaustive study on my part. I have sought the advice and counsel of experts both in and out of government. A large body of data and material has been accumulated for my analysis and study.

School bus safety is an "emerging" issue. In the quest for safer automobiles and advances in highway safety, school bus safety was not initially considered to have a high priority. Primarily due to the diligent efforts of the National Transportation Safety Board, the Department of Transportation, Congress and the public more generally, have been forced to focus their attention on this critical problem.

There are those who point to the rather low injury and fatality rate for school bus passengers as the justification for the low priority given school bus safety considerations. It is true that the fatalities and injuries over 100 million miles traveled are markedly lower for the school bus than they are for passenger cars. But, these cold, rather impersonal statistics can not be permitted to determine our priorities.

The National Transportation Safety Board's (NTSB) rationale for the attention it has

given school bus accidents is compelling. The NTSB states:

"In the school bus field, the degree of effort for safety has not been traditionally determined by cost/benefit considerations, but by the unique need for protection of the innocent children who ride school buses, and who are almost totally unable to assure their safety by their own actions. School bus riding children are seated within the buses usually because State laws require schooling, the children are not there totally of their own volition. Society has established many regulations for the safety of school children which may appear to be exaggerated in other fields. For this reason, it appears that the employment of structural assembly methods in school buses which are less efficient than methods used in other types of passenger buses should be considered primarily a question of justice to school bus riding children. This consideration of justice, in the Board's view should override the question of whether the cost of complete assembly could be demonstrated to be less than the dollar value of the lives saved."

I heartily concur in the Board's declaration that priorities here should be established on the basis of justice rather than the single dimension of accident statistics.

We must take those actions necessary and critical to ensure the safest possible travel for students who must ride in school buses.

One of the immediate reactions to school bus accidents where youngsters have been thrown from a bus, or injured after being tossed around within the bus, is to call for the installation and use of seat belts in all school buses—for both drivers and passengers. On the surface this appears to be a sensible and logical step to take in order to save lives and prevent injury. A closer look at the school bus safety question reveals the seat belt issue is only the tip of the iceberg.

A December 16, 1971 report of the House Committee on Government Operations states, "School bus bodies are usually constructed in a manner that makes them a hostile and unsafe environment in the event of a collision."

Thus, the seat belt question is but a part of a much larger issue—school bus construction standards.

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 was enacted by the Congress to reduce accidents and deaths resulting from traffic accidents. The law gives the Secretary of Transportation the authority to establish motor vehicle safety standards and to undertake and support necessary safety research and development needed to reduce accidents, injuries and deaths. The Department of Transportation's stated goal is the reduction of the traffic death rate per 100 million vehicle miles from a 5.3 level in 1939 to 3.6 by 1980.

In attempting to meet its goal the Department of Transportation has devoted almost all of its efforts to passenger cars. The seat belt-air bag controversy for passenger cars is an example of the preoccupation with this type of vehicle.

Sadly, safety standards for school buses have been neglected. Again citing the House Government Operations Committee report:

"Investigations of the Department of Transportation and the National Transportation Safety Board show that children riding in school buses face unwarranted exposure to death and serious injury in crashes due to the tendency of school bus bodies to literally pull apart at the seams and in that way cause passengers to be ejected or injured by the resulting exposed edges of the sheet metal body panels. . . School buses do not provide impact absorbent interior surfaces, contoured seats, or any form of occupant restraint system. This occupant

packaging technology has existed in the automobile area for several years, and it probably can be applied to school bus body construction with relative ease and at a reasonable cost."

The Government Operations Committee strongly recommended that the Department of Transportation require the construction of school buses that would provide a much safer environment for the school bus passenger.

The need for action—without further delay—is obvious. No excuses remain since the technology needed to improve school bus construction already exists. The cost involved is not prohibitive.

By now it should be clear that the issue is not one of simply seat belts or no seat belts.

Beginning with the school bus accident reports of the National Transportation Safety Act going on through House Public Works and Government Operations Committee hearings—and a Society of Automotive Engineers report on School Bus Passenger Protection—one quickly finds that structural deficiencies in school buses loom as much larger obstacles to the safer transportation of school children than does the matter of seat belts alone.

One of the more serious problems identified by the National Transportation Safety Board is that the structural integrity of the school bus itself is grossly inadequate. In its conclusions after investigating two school bus accidents in Alabama the NTSB said:

"1) There have been crashes in which the disintegration of the structural parts are evident. . .

"2) Interior panels present exposed sharp edges because widely spaced and inadequate fastenings at joints fail. . ."

Most inter-city busses have almost double the rivets or fasteners found on school buses. It appears that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration will not have standards in this area for some time. While work is underway it may well be 12 to 18 months before manufacturers will be forced to meet minimum standards.

Another problem of considerable importance is that of seat stability and configuration. The 1967 Society of Automotive Engineers study reports, "School bus seats at the time of this study are grossly inadequate for protecting passengers." It is my understanding that in the disastrous school bus-truck accident in New Mexico recently only the last two rows of seats in the back of the bus remained fastened to the floor. When the bus collided with the truck, all of the other seats tore loose from the frame.

Obviously, the seat anchorage in school buses are weak. The Society of Automotive Engineers study done at UCLA states that seat anchorages and seat cushion fasteners must not tear loose as the result of forward decelerations under 30G. (The UCLA findings are based on a series of three full scale school bus collision experiments in which anthropometric dummy passengers were used.)

Not only are seat anchorages inadequate, but the seat design itself in school buses is faulty. The UCLA study states:

"Low-back seat units, seat back heights less than 28 inches, greatly increase chances of injuries during school bus accidents. Seats most commonly encountered in school buses have seat back heights ranging from 18 to 20 inches. The low-back units possibly provide no head support, except for the very young school children and have the passenger in an extremely vulnerable condition when the vehicle is rear-ended. In addition, for the head-on collision, the lap-belted passenger, even the three year-old in some instances, pivoted about the belt and struck the top horizontal edge of the low seatback ahead in

a manner that applied extremely dangerous forces to the face, neck and chest of the individual."

The UCLA report speaks directly to the point of placing seat belts in buses already on the road. It clearly states that no seat belts should be placed in any bus unless the seatback height is at least 28 inches. The report also states that seats in existing buses are not designed to withstand the stress of seat belts and must be strengthened substantially if seat belts are installed.

The report clearly demonstrates that standards for seat design must be up-graded. Seat back height must be at least 28 inches. In fact the report states, "The greatest single contribution to school bus passenger collision safety is the high strength, high back safety seat."

The report then recommends that a lap belt or some other type of passenger restraint system is next in importance.

Of course, of great importance as well is the padding of seats, arm rests and any other exposed "hard" surfaces which might cause injuries in a collision.

The National Traffic Safety Administration has recently issued the long awaited new performance standards for seats in buses. While the proposed standards are designed to cover all buses, they too represent a significant step forward in upgrading the safety in school buses.

The new standards do require a seat back height of 28 inches; padding is required on all surfaces within a specified area of the seat; seat belts are offered as an option to meet the proposed standards; under the new standards seat anchorages must meet performance tests to prevent their tearing out on impact.

The proposed standards, which are to take effect September 1, 1974, will result in a higher degree of safety for school-age youngsters. Nevertheless, as pointed out earlier, there are other critical areas where action is badly needed.

There appears to be unanimity on the matter of requiring seat belts for school bus drivers. In fact, Standard 17, "Pupil Transportation Safety" promulgated by NHTSA requires that drivers of all school bus vehicles wear seat belts in vehicles equipped with them.

There is considerable disagreement, however, among experts on the matter of requiring seat belts for all school bus passengers. Presently, seat belts are required in all vehicles transporting up to 12 passengers. They are not required for passenger buses which are designed to carry more than 12 passengers.

As noted earlier, the ULCA study does recommend seat belts for school bus passengers, provided that structure and interior designs are up-graded. Safety experts in NHTSA have recommended against mandatory seat belts. State education experts in pupil transportation have also expressed serious reservations about the advisability of seat belts in school buses. The proposed standards recently issued by NHTSA give seat belts as an option for meeting the standards.

Seat belts in school buses have become an emotional issue. Accidents involving school buses on vehicles carrying students are likely to provoke an anguished call for seat belts. The issue is one not easily resolved. Except for the UCLA study, which leaves some questions unanswered, there are no definitive studies. In the early 1960's one bus company in New York State did install seat belts for slightly over a month. Since no accidents occurred during that time it was impossible to ascertain their effect. A bus company spokesman did, however, comment on other

problems—the use of the seat belt as a play thing; persuading students to use them, etc.

The Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission (VESC), an Interstate Compact organization dealing with motor carrier safety, has developed its own minimum standards for school bus construction and equipment. Its standards do not recommend seat belts for school bus passengers.

New York State's Department of Education regulations, perhaps the most complete and advanced of any of the states, do not require seat belts for school bus passengers.

A controversy over seat belts has been raging in New Jersey over the last couple of years. In January, 1972, Dr. Orville Parish, Director of Pupil Transportation, New Jersey Board of Education, organized a seminar at which seat belts in school buses was the only topic considered.

While there was near unanimity on the need for new highback seats in school buses, there was no consensus reached on the matter of seat belts. Those attending did agree on one other point—there is a need for more reliable data, based on demonstration projects, to settle the questions about seat belts in school buses.

At this point, it becomes necessary to stand back and take a look at where we are. Questions must be asked—who has the responsibility and authority to act. Its record of stewardship of this authority and responsibility leaves something to be desired. It has not been very responsive in fulfilling the mandate given it under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. School bus safety, for reasons already cited, was not given a high priority. Public pressures and legislative initiatives from the Congress have finally speeded DOT's pace.

Rule making activity has been stepped up and an internal task force was formed and has completed its report. (The report has not been made public.)

There is, however, some concern, which I share, that the manner in which the Department of Transportation has approached the school bus safety question may not produce the best results.

Instead of treating the school bus as a vehicle that has special or unique characteristics that demand separate treatment, the Department of Transportation is promulgating construction standards which cover all buses, including school buses.

The differences between the school bus and intercity and intracity buses, it seems to me, are sufficient in magnitude to warrant a separate set of standards for school buses. The requirements of the various types of buses are diverse—they carry different kinds of passenger loads—they are designed to fulfill dissimilar functions.

My own analysis leads me to conclude that the school bus should be treated separately.

As a result, I have introduced a bill which, I hope, will help set a faster pace for the activities designed to up-grade school bus construction and safety.

The legislation I am proposing differs from other legislation which has dealt with school bus safety.

First, it directs the Secretary of Transportation to complete rule making procedures for school bus construction standards within one year of enactment of the bill.

Second, the bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to undertake and complete within two years a comprehensive study to determine the advisability of requiring seat belts in school buses.

Frankly, the data on seat belts available to me now does not provide a sufficient basis on which to make a reasoned judgment. There appears to be compelling reasons which lead one to conclude that seat belts are not necessary—indeed could be counter-productive.

tive to improved safety. On the other hand, it is clear that most of the "compelling" reasons have not stood the test of rigorous analysis and research. Perhaps, the dispute over seat belts will never be resolved to everyone's satisfaction. Nevertheless, the results of the study being proposed in my bill should answer many of the questions which have been raised. It should give us the solid empirical data needed to make informed and reasoned judgments.

School bus safety is an issue that touches most of us in one way or another. While the Federal Government does have a considerable responsibility, State government and local school officials must share this responsibility.

What I have discussed here deals primarily with school bus construction—the integrity of the bus—its interior and design. It is important if school children are to be provided the safety they deserve. But the fact of the matter is that most school bus related deaths do not result from collisions, but rather involve youngsters who lose their lives outside their bus, killed by the bus itself or other vehicles as they approached or left the bus.

We can and must build a safer bus. It can and will better protect our children—but, safe operation of the bus itself, and safer driving on the part of the general public will have as great, if not more of a positive effect on school bus safety.

It is my hope the Committee will carefully consider my bill and the others that have been introduced with the view of reporting needed legislation to the House in the near future.

NARCOTIC TREATMENT PROGRAMS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, I joined Congressman HASTINGS in sponsoring legislation to amend the Controlled Substances Act. Our bill, H.R. 7643, provides for the registration of practitioners who conduct narcotic treatment programs.

In the past, methadone—which is one of the most popular and successful drugs used to treat an addict—was considered as strictly an experimental drug. The clinic and private practitioners who offered methadone treatment were officially deemed to be engaged in research. However, as the number of such programs and doctors surged upward during the past several years, it became quite clear that this treatment was no longer mere research.

Accordingly, last April, the Food and Drug Administration proposed an alteration of its regulations which take maintenance out of the experimental category. The final altered regulations were promulgated on December 15, 1972, and, under the new controls, methadone used as a maintenance drug now receives a new drug status, and is subject to more rigorous requirements.

Unfortunately, there were and there continue to be some carelessly run methadone programs and a small—very small—number of physicians who have

been making fortunes by improperly dispensing the drug. They have presented the country with a serious and flourishing black market problem. In addition to methadone abuse, abuses are being reported with morphine, numorphan, demerol, and other drugs—which, if administered properly, can be very helpful.

The bill I was pleased to cosponsor with my colleague from New York will assist in rectifying the tragic situation I have just described. It will do so by providing for the separate registration of any practitioner who dispenses or administers narcotic drugs in the treatment of addicts—either for maintenance or detoxification. It also presents explicit statutory authority for requiring registrants to comply with standards for the security of drug stocks and the maintenance of records.

This act will certainly go a long way in eliminating the illegal efforts which are being undertaken merely for profit at the expense of far too many individuals. I urge enactment of H.R. 7643 at the earliest possible time as a necessary and vital step in our efforts against drug abuse.

SPIDER AT THE CENTER OF THE WEB

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, Carey McWilliams, editor of the Nation, has recalled for us some history that we should not forget as the Watergate eruptions continue. His contention is that Richard Nixon's 1972 election campaign was no different from his campaign in 1962, so far as tactics are concerned.

Mr. McWilliams urged a real investigation rather than a cover-up, saying:

The President has given us not the truth but a preposterous alibi. What is needed is the kind of investigation that would determine whether a factual basis for his impeachment exists. If such facts can be established, then an impeachment resolution should be introduced; if they can not, then and only then can we begin to forget about Watergate.

At this point I would like to insert the entire editorial into the RECORD:

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

(By Carey McWilliams)

He finally came down from the mountain and gave us the word. But just what has he done? What do we know now that we did not know before?

The departure of Kleindienst, Haldeman, Ehrlichman and Dean is welcome news, if a bit late. The selection of Elliot Richardson to replace Kleindienst, of William Ruckelshaus for L. Patrick Gray, and of Leonard Garment as special counsel instead of John Dean, are perhaps the best selections the President could have made from his immediate circle of loyal political adherents—a somewhat limited talent pool. Mr. Richard-

son, we are told, has "absolute authority" to proceed with the Watergate investigation; we hope that statement is true. He also has authority to name a "special supervising prosecutor" which, on its face, is a bit of a weasel. What Mr. Richardson should do—for his sake and ours—is clear: he should name a special prosecutor, not to supervise but to take charge of the Watergate investigation and the ensuing trials. This special prosecutor should have ample funds and power to select his own staff; Asst. Atty. Gen. Henry Petersen and his aides, all of whom have been discredited, should be removed from the case. The FBI should be ordered to cooperate with the special prosecutor.

It would help if the special prosecutor were a Democrat or an independent, or at least acceptable to the top Democratic leadership (not merely to Senator Mansfield); but that is not essential. Herbert Stern, the U.S. Attorney in Newark, James R. Thompson, the U.S. Attorney in Chicago, or Jon Waltz of the Law School, Northwestern University, all Republicans, would be good nominees.

In brief, the President has finally acted, but he has taken only those steps which were essential to project the image that he is now "clean as a hound's tooth." Kleindienst was discredited before he was confirmed. The removal of Haldeman and Ehrlichman was promptly cheered by the Republicans in Congress and is, therefore, good politics. It also gave the President a chance to indulge in a favorite routine: their removal was, predictably, "one of the most difficult decisions" of his Presidency. Of the four men removed, only Dean showed a possible willingness to cooperate before the roof fell in. Having taken this minimal action, the President will now seek to lock the door to his office, ignore the press, and take as many long junkets as possible, to foreign lands of course. He will turn his full attention to "the larger duties" of his office and, rest assured, will try to have nothing more to say or do about Watergate.

The speech itself was soap opera in the manner of his "slush fund" speech of 1952. The President has never lacked the intuitions of a demagogue; he can skillfully measure the amount and variety of "corn" to use in his invariably self-serving and intellectually dishonest presentations. He never fails to say that he could have taken the easy route but manfully did not; he always tries to touch a few heart strings in his inimitably vulgar way. His TV speeches are Madison Avenue "presentations," empty of content, misleading, couched in wretched rhetoric.

In his speech he told us virtually nothing we did not know and he raised more questions than he answered. He immediately ordered a report on June 17, 1972. What happened to it? Where is it? He was "appalled," "shocked," but "until March of this year" believed what he was told by his staff, who were known to be under investigation. Apparently he did not read a copy of *The Washington Post* for nearly a year. On its face, his statement is simply not credible. The American people would like to be able to believe their President, but the polls indicate that many of them, perhaps a majority, feel that Mr. Nixon was involved in Watergate in the sense that he at all times knew what Mitchell, Haldeman, Ehrlichman and Dean knew.

But more important, he certainly knew—and well before April 17—that efforts were being made to cover up and actually to obstruct the investigation. He must be charged with knowledge of what was being said by a large section of the press and the Republican

leadership in Congress. He wants us to believe that 1972 was the one campaign which he let others manage for him. True, he did make fewer speeches because his "handlers" were anxious to keep him off the hustings; he himself was championing at the bit and watching every phase of the campaign. Indeed he set up a special committee to manage his campaign, apart from the GOP.

Haldeman and Ehrlichman are his "closest associates" in the White House and "the finest public servants" he has ever known. Then why should he throw them overboard? Why not grant them leaves? By inference they were overzealous and "may have done wrong in a cause they deeply believed to be right." But the same overzealousness was exhibited by Haldeman in California in 1962 when he managed his first campaign for Nixon. Court records there indicate that Mr. Nixon and Mr. Haldeman knew of and approved a fake letter and poll which was sent out in the name of a "Democratic" committee to members of the Democratic Party, accusing Governor Brown of being "soft on communism" for not excluding Communists from Democratic Party membership. The mind boggles at the notion that he did not know what Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Dean, Magruder, Colson, LaRue and Mitchell knew about campaign tactics and strategy, the size of the exchequer, and the frenzied efforts to cover up on Watergate. As always, the President presents himself as being angelic: he will not place blame on subordinates but will manfully shoulder responsibility for what happened. President Kennedy accepted responsibility for the Bay of Pigs fiasco, but he did not deny that he knew about it. Who knows more about "the shady tactics" sometimes used in American politics than Richard Nixon? Living witnesses of high repute, Jerry Voorhis, Helen Gahagan Douglas and Earl Warren can testify to his long-standing addiction to precisely the tactics which were used in his 1972 campaign.

What the President has attempted is a whitewash. It may work. The Republicans in Congress are pleased; some of that pressure has been removed. The Democratic leadership, at the top, is weak and unreliable. The public would probably like to pretend that Watergate never happened. All the same there are good reasons to believe that this whitewash won't cover. The trials will drag on. They will be dramatic. More disclosures are certain. More squealers will squeal. A large section of the press will now be engaged and the competition for disclosure will intensify. Then, too, the President is a lame duck, the Republicans are divided over Watergate and what to do about it, and the successorship is up for grabs. It is also unlikely that the President can hold the line he has sought to draw: no communications on Watergate and total preoccupation with affairs of state. Watergate will haunt him wherever he goes, whatever he does. And the Ervin committee hearings will start soon.

The President's problem is that he is responsible for Watergate. He is responsible not merely in the sense that he has indicated but because, in a very real sense, he is the central figure in the case, the spider at the center of the web. What is needed, of course, is an investigation of his role in "this sordid affair" which he once ordered his press aide to dismiss as a third-rate burglary. Even some of his former backers have proposed a resolution of censure. But a better next step would be the appointment of a special panel by the Senate or the House, or jointly as Rep. John Moss has proposed. The public must have the truth. The President has given us not the truth but a preposterous alibi. What

is needed is the kind of investigation that would determine whether a factual basis for his impeachment exists. If such facts can be established, then an impeachment resolution should be introduced; if they can not, then and only then can we begin to forget about Watergate.

THE IMPACT OF PROPOSED HEALTH BUDGET CUTS ON BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, Roger W. Jeanloz is a professor of biological chemistry at Harvard Medical School and is the head of the Laboratory for Carbohydrate Research, Massachusetts General Hospital.

I recently had the opportunity, at the hearings on Federal health programs that I held on May 5, 1973 in Newton, Mass., to receive testimony from Dr. Jeanloz on the subject of medical research.

Like many of his colleagues in the health profession, Dr. Jeanloz is concerned about the impact of proposed reductions in Federal support of biomedical research. As he notes in his convincing testimony, these cutbacks take the following forms: First, reduction in the total amount of research money available; second, shifting distribution of medical research funds from a grant system, which is accessible to nonprofit institutions, to a contract system, which gives an advantage to industrial laboratories; and third, a substantial decrease in scholarship and training grant funds.

If these administration proposals are allowed to take effect, the result will be unfortunate not only for the medical institutions, faculties, researchers, and students who will be most directly affected. Rather the real losers will be the rest of us, and future generations, who will be deprived of the long-term benefits in health care that stem directly from biomedical research.

I urge my colleagues not to abandon the many medical programs now endangered by the administration's myopic budget. While these medical issues may seem at first glimpse to be somewhat vague, their genuine significance suggests to me at least that the issues involved should be comprehensively aired. For this reason I have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of statements from health care professionals and medical educators.

On this occasion I would like to share with my fellow Members of Congress the statement offered by Dr. Jeanloz on the subject of biomedical research:

TESTIMONY OF PROF. ROGER W. JEANLOZ, PROFESSOR OF BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY, HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL, HEAD OF THE LABORATORY FOR CARBOHYDRATE RESEARCH, MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL

Congressman Drinan, I am pleased to have the privilege of testifying here today because

the issue of government cutbacks is of grave concern for the future of medical research, which means for the health of all human beings and, finally, for the reputation of our country.

Basic research is the source of all future practical development and it is commonly accepted that no industry would survive without steadily improving its products. Some may ask why this basic research is not undertaken by private enterprises, for example, drug companies. The answer is very simple: Only the public in general is interested in the improvement of its health. Drug companies are basically not interested in improving the health of the public. I always remember the admonition of the director of a leading drug company when, after obtaining my Ph.D., I was inquiring about a position in their research department. "Don't forget that in industry, it is the stockholder whom we have to please." Since improvement of health is not always directly related to the introduction of new drugs, only public funds can afford to support basic research, and what country will do this, if the wealthiest country in our world does not show the example?

The present policies of the Federal Administration undermine basic medical research in two different fashions: the first is in decreasing the total amount of money available, the second in shifting the mode of distribution from the grant system, which is the only one readily available to nonprofit institutions, to the contract system. The contract system benefits industrial laboratories without special knowledge in the field or academic departments not actively engaged in research.

The decrease in financial support shows its effect on the support of both the Training Grant Program and on the Research Grant Program of the National Institutes of Health.

In the Department of Biological Chemistry of Harvard Medical School, the financial support of the present 30 graduate students in biochemistry will be phased out within the next 3 years. Of the 30 students thus supported, it may be possible for the University to offer help to, at the most, 12 students. After 4 years of college and 5 years of graduate work, these students will normally take 2 to 3 years of postgraduate work at salaries in the range of 7-8,000 dollars yearly, and then they will move to academic positions where some may reach the upper 20,000-dollar range, but many more will remain at around 20,000 dollars. We are far away from the 100,000-dollar salaries generally mentioned as a reason to suppress Training Grants. In the past 15 years, only one student (less than 2%) has found a position in industry, all the others having gone into research and/or teaching positions.

The Laboratory for Carbohydrate Research is a part, with the Arthritis Unit and the Developmental Biology Laboratory, of the Lovett Group for Diseases Causing Deformities, which is studying the causes of arthritis, rheumatism, and other diseases of the connective tissues. The Group presently has a Training Grant for Arthritis which supports three postgraduate M.D.'s for research on arthritis and also supports part of the salaries of the teaching staff. We have been advised that the salaries of the trainees will be phased out within the next two years, and despite the fact that we are at the beginning of May, we still do not know

whether the salaries of the teaching staff will be paid next July. This is the present state of incertitude in which we live under the present policies.

Concerning the Research Funds, much emphasis has been put on the increase in financial support for cancer and heart disease, without mentioning that these increases are made at the expense of the critical needs of other diseases. Because a large proportion of the funds are earmarked for ongoing projects, the funds for competitive projects of the Institute for Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases, which support the research of the Lovett Group, will be decreased by 60% within the next two years. Ongoing projects may be decreased slightly in total amount, but because of inflation, this may mean an effective decrease of 10-15% per year.

Another aspect which is of great concern to the academic basic researcher is the shift from the grant system to the contract system. Basically, the two systems are not too different, since both proposals spell out in detail the goals of the research. However, these goals may be modified in the grant system if new leads open, and who knows in advance the results of research? If we knew the final results, there would be no need to undertake the study. On the other hand, the contract system requires that the proposal be strictly followed or the proposal is terminated on short notice. Whereas grants are usually awarded for a 5-year period, the length of a contract rarely exceeds two years. Since non-profit institutions (such as universities and hospitals) have no funds to pay their basic scientists between contracts, they are unable to compete with industrial laboratories which can maintain ongoing research groups between contracts at the expense of their profit. Finally, only the research groups, which may have very little experience in the field where they request a contract, or groups at universities where most of the staff is engaged in and paid for a heavy load of teaching, will propose contracts. This is clearly reflected in the scientific level of the proposal. In my own experience, I have found that whereas up to 90% of the scientific proposals submitted under the grant system were acceptable, less than 10% were acceptable under the contract system. At the present time, we see industry offering high salaries to medical technicians trained at the universities, thus undermining successful academic research groups. Industry is, however, unable to attract highly trained professionals because of the lack of security in industrial research supported on government contracts and of the secretive aspect of industrial research.

Finally, I would like to discuss an aspect which is rarely mentioned and to which I am probably more sensitive, as a naturalized citizen, than many of my American-born colleagues: It is the great disservice done to the reputation of this country abroad by the dismantling of our basic medical research establishment. I came here from Switzerland in 1949 for one year as a trainee of the National Institutes of Health and stayed because I liked the research atmosphere of this country. I was proud to work in a city called the Athens of America and to work in a scientific community which was becoming the leader of the scientific world. I have been an exchange scientist in the USSR under the exchange program of the Academy of Science and a lecturer in Poland under the auspices of the State Department, and I am regularly invited to lecture in Western Europe. Everywhere I have seen the greatest respect and

admiration for American science. Scientists from as far as Japan, South Africa, India, Pakistan, Israel, Egypt, Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as from most Western European countries have spent from one to three years in my laboratory. Those coming from wealthy countries were supported by their own country; the others were supported by our research funds. If our academic research effort is curtailed or abolished, to which country will these excellent young foreign scientists turn? Is our country, in the future, going to be known only by the number of atomic warheads and supersonic bombers that she possesses?

STANDBY AIR FARES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to save youth and senior citizen standby air fares that have come into common use among the Nation's commercial air carriers. These fares are currently under attack by the Civil Aeronautics Board. A recent ruling would phase them out by June of 1974. The CAB holds that such fares constitute age discrimination and should be discontinued.

I disagree with the CAB. There are many compelling reasons for continuing fare reductions on a space-available basis, and I feel it can be demonstrated adequately that all concerned are better off for their existence. These fares provide an acceptable method of promoting greater passenger traffic among these age groups.

In most cases with these age groups, it is not a case of a person flying for a higher fare or a lower fare. It is a case of flying for a lower fare or not at all. Current airline figures show an average load rate of only 50 percent of capacity. It should be very obvious that the airlines would prefer to fill their planes, even at reduced rates, than to continue to fly half empty. Filling a plane with more cash-paying customers raises the revenue of the airline and lowers the average cost of flying each passenger.

Figures my staff has researched show that the airlines enjoy a profit of more than \$20 million each year from standby youth fares. Without these fares and the subsequent income they generate, this money would have to be made up from travelers left taking the plane.

Where preferential air fares ran into trouble was with the advent of reserved seat youth fares. These fares guarantee the use of an airplane seat at only 80 percent of a regular fare with the only justification for the price difference being the traveler's age. Under these

types of fares, younger passengers actually take seats away from full-fare paying customers on the busier weekend flights. As such, these fares are discriminatory and I agree with the CAB that they should be abolished.

However, my bill deals solely with reduced fares on a space-available basis. Standby fares do not deprive any full-fare customer of a seat. They only fill seats which would otherwise go empty, a cost to both the airline and the paying customer. Empty seats abound during "offpeak" hours when travel is the lightest. Senior citizens and youth are groups which could help fill this breach.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this legislation would benefit everyone concerned with commercial air travel in the United States today. It would provide millions of Americans with the opportunity to fly they would not otherwise have, thus making them more mobile and productive members of our society. It would generate more income for the commercial carrier, helping him out of his economic straits and avoiding Government subsidy. Finally, it would help the airlines keep the cost to other air travelers down by lowering the average per seat cost of most flights.

Because the ruling by the Civil Aeronautics Board is scheduled to go into effect in the very near future, I feel it imperative that the Congress pass this legislation with the utmost speed. Therefore, I would urge the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to consider such a measure at the earliest possible date.

MEASURING QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of College and University Business contains a most interesting guest editorial by Allan W. Ostar, executive director of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Ostar's theme is the necessity of identifying appropriate standards of accountability for the Nation's colleges and universities. He points out that considerations of both quality and quantity are essential to any appropriate definition of accountability, and identifies several other factors important to any such inquiry.

In order that all Members may have the benefit of Mr. Ostar's editorial, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

QUALITY: HOW IS IT REALLY MEASURED?

(By Allan W. Ostar)

More than one college and university ad-

administrator has been trapped in the headlock of accountability by a state official, by a taxpayer, by a newspaper editor. It is very easy to demand accountability. It is far more difficult to demonstrate it. Unlike business and industry, colleges and universities do not "produce" graduates. A campus is not an assembly line, a student is not raw material, and a diploma is not a profit margin. The process of education is more subtle, the results more diffuse.

Obviously a far different formula is needed to measure the quality and effectiveness of higher education—one which measures accurately the true function of colleges and universities, the education and socialization of students.

There is a standard currently employed by educators, a traditional standard which defines institutional quality in highly quantifiable terms. According to this traditional measure, institutional quality becomes the coefficient of the number of volumes in the library, the student-faculty ratio, the adequacies of the physical plant, and per cent of Ph.D.s on the faculty.

These factors are quantities. They also are inputs into the higher education process, not the results of the process, and as such they really give little indication of how well the college or university fulfills its true purpose: educating and socializing. It matters little how many volumes are in the library if the students are not stimulated to open the covers. It matters little how many degrees a faculty member possesses if the students in his classroom spend the period gazing out the window.

These traditional indices are as inappropriate as the production approach in defining quality. Evidence of the unsuitability of the indices exists in the fact that despite their utilization, the cries for accountability are mounting. Realistically, what is needed is a redefinition of educational quality which focuses on the educational process, not the accessories.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) confronted this thorny problem and established a Committee on Quality and Effectiveness in Undergraduate Higher Education to study more appropriate standards. A statement subsequently drafted by the committee was wholeheartedly approved by the 289 members.

The statement sets forth new criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of an institution: criteria which place the quality factors in higher education on the individual internal goals of an institution. Viewing quality as a function of internal goals avoids the danger inherent in the traditional measures of quality. That is: Externally imposed standards force colleges and universities to emulate an institutional ideal, stifling diversity and the adaptability needed to accommodate the changing needs of an institution's constituencies.

For example, one hears condescending comments about the quality of black institutions. But quality compared to what? A Harvard? How is a Harvard of "higher quality" than a North Carolina Central University, or a Jackson State University? Is quality more "big name" professors, federal grants, rare collections in the library, and higher cost per student? Or is quality the impact that an institution has on a student. The value added to a person in terms of skills, problem-solving, expanded perspective and self-awareness is a comparative point between a Harvard

and a Jackson State. And in terms of what a student is capable of when he enters the institution and what he is capable of when he leaves, the Jackson States of our nation are offering a much higher quality of education than the Harvards.

Not all students have the same educational needs. Not all segments of society have the same needs. Not all regions have the same needs. In geography, in population, in technology, and in societal attitude, the United States is a heterogeneous country. A numerical rating of standard factors which compels colleges and universities to form a homogeneous group is not in the best interests of education or the country. It is time to eliminate the pecking order syndrome in higher education and talk about quality in terms of how well each institution measures up to its own goals and objectives, what kind of impact it makes on its students, and what kind of contribution its graduates make to society.

Protecting diversity is not ducking the issue, as some people may claim. Diverse quality is measurable. To evaluate the effectiveness of an institution's unique goals, four criteria may be used: student development, institutional vitality, public service, and research.

By far the most important criterion is student development, the cognitive and affective progress of students, which is the value-added concept. Cognitive development may be measured by the level of special knowledge in a student's chosen field and his ability to reason critically and objectively. Affective development may be measured by post-graduate employment, achievement motivation, and the types of organizations in which the student has membership.

Related to student development is the criterion of institutional vitality, which is the ability of an institution to adapt its structure and power to changing conditions. Institutional vitality can be measured by the rate of student retention, the successful education of high-risk students, and the racial and socioeconomic mix of the student population.

The third factor is the degree to which institutions perform public service to the society at large and to the surrounding community. Public service takes many forms. It may take an educational form in extension programs, evening classes for adults, or seminars for special groups in the community. It may be in a consulting form, where institutional personnel and resources are used in support capacity for business, health, environment or community planning. Or, an institution may serve the esthetic and leisure needs of the community through the performing arts, the availability of the library, art exhibits, and athletic events. The effectiveness of public service is evident in the attitude of the community toward the institution and in the improvement of community life as a result of institutional action.

The final criterion is not the amount of research, but the product of research. Research should not be measured by the number of patents and the number of published papers, but by the qualitative good which results for society and man, benefiting his health, his understanding of other men, his arts, and his safety.

These criteria are as easily measurable as the traditional quantitative criteria. They may not be as easily implemented simply because tradition is accompanied by an inertia and familiarity which is reluctantly released. However, as long as we maintain the tradi-

tional standards, higher education remains vulnerable to the demands of accountability.

NIXON SPEECH—NOT QUITE WHOLE TRUTH

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I, along with the majority of my congressional colleagues are seriously concerned about the need to re-establish public confidence in our Government and in the American system. Occasionally, we are too close to the issues to fully evaluate the impact of actions by Government leaders in the public viewpoint. On April 30 the President expressed his position on national radio and television on the Watergate scandal. One of the leading newspapers in my congressional district, The Clarksburg Exponent, published its editorial evaluation of the President's statement, an evaluation with which I fully agree. I quote that editorial:

NIXON SPEECH—NOT QUITE WHOLE TRUTH

Friends—yes, friends—of President Nixon do not believe he advanced his personal cause or that of the presidency in any enduring way by his cool and lofty tale of the all-consuming Watergate affair.

The tone was presidential. His comment bore the marks of the high quest for truth and justice befitting his office. It was reinforced by solid action in the earlier removals of four top administration men, including his two closest aides.

For the sake of the country and the office, even his Democratic adversaries wanted these very things from him. Yet, somehow, it all came to too little.

In the view of some who have known and liked him, what Mr. Nixon said lacked the impressive force of specific candor. It was presidential gold dust thrown in the eyes, or a glittering movie-set facade supported by shaky props.

He told the American people that, uncharacteristically, he in 1972 delegated most of his campaign decisions to others. But he did not say to whom, nor what crucial instructions he gave to his chosen surrogates.

Besides being uninformative at its heart, this assertion is not accurate. Observers and men who toiled in his campaigns can testify convincingly that he delegated heavy campaign authority in 1968 and perhaps before.

His newest utterance seeks, then, to perpetuate an unsupportable legend, Nixon the man with his eye constantly on every political gauge but too busy with higher duties in 1972 to follow pattern.

Another gaping hole in the facade. Who repeatedly reassured him that his key people were not involved? Was it always the same man, or were there several?

Still, Mr. Nixon left the way open for others to be touched, saying no one could be spared from the workings of justice and there would be no "whitewash" in the White

House. Though his voice choked a bit, was there something of the cold shove in his final pat on the back for "closest friends and trusted aides" John Ehrlichman and H.R. (Bob) Haldeman?

Even as the President promised no whitewash, some of his key words had the pale cast of euphemism. He spoke of men whose zeal "exceeded their judgment" and whose

good intentions in a cause they believe right graded easily into "shady" campaign activities.

How does this cover the alleged break-in by Nixon re-election agents at the office of the psychiatrist serving Daniel Ellsberg, defendant in the Pentagon papers case?

Indeed, as digested by some of his critical friends, this euphemistic language is judged

to be far short of matching the magnitude of the offenses already revealed or hinted at in the Watergate espionage-sabotage case.

The President has seemed to "clean house," leaving his establishment painfully disorganized in the face of pending big events. But his basement and his attic still hold too many secrets which can cloud the fresh image he tried to paint.