

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 17, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Rest in the Lord and wait patiently for Him.—Psalm 37: 7.

O Thou whose spirit sustains us in the stillness of the night and whose strength supports us in the struggle of each new day, grant unto us the grace which will keep us in the fellowship of those who walk in Thy way and give to each one of us the guidance we need to keep our hearts at peace with Thee and with one another.

Help us to do our duties cheerfully. May our burdens not be too heavy, our tasks not be too demanding, and our trials not be too troubling. But if we fail in any good thing—let Thy wisdom correct us, Thy mercy forgive us, and Thy love amend our ways. Deliver us from inward evil and outward harm so that when evening comes it may not find us afraid or ashamed but at peace with Thee and with our fellow men; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 14. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, health care resources, and the establishment of a Quality Health Care Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 723. An act to establish a National Institute of Health Care Delivery, and for other purposes;

S. 1381. An act to amend certain provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 relating to the collection of fees in connection with the use of Federal areas for outdoor recreation purposes; and

S. 1423. An act to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions to jointly administered trust funds established by labor organizations to defray costs of legal services.

GROSS ERROR WITH RESPECT TO SECURITY CHECKS BY HOUSE INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today after notifying the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE), for the purpose of correcting a very gross error made in a press release reportedly

coming from his office. The first sentence reads as follows:

Congressman Jerome R. Waldie, D-Calif., today said he was "appalled by the revelation that since 1971, the Civil Service Commission has singled out all Federal job applicants who have attended college since June, 1968, for a security check by the House Internal Security Committee."

Let me advise the House that the House Committee on Internal Security makes no security checks for any agency. It is true that the Civil Service Commission does have access to certain information in the files of the House Committee on Internal Security, as a part of the national agency check which is performed for all prospective employees of the Federal Government, but the House Committee on Internal Security performs no internal security checks for any agency of Government.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL SAYS ADMINISTRATION PLANS TO IMPLEMENT SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING WITHOUT CONSENT OF CONGRESS

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, any day now we can expect the Federal Register to publish new rules implementing special revenue sharing for manpower programs.

This, despite the fact that Congress has never authorized special revenue sharing. Yet, a high Labor Department official had the audacity to tell a House committee that he has his orders—he is to institute special revenue sharing by July 1 no matter what Congress does.

In addition, Congress has learned that the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to raise user charges \$50 million above the levels approved by the airports and airways legislation.

We all know that the administration has said it has the right to withhold expenditures, even though Congress has specifically authorized them.

Now we see the administration asserting the right to spend money as it sees fit, through special revenue sharing, even though Congress has not authorized such procedures.

And, finally we have the administration exercising the right to tax and to raise revenues on its own initiatives, without asking or receiving the consent of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this administration does not seem to feel that it needs a Congress at all. This administration still refuses to recognize that this is not a nation of one-man rule.

NATIONAL AUTISTIC CHILDREN'S WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 296) au-

thorizing the President to proclaim the last week of June of each year as "National Autistic Children's Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from California?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under this procedure I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is there any understanding officially or as a practical matter, that there be no quorum calls or rollcalls today?

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows of no such understanding.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker for his answer, and withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 296

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation each year designating the week which begins on June 24 as "National Autistic Children's Week", and calling the attention of the people of the United States to the plight of the autistic child, and the services which are available to help such children and their families.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 1, line 4, strike out the words "each year".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) state the purpose of this resolution and give us the title?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the resolution authorizes the President to proclaim the last week of June of this year as "National Autistic Children's Week."

Mr. GROSS. What kind of a week?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. National Autistic Children's Week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman spell that?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. A-u-t-i-s-t-i-c.

Mr. GROSS. And what does that mean?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, these are children who may be physically healthy but live in a world apart from others and fail to respond to normal personal interactions. Because of their handicaps they require special care, and this is of great concern to the medical profession.

The fact that the gentleman requests an explanation of the word "autistic" reflects the need for special attention by our society to these children. The designation of "National Autistic Children's Week" would provide a time for directing public attention to these children and for educating the public on what can be done to help them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the House will today consider a bill to which there can be little, if any objection—a bill which would set aside the last week of June as National Autistic Children's Week, to recognize and draw attention to a little known disorder which affects hundreds of children throughout the United States.

These children have been termed "autistic"—and although they may appear normal outwardly, they live in a world apart from others, seemingly inaccessible. These children are multi-handicapped in their ability to receive and communicate information. Although some display amazing feats of memory, their robotlike insistence on daily routine makes this condition one of the most puzzling of medical mysteries. There is no known cause or cure for autism, although a large and growing body of research indicates that a biochemical error may be at the root of this disorder.

The Maryland Society for Autistic Children describes these children as "seemingly unresponsive to the usual give and take of parent-child relationships."

They said:

Like deaf-blind children they are often hyperactive, their behavior hard to manage. Public outings, even for such necessities as buying shoes, can leave a wake of upset and angry shopkeepers who believe the child (who looks so normal) to be just a "spoiled brat" and berate the parent for the child's unacceptable social behavior.

Some scream for hours. No amount of effort on the parents' part can comfort them. Many can go for days with little sleep or food. A few are so disruptive they require permanent hospitalization.

The last 10 years has brought success in reaching these children. Special education and vocational training efforts suited to their needs have benefited autistic children. However, these children are victims not only of an illness, but of a neglectful society when they are deprived of opportunities provided normal children. By setting aside this week we can further educate society to recognize autism's signs, and make a renewed effort to learn more about the cause and cure for autism.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote favorably on this measure.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the President to proclaim the last week of June, 1973, as 'National Autistic Children's Week'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the distinguished gentleman yield? If he will, I will be happy to respond.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. The program for the House of Representatives for the week of May 21, 1973, is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There will be three suspensions:

H.R. 6628, Micronesian Claims Act amendment;

House Joint Resolution 512, temporary extension of housing laws; and

H.R. 630, additional seats for R. F. K. Stadium.

Tuesday, suspensions, two bills: H.R. 6717, user fees in recreational facilities, and H.R. 2246, to agree to a Senate amendment with an amendment to the Economic Development Act extension. Also H.R. 7200, railroad retirement temporary increase extension, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

On Wednesday, H.R. 7528, NASA authorization, subject to a rule being granted, and H.R. 77, jointly administered trust funds for legal services plans, also subject to a rule being granted.

On Thursday, H.R. 6912, Par Value Modification Act; H.R. 5858, JFK Center maintenance funds; H.R. 5857, National Visitors Center amendment; and H.R. 6830, International Center for Foreign Chanceries, all subject to rules being granted.

Also on Thursday we will receive the former Members of Congress.

The House will recess for Memorial Day at the conclusion of business on Thursday until noon on Tuesday, May 29.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program or changes will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the receiving of former Members. Did the gentleman say that the House would receive them in formal session or after the session?

Mr. O'NEILL. I said after the business is over.

Mr. GROSS. After the business session on Thursday.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is just the usual procedure we go through every year, and it does not interfere with the business of the House at all.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but is this not the day when we adjourn for Memorial Day?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And a rather long weekend with respect to Memorial Day?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Which makes some difference, does it not, as to whether the House will be continued in session with respect to the ability of Members to leave after the business session?

Mr. O'NEILL. I have to assume we will complete our business and on the completion of our business we will meet with the former Members.

Mr. GROSS. That is all I wanted to know: Whether the House would continue in session to receive the former Members or whether we would adjourn and then they would be received on an informal basis.

Mr. O'NEILL. That is the way it has always been.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HARRY S TRUMAN—A GREAT AMERICAN PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, although our dear friend, former President Harry Truman, has been gone from us now for some time, there comes to my attention quite regularly commentaries and memorials on the life of this great American President that should certainly be incorporated in the RECORD in order that these eulogies may in turn be made a part of the memorial volume which will

soon be published in memory of Mr. Truman.

One of the best eulogies, that I must confess I had neglected to recognize until now, was the address by Dr. Richard S. Kirkendall, professor of history, University of Missouri-Columbia. His address on Mr. Truman was presented at the Truman Memorial convocation held in the Memorial Union Auditorium on January 17, 1973, at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

It has now come to my attention that, although Dr. Kirkendall was a native of the State of Washington, he has become one of the authorities on the accomplishments of Missouri's most distinguished son, the great Harry S Truman.

Dr. Kirkendall has excellent credentials as a Truman authority. He joined the faculty of the University of Missouri at Columbia early in 1958 and gained national acclaim for his research and writings on the Truman years. After nearly 10 years, in 1967, he released his first large-scale survey of literature on the Truman era, as editor of "The Truman Period as a Research Field."

This distinguished Truman authority does not come by his knowledge as a matter of hearsay because he has had access to the Truman Library at Independence and had the privilege of several personal interviews with the former President. So it could appropriately be said that Dr. Kirkendall not only had a professional knowledge of Mr. Truman because he is a student of history, but also a personal knowledge because of the several personal interviews with Mr. Truman.

For my part, I am glad that I have recently discovered this excellent address because I would not want it to have been omitted from Mr. Truman's memorial volume. It is my privilege to read into the RECORD at this time the address entitled "Harry S Truman—A Great American President" as follows:

HARRY S TRUMAN—A GREAT AMERICAN PRESIDENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Although he is a native of Spokane, Washington, Dr. Richard S. Kirkendall has become one of the nation's authorities on the accomplishments of one of Missouri's most distinguished native sons—the late President Harry S. Truman.

(Joining the University of Missouri-Columbia history department faculty in 1958, Dr. Kirkendall advanced from assistant to full professor while gaining national acclaim for his research and writings on the Truman years.

(Dr. Kirkendall is a graduate of Gonzaga University at Spokane. After two years in the Navy, he resumed his education and earned master's and doctorate degrees in 1953 and 1958 at the University of Wisconsin.

(He taught history for a year at Wesleyan University at Middletown, Connecticut, before moving to the UMC campus. Not long after his arrival in Missouri he published *Social Scientists and Farm Politics in the Age of Roosevelt* as a hardback volume. In 1967, he made the first large-scale survey of literature on the Truman era as editor of *The Truman Period as a Research Field*.

(Access to the Truman Library at Independence and personal interviews with the former President added to Dr. Kirkendall's personal and professional knowledge of Mr. Truman.)

Harry S. Truman was one of America's

greatest presidents. This is not to say that he was always wise and always successful. None of our presidents has been wise and successful at every point. We have not been ruled by gods. We have been forced to make do with men, and men have limits on their abilities. In appraising presidents, the historian must have realistic expectations.

Harry S. Truman's achievements and proposals entitle him to recognition as a great occupant of the Executive Mansion. He failed more than once; a bolder man might have accomplished more; a wiser one would have avoided some of his moves. His accomplishments may not have been as substantial and significant as Washington's, Lincoln's or Franklin Roosevelt's. Yet, he did promote valuable changes; he developed a new and larger role for the United States in the world, affected some parts of it in very desirable ways, and encouraged social and economic improvements at home. And our experiences since he left the White House suggest that his advice should have been followed more closely.

Truman was not a small man who suddenly had a very big job imposed upon him. The job was very big, but he brought to it rich and varied experiences in American life and politics. He had served for eight years as the chief administrative officer of a populous county and more than nine years as a United States senator. He had campaigned for office on local and state levels, administered and constructed court houses, welfare agencies, roads, and other public facilities in Jackson County, contributed significantly to the war effort as an investigator of the economic side of it, and learned much about the American political and economic systems. Although his brief vice presidency had not supplied specialized training for the higher assignment, his selection as a candidate had enabled him to wage a national campaign in 1944, and his responsibilities as vice president had given him a chance to exercise his political talents in new ways. If he did not shape the administration's proposals, he did obtain opportunities to build support for them. His career before the White House was not a little man's career.

Truman's life before April 12, 1945 also supplied him with a philosophy on the issues that he would face, including the international affairs that would dominate his presidency. His thinking on foreign policy emphasized political considerations, especially the distribution of power, the importance of the military factor, and the need to deal forcefully with aggressive nations. This philosophy was the product of his own experiences as a soldier extending over more than thirty years and of the nation's experiences in world affairs from 1918 to 1945.

As president, Truman was determined to avoid what he regarded as the errors of the past: weakness and refusal to get involved in the major international problems. He feared that the American people would retreat to the foreign and military policies of the 1920s and the 1930s that had failed disastrously. He was convinced that the nation must play a very significant role in the world in the postwar period and must possess military strength.

With Truman supplying essential leadership and making the basic decisions, the United States did not retreat to the policies of the interwar period. Instead, it played a large role in the world. Truman carried to completion Roosevelt's plans for the creation of American membership in the United Nations. Of greater importance, at least in the short run, his administration developed and implemented a plan—the Marshall Plan—for European recovery. The plan and the program that followed contributed decisively to the economic recovery of Western Europe and to the development of political stability and strength in the region.

Truman believed that the United States could and should play a large role in world affairs, but he did not regard American power as unlimited. He did not believe that the United States could do all that it might wish nor accomplish all that it might hope. This sense of limits affected his efforts in Eastern Europe, where he relied largely on words in a futile effort to influence political developments. He was distressed by Russian behavior there but believed that there was little he could do to change it. The sense of limits also prevented him from intervening in a large way in the Civil War in China even though he hoped that Chiang Kai-shek could avoid defeat. He and his aides did not believe that the United States could mobilize the economic and military resources needed to avert a decisive influence on that very large, very complex, and deeply troubled nation.

The sense of limits also contributed significantly to another very controversial aspect of Truman's presidency: his conflict with General Douglas MacArthur in 1951. The President rejected the General's proposal to throw more force against the Chinese in Korea and to carry the war into China itself, according to Truman's top military adviser, "involve Chiang's troops." Truman regarded the suggestions as extremely dangerous. "We are trying to prevent a world war—not to start one," he explained. Furthermore, MacArthur's proposals would tie the United States down in an area of secondary importance and thereby give the Russians new opportunities in a much more important region: Europe. MacArthur's strategy would, according to Truman's top military adviser, "involve us in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy." MacArthur's objectives—the reunification of Korea under non-Communist control and the weakening of China—were not unattractive, but they seemed to Truman to be beyond the limits of American power. The pursuit of them would result in losses that would far outweigh those objectives in importance.

The Truman-MacArthur controversy also involved another very important consideration: the place of the military in American life. Truman regarded military power as essential but also dangerous. His solution was civilian control. This was, of course, the solution of the American Constitution. MacArthur tried to use his prestige to force a change in policy and appealed publicly for support of his ideas. His actions challenged Truman's authority as Commander in Chief, and the President concluded that he must remove the General from command in order to uphold and maintain the essential principle of civilian supremacy.

Foreign affairs was the most significant aspect of Truman's presidency. The record of his domestic accomplishments did not contain any contribution as substantial as the Marshall Plan, to cite a major example. Nevertheless, he was not insignificant in the domestic history of the United States. He was not able to gain acceptance for new domestic proposals, but he did expand and improve already established ones, such as Social Security and public power, and he did defend them against their foes. Moreover, by publicizing various issues, such as health insurance, he paved the way for later accomplishments. Furthermore, he did more on behalf of the civil rights of black Americans than any of his predecessors in the twentieth century.

Truman's civil rights record deserves more than brief mention. It was influenced by his interest in the nation's relations with other people as well as by domestic concerns and humanitarian considerations. Well aware of the international implications of American race relations, he was convinced that the country "could no longer afford the luxury of a leisurely attack upon prejudice and discrimination." In 1951, when vetoing a bill

that would segregate schools on federal property, he explained.

"We have assumed a role of world leadership in seeking to unite people of great cultural and racial diversity . . . We should not impair our moral position by enacting a law that requires discrimination based on race."

Truman's concern in this area was expressed by several significant actions. Late in 1946, he established a Committee on Civil Rights to investigate race relations and make recommendations for government action to protect civil rights, and less than a year later, the committee produced a bold report that influenced the administration's subsequent behavior. Soon, his Justice Department joined the NAACP in an attack before the United States Supreme Court on segregated housing. This marked the beginning of that department's significant participation in the civil rights movement. Early in the following year, the President delivered a special message attacking discrimination and segregation and calling for national legislation that would provide federal protection against lynching, protect the right to vote, prohibit discrimination in interstate transportation facilities, and establish a permanent agency concerned with job discrimination. And in July, 1948, Truman issued two executive orders on civil rights, including one calling for equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed forces and the establishment of a committee to help with the implementation of the order. The President explained that it was intended to end segregation.

Truman enjoyed some successes in this area. His Justice Department continued to function as a "friend of the court" in the major civil rights cases and helped the NAACP win its battles. His appointees to the United States Supreme Court also played important roles in these cases, which attacked segregation in housing, railroad dining cars, and higher education and prepared the way for the monumental decision in 1954 attacking segregation in all public schools. And the armed forces were desegregated. They had taken on new importance as a result of the enlargement of the nation's role in the world, and he promoted progress in race relations in this part of American life.

Truman failed, however, to obtain passage of the broad civil rights legislation that he proposed. Perhaps he might have accomplished more if he had pressed his proposals more boldly. His appraisal of political realities restrained him, however. His ability to promote change was limited by strong resistance, especially in the South. Many southerners bolted the Democratic party in 1948 and supported Governor J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina in a presidential campaign that focused upon race relations. And after the election, a congressional coalition of conservative Democrats, mostly southerners, and conservative Republicans dominated Congress on domestic issues and frustrated Truman's appeal for a legislative attack upon problems in American race relations. Even before Truman became president this coalition had demonstrated that it could thwart a president. It was chiefly responsible for his failure in this area.

Truman did not always succeed, and he did not always make wise decisions. One unwise one was the decision to provide financial support for the French in their battle against revolution in Indochina. This marked the beginning of an involvement that led to disaster.

Truman, however, was not responsible for the disaster. His successors were. They lacked his appreciation of the limits on our power and enlarged enormously a rather small commitment that could have been terminated after the French failed or at some other point far short of massive military involvement.

Many Americans, however, could not accept Truman's belief that their power had

limits. That belief was one of the sources of his unpopularity during his last years in office. By early 1952, only 25 percent of the people thought that he was doing a good job. His most prominent critics were very dissatisfied with his foreign policy, seeing it as responsible for the "loss" of China and for other undesirable developments, and they assumed that the United States could and should accomplish much more than he had accomplished. It was this attitude that led to our large-scale involvement in Vietnam. It has been an effort to "avoid another China."

Truman made mistakes, he failed to accomplish some of his objectives, but he was a much greater president than most Americans realized during his years in the White House. They should have accepted rather than resisted his advice on civil rights and made a much larger effort to solve the problems in American race relations. Instead, those problems—or many of them—were allowed to grow and become a serious threat to the nation as well as a source of suffering and sorrow for many individuals. More attention should have been paid to his suggestions about the limits on American power. Instead, we enlarged our role until bitter and destructive experiences in Vietnam provided persuasive evidence on this point.

In his area of greatest significance, international affairs, Truman's point of view and performance were complex and balanced. He believed that the United States must play a large role in world affairs, but he also maintained that there were limits on what the nation could and should do. He insisted that the United States must have a strong military establishment, but he also knew that a strong military posed a threat to the American system and must be kept in a subordinate position.

We need that complexity and balance at the present moment. Alive now to the folly of globalism, we may swing back to isolationism, forgetting its dangers. The United States once tried to play a small role in the world, but that failed. It did not keep the country out of major wars. Now the nation, or at least a very substantial part of it has become aware of the shortcomings of the global role, the limits on American power, and the need to make choices, and efforts are being made to define a role in the world that minimizes difficulties. The thought and record of one of our greatest presidents could help us define that role.

TVA ABANDONS ITS ORIGINAL OBJECTIVES BY ENCOURAGING THE STRIP MINING AND DEVASTATION OF THE LAND

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago on May 18, 1933, the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority marked one of the greatest political and social experiments in the Nation's history. In recommending to Congress in 1933 the creation of a TVA, President Roosevelt said:

Many hard lessons have taught us the human waste that results from lack of planning. Here and there a few wise cities and counties have looked ahead and planned. But our nation has "just grown". It is time to extend planning to a wider field, in this instance comprehending in one great project many States directly concerned with the basin of one of our greatest rivers.

TVA began from an impoverished region with proud people, a World War I

munitions plant, and a great river made unnavigable by numerous shoals and siltation which resulted from years of erosion on the steep hillsides which form its watershed. The future of the Tennessee Valley, and indeed the United States, was seen in the potential this river offered as a backbone of transportation and a source of hydroelectric power.

THE DREAM OF GEORGE NORRIS

It was the imagination and ideals of a Republican Senator, George Norris, from a Midwestern State, Nebraska, and a progressive President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which enabled the "Great Experiment" to develop. The experiment was considered by its founders as more than a regional program, it was a prototype for other regions to emulate—a multipurpose program to enrich the land through wise conservation of the natural and human resources.

Muscle Shoals, the site of the munitions plant, became a symbol of the struggle of the Nation to lift itself by its bootstraps. President Roosevelt said of Muscle Shoals:

Muscle Shoals is more today than a mere opportunity for the Federal Government to do a kind turn for the people in one small section of a couple of States. Muscle Shoals gives us the opportunity to accomplish a great purpose for the people of many States and, indeed, for the whole Union, because there we have an opportunity of setting an example of planning, planning not just for ourselves but planning for the generations to come, tying in industry and agriculture and forestry and flood prevention, tying them all into a unified whole over a distance of a thousand miles so that we can afford better opportunities and better places for millions of yet unborn to live in the days to come.

In most respects, that great experiment begun 40 years ago has been an overwhelming success. TVA is unique as a comprehensive program for the betterment of the lives of the population of an entire region. And, so far as management of water and agricultural resources is concerned, TVA has been a leader in developing agricultural fertilizers and promoting modern agricultural husbandry nationwide. It is, in this capacity, a model for the entire world.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BY TVA

TVA is a multiple purpose program in the fullest sense and, indeed, is our finest example of comprehensive planning and development of water resources. Prior to TVA, flooding was one of the chief obstacles to development of the region. Operation of TVA dams has prevented millions of dollars of flood damage to Chattanooga and other communities along the Tennessee River. Similar benefits have accrued from reduction of flood peaks downstream along the Ohio and Mississippi. TVA has been a leading innovator in flood plain management programs, and has coupled its construction program with wise management of riparian lands.

Water flow regulation, together with channel improvements, has also vastly improved navigability. Waterborne commerce increased from 33 million ton-miles in 1933 to 3.7 billion ton-miles in 1970. The importance to economic development is obvious; but, more than

that, the waterways have served as a yardstick for maintaining reasonable rates among other forms of transportation as well.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

TVA reservoirs provide great recreational resources for the entire Nation. The impoundments also provide water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural water uses which are of vital importance to the region.

Apart from development of the water resources, TVA has made great strides in soil conservation, fertilizer research, and production. Power from the hydroelectric plants was vital to the Oak Ridge operations and other defense needs during the Second World War.

The main objective of all this, though, was bettering the life of the people of the TVA region. In 40 years of TVA, per capita income of the region grew from 45 percent of that of the Nation to 75 percent.

However, wealth is not the sole measure of a people. Success is manifest in less tangible ways: In the faces of the people, in educational institutions and in a healthful physical and spiritual environment.

THE ROLE OF POWER

But beginning in 1954, TVA lost sight of the objectives of its founders which were so cogently stated by President Roosevelt:

Now for the TVA. I can put it this way: Power is really a secondary matter. What we are doing there is taking a watershed with about three and a half million people in it, almost all of them rural, and we are trying to make a different type of citizen out of them, not what they would be under their present conditions. Now that applies not only to the mountaineers, we all know about them, but it applies to the people around Muscle Shoals. Do you remember that drive over to Wheeler Dam the other day? You went through a county of Alabama where the standards of education are lower than almost any other county in the United States, and yet that is within twenty miles of the Muscle Shoals Dam. They have never had a chance. All you had to do was to look at the houses in which they lived. Heavens, this section around here is 1000% compared with that section we went through. The homes through here are infinitely better.

So TVA is primarily intended to change and to improve the standards of living of the people of that Valley. Power is, as I said, a secondary consideration. Of course it is an important one because, if you can get cheap power to those people, you hasten the process of raising the standard of living.

Things change, however, and despite the good words of President Roosevelt concerning the secondary nature of cheap power in TVA, it is cheap power that sets the scene for our modern image of this agency.

As we now celebrate the 40th anniversary of this noble experiment, it seems appropriate that we reflect not only on what has gone before in the history of this agency, but what lies ahead, as well.

IS TVA TWO-FACED?

Ancient Roman mythology had as one of its most important deities Janus, who opened the sky at sunrise and closed it at sunset. He is often represented as having two faces, one to see into the future, the other to see into the past.

The analogy which can be drawn between Janus and the Tennessee Valley Authority at this time is appropriate. Certainly, TVA has been responsible for bringing light to the people of south Appalachia. The growing reliance on coal-fired powerplants carries with it the threat of darkness for the land and for the people.

TVA, upon looking back, can find satisfaction in the great good it has done in applying basic conservation premises and enlightened Government policy to solving the problems of a land and its people.

Poverty and erosion were evident in both man and land in the Tennessee Valley 40 years ago. The richness of the land and of the human spirit were washed away by the flood of nature's wrath with man's folly.

The past-seeing Janus eyes of TVA saw those errors of Man erased, to be replaced with constructive reasoned enterprise. Those eyes have seen the land and the people prosper.

There is a troubling mote in the eye of retrospective vision, however. It is a mote that threatens to blot out the accomplishments of the past. And, to set the stage for a future which has the potential to dwarf the ravages of the 1930's.

Modern man, muscled with new technology and motivated by greed, is on the march. TVA, if not leading the parade, is certainly calling the tune.

The bulldozers and power shovels which came to shape and heal, to rebuild in the 1930's stayed when their work was finished. But like house pets left unsupervised too long, they have gone feral, cutting and tearing at the earth as a pack of wild dogs destroys a deer.

George Norris once said, mistakenly, as it turns out:

I think the TVA will prove the greatest thing in the world for the human betterment of common, ordinary men and women. It will combine the blessings and advantages God has given us into an integrated whole, improving the lot of everyone and injuring nobody.

Cheap power, the balm of a generation ago, has become the narcotic debilitating drug of the present. With the hydro potential of the Tennessee Valley largely tapped, the switch was on—to thermal power. Coal-fired thermal power.

THE RAVAGES OF STRIP MINING

Striped mined coal.

A troubling mote in the backward-looking eye, indeed.

Some details on the changing power picture are clear. One of those details is that the U.S. Government has been a key factor in the increasing demand for electricity in the TVA area. Science writer John Walsh noted in October 1965 the ravenous appetite of the Oak Ridge facilities:

In 1944, before Oak Ridge had geared up to its peak wartime pace, Federal installations used some 717 million kilowatt hours out of a TVA total annual output of 9110 billion . . . The Korean War and the advent of hydrogen weapons sent Federal power requirements up proportionately faster (than private demands). In 1954 Federal use of TVA power had climbed to 11.8 billion out of

a total output of 30.1 billion kilowatt hours. By 1964 the Federal share was 25.4 billion kilowatt hours out of a total output of 68.5 billion.

We can only hope that the strategic arms limitation agreements will enable this domestic energy consumption spiral to level off.

Walsh also zeroed in on the supreme irony of the situation, the environmental destruction associated with an organization dedicated to conservation. Walsh quoted former Kentucky Gov. Edward Breathitt's remark that—

Certainly the TVA, which is basically a conservation agency, should insist that good conservation practices be observed whenever it does business. The conscience of the Authority should not allow the destruction it is today helping to promote.

The reaction to those strong words by TVA Board Chairman Aubrey Wagner is interesting. Wagner said:

To put the picture in perspective in 1963, out of a total production of 178 million tons of coal in Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois, Virginia and Alabama, TVA bought some 22 million tons or about 12 percent. During this same year, slightly more than one-third of the total production came from surface mines—strip and auger—and slightly over half of the total coal TVA bought came from these mines.

In that response, Mr. Wagner chose to ignore the point at issue, contenting himself with manipulated figures—only two of the States named lie largely within TVA jurisdiction.

The crucial item in Wagner's statement was that over half of TVA coal came from surface and auger mines. That was the fact that was so at odds with all that TVA should stand for.

NO RECLAMATION AT FIRST

At the time, there was no provision for reclamation in TVA contracts. Cheap power from cheap coal was the operative order of the day. One operator was quoted as saying:

There isn't an operator in this business who can sell coal at TVA prices without tearing up the State. There is no reason why we should have to mine coal under emergency conditions.

The 1965 pressures on TVA appeared to have had some effect, since invitations to bid for coal supply contracts in July of that year carried with them the requirement that strip mined lands be reclaimed.

NEW "RECLAMATION" REQUIREMENTS

The provisions of that date still sound commendable; coal faces and all toxic materials to be buried; breakthroughs to underground mines sealed; no spoiled deposits in natural drainage courses; spoil banks regarded to allow vegetation to become established; and replanting of trees or other cover.

All reclamation was to be completed within 24 months after delivery of the coal. Operators failing to meet the requirements were to have their contract cancelled and were to be removed from the list of eligible contractors for future supply contracts. And the reclamation requirements have been stiffened repeatedly.

Any number of States have legislation on their books at this time, legislation

which proclaims just such a no-nonsense approach to strip mining reclamation.

I have traveled to a number of those States. I have listened to witnesses from those States as they testified before congressional committees considering Federal legislation on strip mining. I have received thousands of letters from citizens in those States.

These experiences have led me to a single conclusion. The only effective legislative control of strip mining is the legislative elimination of strip mining, within a reasonable period of 6 months for contour mining, and 17 months for area stripping.

"RECLAMATION" HAS FAILED

Indicative of the failure to control the ravages of stripping through regulations or laws is the incident reported in the *Nashville, Tennessean* on September 19, 1971, by William Greenburg. After a field inspection of a strip mine supplying coal to TVA, the reporter wrote:

At least one landslide could be clearly seen, dropping a sheet of brown down the lush green mountainside.

A resident of the area pointed up and said: "That is what TVA is doing to us. They tell us they are making the strip miners grow it back. They can never make that mountain green again. And they can never take that slop out of our river again."

This was some 6 years after TVA had first imposed reclamation requirements in its contracts, and after those requirements had been updated and strengthened.

Perhaps the "local resident" quoted in that newspaper account should be packed up and sent to the TVA board of directors. He clearly has a more intimate knowledge of strip mining operations and a more accurate appraisal of the potential for reclamation than do the majority of board members now serving.

That same article lends some hope, however, since it noted—

There are the conservationists within the TVA who hold that the agency doesn't take enough force in demanding that the strip mined lands be redeveloped. A few, in candid moments, wonder if reclamation is impossible after the land has been robbed of its coal.

The renewed opposition to the TVA's continued mammoth consumption of strip mined coal led to the seemingly inevitable result—new reclamation standards, touted to be tougher and more readily enforceable than the previous requirements set just a year before, in December 1970.

Unrealistic as this band-aid-against-a-cancer approach may be, one can still understand the reasoning which underlies the gradual increase in severity of restrictions as previous rules prove ineffective.

Completely beyond understanding or rationalization, however, was the earlier refusal of TVA to comply with the law of the land—the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

This landmark piece of legislation is designed to bring a degree of environmental balance into the Federal decision-making process by requiring agencies to file a statement of expected environmental impacts before undertaking a program

or policy which could significantly affect the environment.

**SEPARATE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS
NOT FILED BY TVA**

Conservationists had called for environmental impact statements to be filed on a series of contracts to supply coal obtained by surface mining.

TVA refused to comply, so the conservationists went to Court on March 1, 1971. The plaintiffs, Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense Fund, and the Sierra Club, pointed out in their suit that T-A had never filed such a specific environmental statement, although the agency had shown an awareness that strip mining does have a detrimental effect on the environment.

The case will be heard on its merits on May 21, 1973, in the Federal district court at Knoxville, Tenn. Two issues will be argued: First, whether the environmental impact statement submitted by TVA complies with the NEPA requirements; and second, whether requiring that individual impact statements be filed as contended by the plaintiff would affect the competitive purchasing procedures required by the TVA Act.

It is interesting to note that the proposed revisions of the CEQ guidelines provide for "generic" impact statements in the case of repetitive or sequential actions by Federal agencies, but even these new guidelines recognize that some actions, although of a class for which a generic statement has been written, would result in unique environmental damage to the extent that an individual impact statement would be required for individual projects. Certainly, each and every coal procurement contract would result in damage in a different location and situation so as to require an independent analysis of the environmental impact.

WEAKNESS OF TVA REGULATIONS

But more importantly than that, the policies followed by TVA are so insufficient as to constitute no policy at all. The agency allows, for instance, strip mining operations on slopes as great as 28 degrees. In the surface mining legislation which passed the House of Representatives last year there was a provision which would have barred stripping on any slopes exceeding 20 degrees.

The toughened provisions of the 1970 reclamation regulations contained loopholes large enough to run the "Gem of Egypt" through. Phrases such as "as closely as possible," and "to the maximum extent practicable" dotted the regulations. So they tried to toughen them further.

It is clear that TVA has not acted in good faith to uphold the charter presented to it in 1933. A recent report by the General Accounting Office prepared at my request thoroughly documents the failure of the TVA to live up to its own requirements.

A survey of the Beaver Creek Basin in Kentucky by the Geological Survey reveals the backsiding which has taken place in the province of TVA as a result of strip mining.

Over 27,000 tons of earth per square

mile were washed away in strip mined areas, as compared to 1,900 tons in non-strip-mined areas. Minerals were washed out of the earth at a rate of 1,370 tons per square mile in stripped areas, while only 111 tons were lost in nonstripped areas.

All the fish and most of the plant life had been eradicated in streams affected by strip mining.

Six years after the mining had been concluded found these conditions still existing.

Strip mining cannot be regulated.

Our coal resources can continue to play a vital role in supplying our Nation with energy, but that coal must come from underground mines where there are available eight times the amount of low-sulfur reserves as there are stripable reserves, mines where the health and safety of the miners are adequately protected, where stable, long-term job possibilities exist.

Underground coal mines can provide economic benefits without trading away environmental protection in return.

A sound economy in a sound land—this is the charter from which TVA has wantonly strayed.

It is the charter to which TVA must be returned.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL PAYMENT ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker. I have this date introduced a bill, with Congressman ANCHER NELSEN as a cosponsor, that would establish a new and what is believed to be a better and improved procedure for determining the Federal payment for the District of Columbia. This proposal includes both the procedure as it relates to appropriating funds for the Federal payment, as well as authorizing the amount of the Federal payment. It legislatively implements the recommendation of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia—the Nelsen Commission—as it relates to this matter.

The Nelsen Commission, in its study, found that the lump sum and the formula approaches to the Federal payment were both troublesome, not only to the Congress, but to the District government as well. The Commission considered that the Federal payment should be predictable; operate to encourage District efforts to raise more revenues; use the prior year authorization level as a base; operate to avoid wide fluctuations impacting adversely on the District's ability to plan and finance operations; and, to the extent possible, reflect the unusual costs to the District of its role as the Nation's Capital.

The Nelsen Commission also recommended that, where the District Government determines that there will be a need for an increase in the authorization, that it should act promptly to insure that the matter is submitted to the Congress sufficiently in advance—ap-

proximately 18 months—so that the Congress will be able to establish a level of Federal payment 1 year in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year in which such authorization would take effect.

It is generally conceded that the problem of the Federal payment as it relates to the District of Columbia leaves both of the principal parties relatively unhappy with the effort they expend to arrive at an agreement regarding the level of that payment. On the one hand, in many instances the Congress deals with the matter in a relatively bulk increment manner, rather than approaching it on a refined statistical basis. However, Congress yielding in certain instances because it considers it does not have sufficient information on which to make a refined judgment, the authorization is set on the basis of compromise rather than need for informed judgment. Meanwhile, the District government is often unhappy, it appears, because certain of its officials may feel that they have been unable to fully get across their story to the Congress as far as justifying needs and convincing the Congress that a larger increase in the Federal payment is fully warranted.

It is believed that the approach contained in this bill would to a large extent diminish, if not eliminate, this controversy and, in addition, permit the Congress to act in a more informed manner as it relates to the Federal payment. On the other hand, District government officials, by providing for intercity fiscal comparisons in justifying their level of request for a Federal payment, will be informing the residents of the District that their need, at least on a basis compared with other cities, is justifiable; and that their revenue-raising efforts, such as those relating to real estate tax, are comparable with like cities, given the uniqueness of the Nation's Capital. Certainly, the information supplied the Congress by the District government and the Office of Management and Budget should also serve to inform and reassure local residents that their taxes are being used by the local government in an effective and efficient manner.

This manner of arriving at a Federal payment should also serve to inform the Nation's taxpayers, "who give a substantial measure of financial support to the operation of the District government (S. Rept. 91-1122, page 2)" that the Congress is performing its proper and informed legislative oversight in establishing a Federal payment for the District of Columbia. Your support on behalf of this measure is solicited, and in order to provide those in the Congress who may not have had an opportunity to read some of the background as it relates to this matter, the excerpt from the Nelsen Commission report which relates to this matter is reprinted below:

THE FEDERAL PAYMENT

The Fiscal relationship between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government has always been difficult to define, let alone quantify. Some aspects of the relationship are more clearly understood than others. For instance, it is well known that the Congress enacts most revenue measures for the District, appropriates annually the funds it may expend including those raised from local

revenue sources, and determines the size of the Federal Payment. Federal grants-in-aid are available to the District as they are to state and local governments.

Great difficulty arises in trying to determine precisely the costs and benefits which accrue to the District of Columbia as a result of being the seat of the Federal Government. Satisfactory techniques have not been developed for quantifying such factors as the influence of the Federal payroll, the tourist trade drawn by the Federal city, the effect of Federal agency relocation and leasing decisions, the impact of exempt Federal and related property (i.e. embassies, national non-profit associations, etc.) as it relates to revenue collection, and the extra costs the District incurs as a result of policing and cleaning up after national demonstrations.

Many feel that the Federal Payment should reflect only the extraordinary net cost (above average or different in some way from comparable cities) to the District of the Federal presence. Others maintain that the Federal Payment should be sufficient to make the District a model American city or, at least an orderly, attractive and pleasing National Capital. In these approaches as well as others, there is little agreement as to which costs and benefits are considered normal and which extraordinary, or how they should be reflected in the annual Federal Payment.

Although intercity fiscal comparisons are useful in determining the level of the Federal Payment, measurement difficulties preclude establishing the Payment based solely on the difference between District expenditures and revenues of average intercity rates. Nevertheless, intercity comparisons are still extremely helpful as a starting point in determining whether the standard of fairness seems to be observed for each new level of the Federal Payment. It is important to realize that the knowledge gained from intercity fiscal comparisons is suggestive and not definitive—it must be used judiciously and its limitations must be understood.

Because of the vital role the Federal Payment plays in District financial operations and its effect on the economy and efficiency of those operations, the determination of the level of the Federal Payment has been a matter of primary concern to the Commission. The Commission has not been able to develop a precise mathematical formula nor does it believe the subject is amenable to such precision. Nevertheless, a list of several identifiable elements of costs and benefits to the District of the Federal presence has been assembled which bears on the subject and should be considered, among others in future deliberations.

1. Revenues unobtainable because of the relative lack of taxable commercial and industrial property.
2. Revenues unobtainable because of the relative lack of taxable business income.
3. Potential revenues that would be realized if the following exemptions from District taxes were eliminated:
 - a. Non-resident income earned in the District
 - b. Other special exemptions from individual income taxes
 - c. Exemptions from sales taxes
4. Recurring and non-recurring costs of unreimbursed services to the Federal Government.
5. Other expenditure requirements placed on the District by the Federal Government which are unique to the District.
6. Benefits of Federal grants-in-aid relative to aid given other states and local governments.
7. Recurring and non-recurring costs of unreimbursed services rendered the District by the Federal Government.
8. Benefits derived through Treasury borrowing.
9. Higher than average sales tax revenue from tourist trade.

10. Benefits from museums, parks, libraries, and cultural activities which are financed by the Federal Government or are located in the District because it is the Nation's Capital.

11. Net costs, if any, after considering other compensation for tax base deficiencies and the direct and indirect taxes paid, of providing services to tax-exempt non-profit organizations and corporate offices doing business only with the Federal Government.

12. Benefits of a relatively stable economy.

Some of the above elements can be quantified; others are purely judgmental. The Commission believes that the Federal Payment will thus continue to represent a kind of equilibrium, balancing extraordinary net benefits of the Federal presence with extraordinary net costs, however these benefits and costs may be defined. Adjustments in the Payment should be considered when these extraordinary elements change significantly to the extent that the adjustments can be based on measurable changes.

A continuing analysis of the elements affecting the level of the Federal Payment is essential to recommending such adjustments on a fair and equitable basis. The Commission believes that such analysis should hereafter be conducted on a continuing basis under the supervision of the Federal Office of Management and Budget in conjunction with its annual review of the District Government's budget submission, and related inter-community revenue and expenditure comparisons developed by the District government. A background paper on the Federal Payment may be found in Volume III of the Nelsen Commission Report.

HOUSE MEMBERS CALL FOR OVERHAUL OF SOCIAL SERVICE REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Finance Committee is holding the last of 4 days of hearings on the revised social service regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on May 1.

In a statement submitted to Finance Committee Chairman RUSSELL LONG, 84 House Members have called for an overhaul of the May 1 regulations.

We feel that HEW has moved beyond congressional intent by using the regulations to convert social services from a program intended to keep people off welfare to one which is targeted almost exclusively on welfare recipients.

In an effort to exclude most nonrecipients from the program, HEW has unintentionally provided an incentive for welfare dependency. Under new income eligibility standards, many cash assistance recipients with outside earnings will be able to qualify for free day care, for example, while people at the same income level who are entirely self supporting will be unable to obtain the free service. Obviously, there will be little incentive for the welfare recipient to become financially self-sufficient under this arrangement.

A copy of our letter to Senator LONG follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1973.
Senator RUSSELL LONG,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We want to indicate our concern about the revised regulations for the social services program issue by the

Department of Health, Education and Welfare on May 1.

After reviewing these latest regulations together with the earlier version published on February 16, it appears to us that HEW has lost sight of the original objective of the social services program—the prevention of welfare dependency.

The new regulations, in effect, convert social services from a program intended to keep people off welfare to one which is targeted almost exclusively on welfare recipients.

In some areas, the regulations are actually counter-productive. Welfare dependency, in fact, will be encouraged rather than discouraged. A good case in point is the new income eligibility standards. The May 1 regulations state that with the exception of day care, potential welfare recipients will be eligible for services only if their gross income does not exceed 150% of their state's welfare payment standard. This means that in every state, many welfare recipients with outside earnings will be eligible for services while non-recipients at the same income level will be ineligible. The accompanying chart documents this point.

Clearly, HEW will have difficulty justifying an arrangement in which a non-recipient finds that he can not qualify for free day care service, for example, while his welfare recipients neighbor with an *equal if not higher income* can obtain the free service.

What HEW is really telling people through these new regulations is that you can do much better for yourself if you stay on welfare so why bother trying to make it on your own.

The new assets requirement will also tend to discourage economic independence. Under the revised regulations, potential recipients will have to meet the same assets test used for cash assistance recipients. In most states,

this means that low income homeowners, farmers and people with modest savings will be effectively cut off from the program. Here again, we will be penalizing those people who are struggling to maintain their self-sufficiency at poverty level incomes.

We are also concerned about the extremely restrictive definition of services eligible for federal reimbursement. Funding will be cut off for a wide range of programs, including education, mental health, medical treatment and nutritional services.

A number of states have used social service funds to establish drug treatment and alcoholism control centers. By treating an individual's drug problem, a community agency is doing much to keep this person off the welfare rolls. Yet, most drug treatment programs will no longer be fundable under the new regulations.

Many older people have maintained their independence and avoided institutionalization with the aid of programs such as "Meals on Wheels". But many of these efforts, as well, will now be terminated as a result of the new regulations.

These new federally-imposed restrictions run counter to efforts underway throughout the federal government to give states more flexibility in dealing with their own locally identified needs. For some reason, the objectives of the New Federalism have been abandoned when it comes to social services.

Clearly, additional revisions of the May 1 regulations are necessary if the social service program is to meet the major goal laid out for it by Congress—the prevention of welfare dependency. If the necessary adjustments are not made on an administrative level, we urge the Finance Committee to consider legislative action to deal with the concerns we have just outlined.

We would appreciate having this letter

made part of your committee's official hearing record on social service regulations.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Brock Adams, Bella S. Abzug, Joseph P. Addabbo, Thomas L. Ashley, Herman Badillo, John A. Blatnik, Jonathan B. Bingham, Edward P. Boland.

John Brademas, Frank J. Bracco, George E. Brown, Jr., Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Shirley Chisholm, William Clay, John Conyers, Jr., James C. Corman.

Dominick V. Daniels, Ronald V. Dellums, Frank E. Denholm, John Dent, Ron de Lugo, Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Robert F. Drinan, Bob Eckhardt.

Don Edwards, Joshua Eilberg, Dante B. Fascell, Walter E. Fauntroy, Richard H. Fulton, Henry B. Gonzalez, Ella Grasso, William J. Green.

Gilbert Gude, Michael Harrington, Augustus F. Hawkins, Henry Heistoski, Ken Hechler, Elizabeth Holtzman, James Howard, Barbara Jordan, Robert Kastenmeier.

Edward I. Koch, Robert L. Leggett, Spark M. Matsunaga, Lloyd Meeds, Ralph H. Metcalfe, Patsy T. Mink, Parren J. Mitchell, John Moakley.

William S. Moorhead, John M. Murphy, Claude Pepper, Bertram Podell, Richardson Preyer, Charles B. Rangel, Thomas M. Rees, Donald W. Riegle.

Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Fred B. Rooney, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Dan Rostenkowski, Edward R. Roybal, Paul S. Sarbanes, Patricia Schroeder, John F. Seiberling.

B. F. Sisk, James V. Stanton, Fortney H. Stark, Louis Stokes, W. S. Stuckey, Jr., Gerry E. Studds, James W. Symington, Frank Thompson, Jr.

Robert O. Tiernan, Lionel Van Deerlin, Charles A. Vanik, Antonio Borja Won Pat, Sidney R. Yates, Andrew Young, John Culver, Robert Roe, Mike McCormack.

TABLE 1.—ELIGIBILITY FOR SOCIAL SERVICES FOR A FAMILY OF 4 UNDER HEW REGULATIONS¹

State	AFDC payment standard (annual)	Annual net earnings level ² at which AFDC closes ³		Limit on family eligibility ⁴ for—		State	AFDC payment standard (annual)	Annual net earnings level ² at which AFDC closes ³		Limit on family eligibility ⁴ for—	
		AFDC	AFDC closes	Services other than day care	Day care			AFDC	AFDC closes	Services other than day care	Day care
Alabama	\$1,164	\$2,106	\$1,746	\$2,716		Nebraska	\$3,684	\$5,886	\$5,526	\$8,596	
Alaska	4,800	7,560	7,200	11,200		Nevada	2,112	3,528	3,168	4,928	
Arizona	3,384	5,430	5,070	7,896		New Hampshire	3,528	5,652	5,292	8,232	
Arkansas	2,748	4,482	4,122	6,412		New Jersey	3,888	6,192	5,832	9,072	
California	3,768	6,042	5,682	8,792		New Mexico	2,436	4,014	3,654	5,684	
Colorado	2,904	4,716	4,356	6,776		New York	4,032	6,408	6,048	9,408	
Connecticut	4,056	6,444	6,084	9,464		North Carolina	1,906	3,219	2,859	4,447	
Delaware	3,444	5,527	5,167	8,039		North Dakota	3,600	5,760	5,400	8,400	
Washington, D.C.	2,868	4,742	4,382	6,692		Ohio	2,400	3,960	3,600	5,600	
Florida	2,676	4,374	4,014	6,244		Oklahoma	2,268	3,762	3,402	5,292	
Georgia	2,724	4,446	4,086	6,356		Oregon	3,204	5,166	4,806	7,476	
Hawaii	4,008	6,372	6,012	9,332		Pennsylvania	3,756	5,994	5,534	8,764	
Idaho	3,384	5,436	5,076	7,896		Rhode Island	3,156	5,094	4,734	7,364	
Illinois	3,264	5,256	4,896	7,616		South Carolina	2,496	4,104	3,744	5,824	
Indiana	4,356	6,894	6,534	10,164		South Dakota	3,420	5,490	5,130	7,980	
Iowa	3,600	5,760	5,400	8,400		Tennessee	2,604	4,266	3,906	6,076	
Kansas	3,864	6,156	5,796	9,016		Texas	1,776	3,024	2,664	4,144	
Kentucky	2,808	4,572	4,212	6,552		Utah	2,820	4,590	4,230	6,580	
Louisiana	1,296	2,304	1,944	3,024		Vermont	4,020	6,390	6,030	9,380	
Maine	4,188	6,642	6,282	9,772		Virginia	3,132	5,058	4,698	7,308	
Maryland	2,400	3,960	3,600	5,600		Washington	3,528	5,652	5,292	8,232	
Massachusetts	4,188	6,622	6,262	9,772		West Virginia	1,656	2,884	2,484	5,796	
Michigan	4,332	6,858	6,498	10,108		Wisconsin	3,624	5,796	5,436	8,456	
Minnesota	4,068	6,462	6,102	9,492		Wyoming	3,120	5,040	4,680	7,279	
Mississippi	3,324	5,346	4,986	7,756		Puerto Rico	1,584	2,736	2,376	3,696	
Missouri	3,636	5,814	5,454	8,484		Virgin Islands	1,992	3,348	2,988	4,648	
Montana	2,472	4,068	3,708	5,768							

¹ Based on July 1972 data, except for West Virginia (July 1971). Individuals must also have resources (assets) which are within the limits specified by the State for cash assistance recipients.

² Income limit for people off welfare.

³ Work expenses may be deducted from total earnings in calculating net earnings.

⁴ Income limit for people on welfare.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Minneapolis Tribune discusses the welfare-dependency incentive created by the new social service income eligibility standards.

This flaw in the May 1 regulations was brought to light at the Senate Finance Committee hearings by my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WALTER MONDALE.

The article follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, May 9, 1973]
MONDALE QUESTIONS LEAD TO REVIEW OF HEW RULES ON SOCIAL SERVICES

(By Finlay Lewis)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Questions raised Tuesday by Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., have prompted the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to reexamine key positions of its regulations that will govern a \$2.5-billion program of social services.

Philip Rutledge, HEW's acting administrator of social and rehabilitation services, acknowledged in an interview yesterday that the department will restudy its income eligibility standards for the program as a result of Mondale's questions.

Earlier yesterday, Mondale produced figures during a meeting of the Senate Finance Committee showing that in certain instances welfare recipients could do better under the program than those who are not on welfare.

Rutledge, HEW Secretary Casper Weinberger and other department officials appeared before the committee to explain the regulations, most of which will go into effect July 1.

The regulations will govern a program under which federal, state and local governments and private charities put up funds to carry on a wide range of social services aimed at moving poor people off of welfare. A corollary objective of the program—two-thirds of which is financed by the federal government—is to keep potential welfare recipients off of the public assistance rolls.

Under HEW's new regulations, a person who is not already on welfare can qualify for social service benefits if his or her income is less than 150 percent of a particular state's welfare assistance standard.

An exception to the income standard is in the area of day-care services. Here a mother, for example, can receive a partial subsidy for day-care expenses until her income becomes more than 233 percent of the state's assistance standard.

Mondale's figures disclosed, however, that in every state the figure of 150 percent would be at least \$360 less than the maximum amount of earnings that a welfare recipient is allowed to keep under various employment programs.

The situation arises because a welfare recipient is allowed to discount a flat \$30 a month, plus one-third of his earnings in computing his or her eligibility for public assistance.

In Minnesota, Mondale's figures show that the basic assistance standard for a family of four is \$4,068. However, a welfare family of four can actually receive \$6,462 in income as a result of the discount provisions and still qualify for HEW's program of social services.

In contrast, a family of four that is not on welfare is disqualified from the social services program as soon as its income hits \$6,102, or 150 percent of \$4,068.

"This simply means that many people who are on welfare will receive more free services than those who are not on welfare—and whose incomes are actually less than the welfare recipients," Mondale said.

This situation might result in a "disincentive" that would frustrate the effort to move people off of welfare, Mondale suggested.

Despite persistent questioning by Mondale none of the HEW officials at the committee session effectively rebutted his arguments.

In the interview later, Rutledge said that HEW analysts are studying Mondale's figures but he agreed that there is an income gap built into the regulations favoring those on welfare.

"I'll have to see his arithmetic but he's raised a good point and we're going to analyze the situation again," said Rutledge.

"The question is whether this amount of money constitutes a disincentive or whether it doesn't. There's disagreement around that question," added Rutledge, whose office administers the social services program.

In a separate interview, Mrs. Joan Hutchinson, acting deputy assistant secretary for welfare legislation, said that the policy of discounting certain portions of a welfare recipients' income is intended to serve as a work incentive.

WATERGATE

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Ervin Committee opened its hearings into the Watergate scandal and other events surrounding the 1972

presidential election campaign. I hope and expect that the Ervin hearings will bring out much of the information about Watergate that has not yet been made available to the Congress and the public, but the work of that committee is not and cannot be enough.

Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives has an independent responsibility to oversee and inquire into the conduct of "the President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States," and, if necessary, to discipline them. The House must not shirk that high duty.

Included at this point in the RECORD are two items from this morning's New York Times—an article by Anthony Lewis and an editorial:

THE VOICE OF HISTORY—AT HOME ABROAD

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, May 16.—The Convention that wrote the Constitution of the United States debated only July 20, 1787, the clause making the Chief Executive of the new Government removable on impeachment and conviction. The surviving notes of the debate, by James Madison, make highly pertinent reading in 1973.

Opinion in the Convention was divided. Some thought a limited term of office would be sufficient assurance against executive misbehavior. But three of the Convention's leading figures argued for impeachment: Benjamin Franklin, Madison himself and his fellow Virginian, George Mason.

"No point is of more importance," Mason said. "Shall any man be above Justice? Above all shall that man be above it who can commit the most extensive injustice?"

Dr. Franklin warned that the absence of an impeachment provision would leave the removal of an "obnoxious" executive to more violent methods. Madison thought the clause "indispensable . . . for defending the community against the incapacity, negligence or perfidy of the chief Magistrate."

The clause was approved in general terms. On Sept. 8 it came before the Convention again in final draft form, listing as grounds for impeachment "treason and bribery." Mason thought that was too narrow.

"Attempts to subvert the Constitution," he warned, "may not be treason." He first suggested adding "maladministration," then substituted "other high crimes and misdemeanors." The amendment carried.

The framers of the Constitution plainly intended impeachment to play a broad role as one of their several defenses against abuses of power. That was still the view fifty years later, when de Tocqueville said the main object of the clause was "to take power away from a man who makes ill use of it."

It is a historical anomaly, therefore, to treat the idea of impeaching a President as almost sacrilegious. The notion that kings rule by divine right was pretty well undermined by the 18th century, and those who made the American Revolution hardly meant to enshrine it afresh in the Presidency.

Of course the importance of the Presidency in the American system, and in the world, has grown beyond what the men who met in Philadelphia in 1787 could have imagined. It is inconvenient to change Presidents in mid-term; it is risky. But the risks are not only one way.

We can live with a weakened Presidency; we have done so before, and the Presidential mystique is overdue for deflation. But can we live with ourselves under a leadership that we know is tainted? For the inevitable obscurity about exactly what Richard Nixon did cannot hide what everyone must know: that the lawlessness we call Watergate could

not have taken place except in an atmosphere created and permitted by this President.

It is true that no American President has been removed from office, and that is an important gloss of history on the constitutional text. But then no President in office has had so many close associates charged with such grave abuse of power—or has had called into question the honor of the terms on which he was elected.

In thinking about the difficulties of changing Presidents, we should not forget how a democracy may benefit from a cleansing change in leadership. After the disastrous Suez affair in 1956 Britain changed Prime Ministers without changing parties. Even that was enough to lift much of the cloud from public life, for all the lasting impact of Suez.

The American system is less flexible than the parliamentary, but it does not condemn us to the rigid embrace of a President unfit for office. The Constitution speaks not only of "removal" but of "resignation." Those words were used again just six years ago, in the 25th Amendment.

Is there any serious possibility of resignation? It is an act of self-denial hard to imagine in any man ambitious enough to have become President. But once before on a momentous occasion Richard Nixon put his country ahead of his own ambition—when he decided not to challenge the 1960 election. One cannot exclude a decision that only his resignation could open the way to a healing of American politics.

The succession of Spiro Agnew to the Presidency would still leave us, however, under the shadow of doubt about the integrity of the 1972 election. The necessity is to remove that shadow without leaving the country driven by partisan rancor. As it happens, the 25th Amendment offers a way out.

A little-noted section of the new amendment provides that when there is no Vice President—as, for example, when one has succeeded to the Presidency—the President shall nominate a successor, subject to confirmation by majority vote of both houses of Congress. If Mr. Agnew undertook to resign when a successor qualified, he would set in motion a process bipartisan in its nature. Such an idea is still staggering to contemplate, but we shall have to begin opening our minds to the constitutional possibilities.

At the Convention of 1787 Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania at first opposed the impeachment clause but changed his mind after the debate. The President was not to be a king, he said: "The people are the king." How ironic it would be if we now bound ourselves to a king of shreds and patches.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

With the opening of the Ervin committee hearings today, the nation carries forward the task—already under way in several grand jury rooms—of sorting out truth from rumor about the interlocking crimes and conspiracies known as Watergate. Public testimony by many witnesses over the coming weeks may illuminate the role of one man not likely to be called as a witness, President Nixon.

The President's address to the nation on April 30 clearly failed to resolve the gathering doubts about that role. His subsequent speech at a Republican fund-raising dinner in Washington only made matters worse. He has avoided holding a press conference where he could be questioned. Yet silence and a determined attempt to carry on public business as if nothing had happened are not convincing or reassuring. The questions accumulate.

What took place between the President and John N. Mitchell, his former Attorney General and most trusted political confidant, during the two-hour conference last July 1

which preceded Mr. Mitchell's resignation as campaign manager? That was two weeks after the Watergate burglars were arrested. The involvement of some officials of the Committee for the Re-election of the President was already becoming apparent.

Did President Nixon fire Mr. Mitchell because of the bungled Watergate break-in? Did Mr. Mitchell remove himself for public relations purposes but continue to keep effective control over the committee's operations? Did Mr. Mitchell tell the President during that conference what he knew about Mr. Liddy, Mr. Hunt and the other Watergate operators? If not, why not? When did the President first learn that Liddy and Hunt had been on the White House payroll performing undercover missions?

Next, there are the mysterious telephone calls last July to and from L. Patrick Gray 3d, the acting director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Gray, distraught because of the interference of White House aides in the F.B.I.'s investigation, called Clark MacGregor, the successor to Mr. Mitchell as campaign manager, and warned him that Watergate might be much more serious than anyone thought.

Whether Mr. MacGregor told that to the President is unclear, but soon thereafter Mr. Nixon and Mr. Gray had a telephone conversation. The latter told the President he was "confused" about the intervention of White House aides, if Mr. Gray's account is correct, Mr. Nixon did not ask him for details. He merely told him to carry on the investigation and ended the conversation. Why did the President not express curiosity about something obviously worrying his inexperienced appointee at the F.B.I.?

A third set of questions concerns the Watergate investigation supposed to have been carried on by John W. Dean 3d, the President's counsel. Mr. Nixon referred to Mr. Dean's "complete investigation" as the basis for his assertion at a news conference last Aug. 29 that no one then employed at the White House was involved in the Watergate case.

It now appears, according to Mr. Dean, that he never made any investigation, never submitted any report written or oral to the President. It further appears, according to unidentified White House sources, that President Nixon relied upon an oral report from John D. Ehrlichman who was Mr. Dean's superior, in that remarkably narrow hierarchy of authority at the White House. What is the truth about "the Dean investigation"? Did Mr. Dean mislead Mr. Ehrlichman, or did Mr. Ehrlichman mislead the President?

A fourth set of questions arises from the activities of Dwight Chapin, the President's appointments secretary, and Herbert Kalmbach, the President's personal attorney. Mr. Kalmbach raised large sums in cash some of which he dispensed, on Mr. Chapin's instructions, to the head of a network of political saboteurs. In view of Mr. Kalmbach's lawyer-client relationship with the President and in view of his long personal and political association with him, would he have engaged in such activities unless he was certain that they had the President's approval? Has the President ever discussed these matters with Mr. Kalmbach? When Mr. Chapin unexpectedly resigned last winter from his prestigious White House post to take a lower-paid job in private industry, did not Mr. Nixon experience any surprise at his departure?

If President Nixon were the kind of man who, like General Eisenhower, had little interest in the details of politics or, like President Harding, were unintelligent, some of these questions would not arise. But Mr. Nixon is an able lawyer quite familiar from the Hiss investigation with the work of the F.B.I. and of criminal prosecutors. He has an omnivorous taste for political information

and a feeling for the nuances of power. He is not an ignorant or careless man.

The hearings of the Ervin committee and the work of the grand juries may unravel some of these mysteries. But until these questions—and many more like them—are answered, the public cannot be satisfied that the whole truth has been learned.

THE NEED FOR TOUGHER FOOD SANITATION LEGISLATION

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 93d Congress, I introduced H.R. 323, a bill to strengthen the authority of the Food and Drug Administration in enforcing hygiene and sanitation standards in the Nation's food-processing industry. This bill attracted broad bipartisan cosponsorship and public interest.

Since the introduction of H.R. 323, a series of processed-food contamination incidents and the resulting dangers to the consumer public have underscored the necessity for enactment of strong and effective food-processing legislation to protect the American consumer. One of the provisions of my bill would require the registration of all food-processing establishments with the FDA, a practice which is not presently mandated by law. The National Canners Association has announced that it supports the concept of registration of commercial food canners with the FDA, and I hope that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, under the very capable leadership of its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), will take action upon this proposal at the earliest possible date.

The New York Post has published an article on the recent history of food contamination in the United States, and I am including it for reprinting in the RECORD:

FDA CHECKING MUSHROOM CANNERRIES

WASHINGTON (LAT)—Government food inspectors are conducting a nationwide survey of the mushroom canning industry in the wake of three discoveries of deadly botulism germs in canned mushrooms this year.

The mushroom discoveries were the latest in a series of commercial botulism cases that have occurred since 1965, when the first outbreak in 40 years killed two Detroit women who had eaten tuna fish salad.

The three discoveries of contaminated mushrooms were made before anyone had eaten them. The Food and Drug Administration considers this the result of increased surveillance and public awareness.

The first mushroom discovery this year was made by a company employee taking inventory at United Canning Co. in East Palestine, Ohio.

The second was made by an FDA inspector who noticed swollen cans at a warehouse during a visit to Fred's Cannery of South Lebanon, Ohio.

The third discovery, involving Fran's Cannery of Ravenna, N.Y., was made by a shopper at the Fort Gordon, Ga., commissary.

HUGE RECALL

After the discoveries, the FDA recalled more than 100,000 food items—pizza, tuna noodle casseroles, chicken dinners, beefbur-

gers—containing mushrooms supplied by the canneries.

At the same time, the FDA launched a nationwide survey of all mushroom canning plants, about 50. The survey is more than half completed.

Food protection activities were greatly stimulated after a bowl of canned soup claimed a life in 1971 and led to a nationwide roundup of more than a million cans of the company's (Bon Vivant) products.

Spending on FDA food programs, including beefed up inspections and research, soared 61 per cent from fiscal 1971 to 1973. State food law enforcement agencies were given \$4.5 million to carry out 30,000 plant inspections over a three-year period and report the results to FDA.

FDA scientists developed an improved technique to screen food products for *C. botulinum*, the organism that produces the botulin toxin.

Meantime, the National Canners Assn. came up with a program calling for registration of commercial food canners, mandatory code marking and highly detailed production controls for processing of Hermetically sealed low-acid foods.

One part of the program was to require supervisors of cooking and container sealing operations to receive extensive training and be certified as competent.

Training courses have begun for both industry personnel and FDA food plant inspectors at university food technology centers in important canning areas.

The industry program is being supplemented with specific codes of sanitation practice for different sectors of the food industry.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that had I been present and voting, I would have voted "aye" on roll-calls 11, 19, 54, 79, 80, and 138. I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 111.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AGAINST RACISM AND POLITICAL REPRESSION

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on last May 3, I addressed the House to call attention to the plans of the Communist Party to establish a new front organization to be known as the National Defense Organization Against Racist and Political Repression—NDO. On that occasion, I briefly reviewed the background of the NDO and set forth some of its objectives. On last May 9, my distinguished colleague from Ohio, JOHN ASHBROOK, also addressed the House on this subject matter and furnished additional details establishing the Communist character of the NDO. These actions were taken in order to alert the Congress and the American public of a new Communist propaganda drive designed to bring about the repeal of existing legislation pertaining to national security and to cause the defeat of proposed remedial legislation in this very important area.

Because I believe that the majority of my colleagues and the American public

are interested in learning additional details concerning the NDO, I am again taking to the floor to alert you to the current plans of this Communist front group.

The founding conference of the NDO was in Chicago, Ill., on the weekend of May 11-13, 1973, at the Pick-Congress Hotel with approximately 750 individuals in attendance, reportedly representing some 225 separate organizations. Conspicuous by their absence were contingents from the Communist Party's bitter rivals; namely, the Maoists and Trotskyites. The fact that they were not officially represented there is further evidence that this was strictly a Communist Party show.

Charlene Mitchell, a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee and the 1968 Presidential candidate on the Communist Party ticket, chaired the conference. It is expected that Mitchell will also be directing the National Defense Organization's day-to-day activities from its New York City headquarters.

The keynote speaker at the founding conference was the notorious Angela Davis, who is also a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee. It is interesting to note that just a decade ago, prominent Communist Party members such as Charlene Mitchell and Angela Davis would never have allowed their names to be published in connection with fronts established by the party. Today, however, the seeming public apathy toward communism has encouraged Communist Party members to "come out of the closet" in an effort to legitimize their activities.

Running like a redline through Angela Davis' keynote speech was a total hostility toward our free society. Davis charged that the United States has a history of "repression." She termed the United States "an imperialist power" that has taken drastic forms of repression against the "struggling peoples in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America." At the same time, Davis commended the "heroic Vietnamese people who tied down the U.S. military apparatus and finally expelled them from South Vietnam." She termed this "an extraordinary victory over imperialism." In conclusion, Davis stated:

We intend to devote the majority of the conference to the task of developing policies and programs for united action designed to defend and free political prisoners, and all victims of the racist and Fascistlike offensive in the United States.

It is interesting to note that among those applauding Davis' diatribe at the conference was none other than Mary Timothy. Timothy was the foreman of the jury which acquitted Davis of charges that she furnished some of the guns used in a 1970 court shoot-out and kidnaping which resulted in the death of four persons in California, including the presiding judge. Of further interest is the fact that Timothy stayed in Chicago with Bettina Aptheker, who is another of the CP's central committee members.

A most active participating organization at the founding conference was the National Committee Against Repressive

Legislation—NCARL—a group which was originated as a Communist front group and which still has several prominent Communists among its leaders. The primary objective of NCARL is the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security. In addition to running a conference workshop, the NCARL was active in distributing to those at the conference its literature aimed at abolishing the House Committee on Internal Security. It was particularly interesting to note that the NCARL distributed flyers containing reprints of my remarks on the House floor on last May 3 as they appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the usual Communist diatribe against the Committee on Internal Security and imploring recipients of the literature to write to their Congressmen to demand abolition of the committee.

On last January 9, I addressed the House as to the history and leadership of the NCARL and also exposed the false charges they made against my committee. For the benefit of Members who may want to refer to my remarks they may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9, 1973, beginning on page 537.

Other workshops at the conference were held on the following subject matters: Prisoners and prisons; police brutality; immigration and deportation; repression in the Armed Forces; repression and labor; and repression of political organizations and individuals.

A nationally coordinated campaign, using regional, State, and local defense coalitions with a national coordinator appointed by the National Steering Committee, was announced at the conference. States are grouped into 17 regions.

In working to achieve its objectives, the National Defense Organization program calls for a campaign of opposition to the following legislation currently before the 93d Congress: H.R. 6241, Constitutional Oath Support Act; H.R. 1594, restraint on travel by U.S. citizens to hostile areas; and H.R. 6046, Criminal Code Reform Act of 1973. Also high on the NDO objectives is the abolition of the Committee on Internal Security and the repeal of the Anti-Riot Act of 1968 as well as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The NDO plans to establish a national mass lobby in Washington, D.C., around its campaign priorities; to organize letter writing campaign to Members of Congress; and an appeal to the United Nations "relying on the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

It should be obvious to any reasonably objective observer that the NDO is nothing more than a Communist-led effort to undermine our national security by falsely claiming that all legislation relating to national security is "repressive." In spite of this, prominent public leaders around the country, including two mayors of large cities in Indiana and Wisconsin, as well as some of my congressional colleagues, have endorsed the program of the NDO.

Although the NDO claims a sincere interest in ending repression and racism, this is in reality just another of the great deceptions practiced by the Communists through the years. Theirs is a single aim;

namely, the gaining of the Communist objective looking toward the defeat of all legislation designed to protect our internal security.

There are those who may scoff at the significance of the NDO program, but let us make no mistake; the CP does not consider the NDO program insignificant. Those who choose to downgrade the threat of this Communist Party-directed operation are sadly underestimating the zeal and dedication of some of the participants.

When the antiwar demonstrations were at their height here in Washington I repeatedly called to the attention of my colleagues that those of them who were following the lead of the two largest antiwar groups, the National Peace Action Coalition and the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, were in reality marching behind the banners of the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party, which owned the National Peace Action Coalition lock, stock, and barrel, and the Communist Party, which had a substantial participation in the leadership of the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice.

I am doing the same thing concerning the latest Communist Party effort—warning those of you who may be misled by its propaganda. Nothing lasting or worthwhile can be accomplished by following the line of Communist Party leaders who are not motivated by real concern for social justice. There are hundreds of legitimate organizations working in behalf of reform of our penal system and other alleged concerns of the National Defense Organization. They all need support and I suggest to my concerned colleagues that they lend their very substantial influence to those who really need it and will not misuse it.

I am, incidentally, happy to report to the House that its Committee on Internal Security continues to be a prime target of the Communist Party and its supporters. I would have cause for concern if it were not.

MEMORIES OF HARRY TRUMAN

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the magazine *Modern Maturity* is a publication of the American Association of Retired Persons. In their February-March issue, a tribute was paid to our former President, Harry S Truman, which escaped my attention until within the last few days.

The article was written by Hubert Pryor. It is not long, but it makes some points that have been emphasized before but put in slightly different terminology, with a sidelight that had not been included in other editorials or other commentaries.

The article so appropriately starts off with the fact that there was never a more difficult time for a man to succeed to the Presidency of the United States, but above all there was never a moment left for him to reflect on the difficulties he had to face. In just a few words, this

well-prepared memorial points out that within 2 months after being thrust into the world's highest office, he had presided over the end of the war in Europe and had the courage to use the awesome weapons to end the struggle in the Pacific. Finally, this very brief memorial concludes with the thought that of all of Mr. Truman's virtues, his one supreme virtue was that he was one of us—and, most of all, he demonstrated what anyone of us can do when we are challenged to solve difficult problems.

The full content of the article, "Memories of Harry Truman," by Hubert Pryor, as it appeared in the February-March, 1973 issue of *Modern Maturity*, follows:

MEMORIES OF HARRY TRUMAN

If there was ever a more difficult time to succeed to the presidency of the United States, there wasn't even a moment to reflect on the matter. In the above picture, barely two months after being thrust into the world's highest office, Harry S Truman had presided over the end of the war in Europe and was preparing to end the struggle in the Pacific with weapons so awesome that the world would never again be the same. Between VE-day and VJ-day, he made a historic appearance in San Francisco. Chopping his hands down on the rostrum, and sticking out his jaw, he wound up the conference held for the purpose of founding the United Nations and attempting to set the human course for all time on the path of peace.

It has seemed at times since then as if the high hopes of San Francisco could not have been more short-sighted. And yet, with all the turmoil of the world, we have been spared the total nuclear conflagration so often feared.

We owe no small part of that good fortune to the acts of Harry Truman during the next almost eight years—maybe not always the wisest, maybe not always the most popular, but certainly among the most clear-cut, the most decisive or any series of acts undertaken by any American chief executive.

In the social order, too, we have much for which to be grateful to Harry Truman. It was in answer to his call that the first National Conference on Aging was held in 1950, a meeting in Washington attended by some 800 men and women from around the country to prepare, as it turned out, for the first and second White House Conferences on Aging held in 1961 and 1971.

The status of older people has risen many notches since the days Harry Truman was in office. And for all our problems, we have much else for which to be grateful in our lives since then, too.

Harry Truman's supreme virtue was that he was one of us and that he showed what any one of us can do when challenged to do so.

We will miss him. Let us not miss the high example he set us.

HUBERT PRYOR.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of pressing family business, for today and Monday.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders herefore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FUQUA, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

For unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN to include a newspaper article.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. WYLIE in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. HOGAN in three instances.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. MILLER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.

Mr. MINK.

Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 14. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, health care resources, and the establishment of a Quality Health Care Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 723. An act to establish a National Institute of Health Care Delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1381. An act to amend certain provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 relating to the collection of fees in connection with the use of Federal areas for outdoor recreation purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 21, 1973, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

922. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92-403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

923. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on a preliminary study on the disposal and possible alternative use of waste oil, pursuant to Public Law 92-500; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3801. A bill to extend Civil Service Federal Employees Group Life Insurance and Federal Employees Health Benefits coverage to United States nationals employed by the Federal Government; (Rept. No. 93-214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WYDLER):

H.R. 7900. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LENT, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 7901. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr.

SNYDER, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 7902. A bill to provide for the continued sale of gasoline to independent gasoline retailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. SELBERLING, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 7903. A bill to provide for the continued sale of gasoline to independent gasoline retailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAFALIS:

H.R. 7904. A bill to deauthorize permanently the recently-halted Cross-Florida Barge Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 7905. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of certain ceramic articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BEARD, Mr. BURGENER, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Miss JORDAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 7906. A bill to provide certain facilities and assistance for Members-elect to the House of Representatives who are not incumbent Members of the House and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia):

H.R. 7907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals an income tax credit for certain expenses of elementary or secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. STEELE, and Mr. VESEY):

H.R. 7908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 7909. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to 10 years the delimiting period in which veterans must complete their educational programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself and Mr. NELSEN):

H.R. 7910. A bill to establish a procedure for determining the Federal payment for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow deductions from gross income for salary paid to aliens illegally employed in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANRAHAN:

H.R. 7912. A bill to assure the imposition of appropriate penalties for persons convicted of offenses involving heroin or morphine, to provide emergency procedures to govern the pretrial and posttrial release of persons charged with offenses involving heroin or morphine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 7913. A bill to repeal the meat quota

provisions of Public Law 88-482; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7914. A bill relating to the dutiable status of fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss JORDAN:

H.R. 7915. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 7916. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. ECKERHARDT, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 7917. A bill to provide minimum disclosure standards for written consumer product warranties against defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties; to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act in order to improve its consumer protection activities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. HUBER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DENT, Mr. FISHER, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 7918. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to protect the freedom of student-athletes and their coaches to participate as representatives of the United States in amateur international athletic events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. HUBER, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 7919. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to protect the freedom of student-athletes and their coaches to participate as representatives of the United States in amateur international athletic events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7920. A bill relating to collective bargaining representation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. PIKE, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 7921. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of drugs sold by prescription the "established name" of such drug must appear each time their proprietary name is used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. PIKE, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 7922. A bill to require that certain drugs and pharmaceuticals be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which potency

or efficacy becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. PIKE, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 7923. A bill to permit the advertising of drug prices and to require retailers of prescription drugs to post the prices of certain commonly prescribed drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. METCALFE, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 7924. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to provide for compulsory licensing of prescription drug patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARASIN:

H.R. 7925. A bill to eliminate racketeering in the sale and distribution of cigarettes and to assist State and local governments in the enforcement of cigarette taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 7926. A bill to require the President to furnish predisaster assistance in accordance with the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to avert or lessen the effects of a major disaster in California; to the Commission on Public Works.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 7927. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to broaden the powers of national banks to make real estate loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7928. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment under part A thereof (the hospital insurance benefit program) for care and treatment furnished at a central radiation therapy treatment facility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. PATTEN):

H.R. 7929. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), to insure a fair and reasonable participation of U.S. flag commercial vessels in carrying petroleum and petroleum products whose shipment originates in foreign ports and which are carried to the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAMPLER (for himself and Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia):

H.R. 7930. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act with respect to custom slaughtering; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAFALIS (for himself, Mr. ABDON, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HEDNUT, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, and Mr. WALSH):

H.J. Res. 558. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DEVINE):

H.J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to establish a nonpartisan commission on political cam-

paign reform to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROV, and Mr. TALCOTT):

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week in November which includes Thanksgiving Day in each year as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

R. Res. 397. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2; to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 7931. A bill for the relief of Bruce A. Feldman, lieutenant commander, Marine Corps, U.S. Navy Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7932. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Manuel H. Araya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7933. A bill for the relief of Luis Osvaldo Salazar-Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2160. The Speaker presented a petition of Norman L. Birl, Jr., Rosharon, Tex., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH EXPLAINS IMPORTANT ROLE OF POLICE—WEST VIRGINIA PROBLEMS ARE LISTED—NATIONAL POLICE WEEK FOCUSES ATTENTION

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this week, May 13-19, is "Police Week"—a week that deserves recognition by America's citizens. The policeman's job today is tougher than ever. Patrick V. Murphy, head of the Police Foundation, says the Nation's law enforcement community is crippled by frustration, low morale, and a shattered self-image. Murphy feels that—

The policeman has never been able to tell the public how different and tough his life is, how dangerous it is. People have no idea of the complexities and pressures of his job.

The policeman's roles are many and varied. He or she must be a traffic director, a "big brother," a teacher, an administrator, and a protector of the public. At a recent meeting of the West Virginia Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency, and Correction, the discussion of community relations covered issues such as: The relation of education, religion, and employment to crime; new directions in education and employment efforts; specific community and individual actions as deterrents to crime; integrity of government; delivery of social services; responsiveness of government; drug abuse prevention, treatment and education.

I am seriously concerned over the increasing number of law enforcement officers who have been killed by criminals. Our able colleague, Senator EASTLAND, has called for "immediate action from Congress." One hundred or more police officers have been killed in each of the last 3 years—double that of the mid-1960's. In 1971, 126 policemen were killed. Last year 112 officers were slain. More officers were killed attempting arrests than in any category. We must stop warfare against the police.

An ever-increasing problem for law enforcement is drug abuse. Col. R. L. Bonar, head of the West Virginia State Police, has asked the State to provide additional troopers to meet the drug situation. Bonar said that the drug problem is a serious one and has affected stu-

dents in high schools throughout West Virginia. In 1968, he said, there were only three drug arrests made in the State but last year there were 434 and he expects 600 this year. The age group most seriously affected ranges from 14 to 23.

During this week and throughout the year, Mr. President, our citizenry is reminded to say "Hello" to the neighborhood policeman or to nod "Thank you" at the officer when he assists us in crossing the street or giving us directions. It's a small token of appreciation but yet a well-deserved one.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the following articles be printed in the RECORD: An excerpt from Bill Gold's "District Line" column about a radio program responsible for better communication between the police and the community in Charleston, W. Va.; my statement on the anniversary of this unique program; a letter from the Charleston chief of police about the "Buzz the Fuzz" program; a new article on Patrick Murphy of the Police Foundation; and a "letter to the editor" of the News-Tribune in Keyser, W. Va., by a former West Virginia State trooper.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1973]

THE DISTRICT LINE

(By Bill Gold)

SUGGESTION BOX

A young friend named Jennings Randolph served his state for 14 years in the House of Representatives, has already put in 14 more in the Senate, and was reelected to another 6-year term last November. Somehow during all these years he has managed to maintain a lively interest in new ideas.

The latest from him is about the "Buzz the Fuzz" idea that gained almost instant popularity in Charleston, West Virginia's capital. Any citizen who has a police-related question can get it answered by dialing a special number listed in the Charleston phone book. In addition, there's a Buzz the Fuzz radio program sponsored by a Community Involvement Task Force.

Big city police departments looking for ways to establish better lines of communication between themselves and their communities might be well advised to consider Sen. Randolph's report on Buzz the Fuzz.

CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, W. Va., February 27, 1973.
Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to acknowledge, with appreciation, receipt of the article entitled

"The District Line" . . . by Bill Gold, which appeared in the Washington Post on February 16, 1973, and in which your latest idea concerning Charleston's "Buzz-the-Fuzz" program was published in the suggestion box.

Since the establishment of "Buzz-the-Fuzz", Charleston Police have been successful in reaching approximately eighty percent of the teenager and pre-teen youth in our City.

Our last radio broadcast was on Thursday, February 22, 1973, between 7:00 P.M. and 7:30 P.M. After "Buzz-the-Fuzz" left the air, our officer remained at the radio station for more than thirty minutes, answering questions still being telephoned in.

We feel that "Buzz-the-Fuzz" acquaints adults and youth with "their" police department and establishes a better relationship between our department and the citizens of the City of Charleston. It also makes our officers more aware of their personal lives and conduct so as not to be exposed on "Buzz-the-Fuzz".

Our program is very successful and one of which we are extremely proud.

May I thank you for your suggestion to other Police Departments that such a program might be advisable to establish communications between the police and the community.

Very truly yours,

L. H. MORRIS,
Chief of Police.

RADIO STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, MARCH 8, 1973

I commend WXIT's Buzz the Fuzz Program on its first anniversary. I know the important public service role it provides and its value to the people.

The Charleston Area Chamber of Commerce, The Charleston Police Department and the management of WXIT are all to be commended for their participation in this unique program.

I am especially interested in the drug information effort of WXIT. As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, I know of the drug problem facing us. I believe informational programs such as Buzz and the Fuzz are very beneficial.

Again, my best wishes for continued success.

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1973]

EX-CHIEF MURPHY SEES WORK AHEAD

(By Paul W. Valentine)

Patrick V. Murphy, cop for 27 years, police chief in four cities including New York and Washington and now head of the Police Foundation here, says the nation's law enforcement community is crippled by frustration, low morale and a shattered self-image.

"There have been improvements, yes, but we still have a very long way to go," said Murphy, 52, in his new office at the Police Foundation, an arm of the Ford Foundation