

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 17, 1973

with a \$30 million grant to devise experimental and innovative training and research projects among the nation's police departments.

In a wide-ranging but bleak overview of law enforcement in America, Murphy said police departments lack professionalization, resist change, suffer organizational fragmentation, place undue emphasis on hardware and equipment and are paranoid about the often hostile world surrounding them.

Rank-and-file policemen are deeply troubled by the social "permissiveness and loss of standards" they see around them, he said, while police chiefs are vexed by a similar loss of discipline among the rank and file itself.

Police departments are plagued by sick-ins, "blue flu" protests and other breaches of the paramilitary tradition of policing, he said.

"The chiefs are always complaining that the new policemen don't respect authority, that they don't want to comply, to conform," he said.

Rank and file officers in turn feel that the "country is going to hell," he said, and they consider themselves the "thin blue line" between order and chaos.

Police officers increasingly have retreated into social isolation and their own closed fraternities "because they feel that no one understands them," Murphy said.

"It's so frustrating to them," he said. "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 . . . Since he feels no one understands him, he tends to get into that kind of a shell."

Many officers resent what they feel is an attempt by modern police departments to force them into a "social worker" role in addition to their traditional enforcement jobs, Murphy said.

"We're trying to improve the policeman's perception of himself in this respect," he said. "If he ever sat down and thought about it, he'd realize that most of his work always has been of a noncriminal nature—ambulance runs, accidents, quieting a noisy party—and not to lock people up."

"The policeman's job is maintaining order, not just arresting people . . . Settling domestic disputes without arresting anyone is an example of how a truly professional policeman can put his skills to work."

Despite these and other problems, Murphy said, there have been some fundamental improvements in police performance in recent years.

"Major city departments especially are more sophisticated now in handling race relations, crowd control, when and how to make arrests, things of that sort," he said.

But a central problem remains: professionalizing police departments and jettisoning the "military model" on which most departments are now structured, he said.

Among other things, this would allow rank-and-file officers to participate more fully in the "problem solving and priority setting" procedures of the department, he said.

Professionalization would also help to establish statewide standards of performance, encourage the merger or elimination of small inefficient departments and overcome the "fragmentation and interjurisdictional messes we now have in our metropolitan areas," he said.

Another benefit, already used in some cities, he said, is employment of civilians as personnel directors, systems managers, lawyers and other specialized consultants in the police hierarchy.

There is an additional need, he said, for departments to de-emphasize the use and display of police hardware—guns, tear gas,

armored personnel carriers—and to encourage instead the use of low key tactics, non-violent crowd control procedures and individual dispute settlement skills.

As president of the Police Foundation, Murphy says he hopes now to combine his experience as a policeman with the energies of the foundation to help cure the ills of contemporary law enforcement.

Once a beat patrolman in New York City 27 years ago, Murphy has served as police chief in Syracuse, N.Y., public safety director in Washington, police commissioner in Detroit and most recently police commissioner in New York.

He was also briefly an administrator of the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in late 1968.

[From the Keyser (W. Va.) News-Tribune, Dec. 14, 1972]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

On Monday, Dec. 11, 1972, three West Virginia Conservation Officers were walking across Potomac State Campus. I personally knew one of them because when I was a member of the West Virginia State Police I had the pleasure of working with him on occasions. The other two officers I had never worked with but have had the pleasure of meeting in the past. They stopped and we talked for a minute and I asked: "What are you doing up here?" They informed me that they had a warrant for an individual. I told them to take it easy and that I would see them around. As they started to continue their walk across the campus I heard some shouting "GET THE PIGS OFF CAMPUS." Not only does this type of thing occur with the students but with the public in general also.

Not too long ago the legislature passed a law lowering the adult status from 21 years of age to 18 years of age. This means that an 18-year-old by law is considered an adult. It gives him the right to vote, to buy whiskey, and to enter into corporations, etc. I have always contended, however, that just because an individual reaches the age of 18, 21, or even 25 that this in itself doesn't make him an adult. Whenever I hear comments like I heard on Monday then I feel it just sets a stronger foundation on my belief mentioned above. Unfortunately, it's not only the students, it's the citizens, and what is more disgraceful it is the parents who also make these type of comments.

So many times I hear people say that a particular person isn't a cop because he has never had any training. All the administration has done is given him a badge and gun and call him a policeman. I will admit that you are 100 percent right and that I disagree with that procedure 100 percent. Unfortunately, there are policemen in this category and because of their lack of knowledge, not only of the law but more so common sense, it makes it bad for all law-enforcement officers, just like those few individuals who shouted those words make it bad for all college students and all citizens, parents, etc. I will be the first to admit that we don't need policemen of this caliber. I feel that all law-enforcement personnel from Justice of Peace to F.B.I. should be required to be trained before being sent out to do a man's job.

As for the word "PIG." To a well trained, dedicated police officer that word has a specific meaning. Pride, Integrity, and Guts. If an individual gets all excited when someone calls him a "PIG," then he's not cut out for the job.

When I heard the words, "get the pigs off campus," it wasn't the fact that the word "pig" was mentioned that puzzled me, it was the sound of disrespect that encouraged me to write this letter. I sincerely believe that if people had the opportunity to ride for one week with a law enforcement officer the

attitudes of many would change. I venture to say that there would be many people who couldn't take it for a week.

I hear people talk about police harassment. You people don't know what harassment is until you are a policeman.

A policeman is a lot of things, but what people forget is that he is an individual with feelings also. He goes out and tries to do a job (most of the time the odds are against him) protect lives and property. The lives and property of you and your family. He takes many risks and is compelled to do things which brings tears to his eyes or makes him feel like its time to get behind the bushes and vomit (only because what he has to do is part of his job and it takes a certain kind to do it).

Do you know what it's like to get a call that a man has just shot and killed three people and has barricaded himself in a house? Do you realize who has to get that man out of that house before he kills anyone else? The policeman. Do you know what it is like to be called out on an accident and when you arrive you recognize the car as being your best friend's or a neighbor and all that is visible is blood and part of a leg because the rest of the body is pinned underneath the car? Do you know how it feels to have to go to a home and tell a mother, father, husband, or wife that their son or daughter or mate was killed in an automobile accident by a drunk? The sound of screams, the begging, the hoping that there has been some kind of a mistake. None of it is pretty. Not one bit of it. Then finally the day comes when you receive a teletype that Trooper or Patrolman _____ was killed this morning attempting to serve a warrant or while making a routine check. That, my friends, is a terrible feeling. It makes you want to cry, to vomit, and the worst of it all is that the policeman must attend his fellowman's funeral and be brave as he sits and watches the dead policeman's wife and family accept all that is left of his life. His name plate and the flag that was draped over his coffin. I could go on and on about the policeman.

Again I must agree with the public that there is no place for a law enforcement officer if he has no training. He is a menace to our society, he may get a fellow police officer killed, and, yes, he will find it hard to gain the respect of the people he is to serve. We cannot blame all of this on the individual himself except that he ought to respect himself and the people he is to serve more by fighting and requesting that training be made available for him. Also if the public would concern themselves with this problem and demand that their law enforcement officers be trained then I'm sure this would wake many administrations up throughout our country.

I was a policeman or a "PIG," if you wish, in Keyser for a little over two years. I was proud to wear the forest green uniform of the W. Va. State Police, and I was also proud to work with the individuals that I worked with. They taught me a lot and I have a lot to learn and eventually hope to go back into law enforcement. The citizens of Keyser and Mineral County taught me a lot also. They care, but they don't want to get involved. If you care, you will get involved if only to voice your opinion.

To the students and to the citizens who feel that the words disrespect and policeman go together, there is one thing to keep in mind. If it wasn't for the "PIGS" then the PENS throughout the nation would not be filled with people who have committed crimes against the lives and property that the policeman tries in vain to protect.

Ex-Trooper JAMES D. ROSS,
Keyser, W. Va.

May 17, 1973

BIG BROTHER GOVERNMENT NOW
TELLS PRIVATE SCHOOLS WHAT
TO DO

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1966, the Clinton Christian School was founded on a curriculum which interlinked a progressive educational program with religious concepts and discipline. Recent governmental actions at this privately operated school are an example of "big brother" government assuming the role of dictating to all of us, not only what is to be taught in our schools, but also how it is to be taught.

In conferring with Prince Georges County Councilman, John Burcham, he informed me that the County Health Department objected to the disciplinary methods employed by the school as well as the children learning and repeating in unison, verses and chapters from the Bible. Furthermore, representatives of the Health Department gave scores of zero to the school because it did not have exactly the materials prescribed for 3-to 6-year olds, such as a table and chairs, telephones, sponges, hand puppets, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a real paradox when a representative of government expresses concern about young children having the opportunity for freedom of expression when in the same breath those representatives of government are prescribing to those in charge of a school a very specific controlled environment. It seems strange that children must have an opportunity for freedom of expression, but the grownups do not.

It is obvious to me that this campaign against this and other private schools is a thinly disguised attempt to deny parents of Prince Georges County a chance to send their youngsters to private schools rather than have them bused miles and miles away from their home neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, because it represents clearly the concept that the parents, not the State, can make the best judgment as to what is best for their children, I would like to call, to the attention of my colleagues, an editorial by The Courier, a weekly newspaper published in Prince Georges County, Md.

INEXCUSABLE REPORT

Just seven years ago several people who were dismayed by the lack of association between God and life in the public school system of Prince Georges County founded and opened the Clinton Christian School.

Its founders embarked on a program of education which not only would teach children to read, write, add and subtract, but would place an important emphasis on God's role in man's life and man's role on God's Earth.

The founders realized what everyone in the world realizes except the various boards of education. If the learning process is to function well there must be discipline, so with

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

parental permission paddling was instituted as the reward for misbehavior.

That people liked the idea of this school was evidenced by an ever increasing enrollment. Parents who could send their children to public school for free chose instead to pay hundreds of dollars a year to send them to Clinton Christian School where the Bible and strict discipline were an integral part of regular school life.

Presently more than 600 students are enrolled on three separate campuses of the school.

Now comes the bureaucracy, that so totally epitomizes Prince Georges County these days, in an attempt to close the school for reasons that smack more of harassment than genuine concern for the children of parents who willingly and deliberately place their children in an educational environment of which they approve.

There are zoning considerations and fire safety considerations included in the move against the school.

Zoning is an arbitrary situation and easily resolved by a majority vote of the County Council. The fire safety violations cited appear easy enough to solve with the placement of additional exit signs and an improved alarm system.

The real crux of the situation may revolve around philosophy and may not be so easily or willingly changed.

The county Health Department has stepped into the scene with criticism of children learning and repeating in unison verses and chapters from the Bible. A report written by someone named Helen Foster who is described as chief of child day care and child development division also objects to teaching children to read at an early age.

Mrs. Foster reveals herself as reading, writing and arithmetic advocate when she writes "creative experiences were not provided nor were time, materials, equipment and opportunities for such experiences provided."

Such an observation harks of that large cadre of modern educators who would rank a course in creative sandbox well ahead of either reading or writing.

However it is a strange world in which public health officials hold undue influence over school curriculum and reverence to God.

Mrs. Foster also cites a regulation that states, "no child shall be subjected to treatment injurious to his physical or emotional health by a staff member."

Apparently learning to read at an early age and learning Bible verses is considered by the Health Department to be injurious to the emotional health of children.

Dr. Perry Stearns, the county's public health officer also got into the act by declaring that the school could be closed if it fails to correct the violations.

Dr. Stearns declared that "paddling children is not an accepted practice" even if parents do consent.

It is just this sort of drivel from fuzzy thinking public officials that has brought the public school system to its present chaotic state. Lack of discipline in public schools is eroding the entire educational process.

If the Mrs. Fosters and Dr. Stearns of the world have their way we may yet succeed in rearing a generation of totally undisciplined and atheistic people who are much more concerned with their creative experiences than the productive work of life.

We still steadfastly hold to the concept that parents, not the state, can make the best judgment as to what is best for their children.

We are confident that Clinton Christian School will wage a determined fight for those ideals which it and its supporters believe and that David once again may slay Goliath.

16161

CARL SCHURZ HIGH SCHOOL
MARKS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 Carl Schurz High School, located in the 11th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent, will be 100 years old. The school will celebrate the occasion with an art fair and a reunion. All former teachers have been invited to return and to meet with their students from bygone years.

The program will include a turn-of-the-century melodrama play, art displays in the halls, strolling musicians, and a concert, concluded by school chorus members from years past, singing Handel's Hallelujah Chorus.

Carl Schurz High School is a Northwest Side Chicago landmark, both as an institution and as a building. Begun as Jefferson Township High School in 1872, the school changed its name once and location twice before it became a fixture at Milwaukee and Addison, growing with the Northwest area which it has served for five generations.

As it was being built, a civic official of German origin pressed for and won renaming of the new facility for Carl Schurz, prominent German-born friend of Abraham Lincoln, orator, journalist, ambassador, and senator who died in 1906.

While unconnected with Chicago or the Northwest Side, Schurz was not without fame in the field of education. Upon his arrival in the United States in 1849 and his settlement in Watertown, Wis., his wife, Margarethe, transplanted a German custom and began the first American kindergarten in 1856.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be assigned as a teacher at the Carl Schurz High School in 1936. During my tenure at Schurz, I had the honor of knowing William Slocum, the distinguished principal of Carl Schurz who served in this capacity for more than 25 years, as well as Thomas C. Johnson, who served as principal from 1936 to 1939, after Mr. Slocum's retirement.

Carl Schurz High School was, and still is today, the center of many community activities. It provided the community with outstanding basketball and football teams, many fine operettas, and extracurricular activities that involved the whole community. The "esprit de corps" of the faculty and its excellent relations with the community were a source of great pride and inspiration both to me and to the other teachers.

I was the class adviser on the clean-up campaign which generated so much interest among the students, their parents, and the various community organizations. I can remember distinctly the feeling of pride shared by the faculty and the students as we ran the poster contest for the best clean-up poster, the locker clean-up, and the competition among the

various grammar schools, whose students ultimately came to Schurz.

Carl Schurz was a "hub" for all of the community activities. I salute Carl Schurz High School on its 100th birthday, and I also salute Mr. J. P. Maloney, its present principal, the teachers, the students, and the parents, for carrying on all of the wonderful traditions established during the 100-year history of Carl Schurz—including outstanding service to its students and dedicated service to the entire community.

RUBBERSTAMPED POSTAL ALIBIS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Clarinda, Iowa Herald-Journal concerning the U.S. Postal Service will be of interest to my colleagues. It describes the excuses most favored by the Post Office to explain tardy mail delivery and suggests a variety of ways to expand the now limited vocabulary of the rubberstamp. It might not expedite your correspondence—What could?—but it will liven up its looks.

The editorial follows:

RUBBERSTAMPED POSTAL ALIBIS

A man recently received a letter that took 15 days to get from Indiana to California. It was rubber-stamped with this explanation from an Indiana post office: "Found in Supposed Empty Equipment."

A rubber stamp? It must be necessary to use such a message quite a lot. A California editor snooped around and found another stamped message used often by the postal services: "Found Behind Inoperative Files."

This led to a game anyone can play. The Lapeer (Mich.) suggests making up your own rubber stamps for the postal service. Such as:

"Found in Cornerstone of Building Dedicated in 1854."

"Chewed & Considered Digested by Friendly Goat."

"Excavated by Archeological Crew in Ancient Greek Diggings."

"Removed by Mistake from Mail Bag by Old Bag."

"Missent to Moscow, Russia, from Moscow, Idaho."

"Found in Septic Tank at Home of Discharged Mail Carrier."

"Went South With Sparrows by Mistake."

"Fell into Disgrace, but Recovered by Loyal Postal Employees."

"Found in Pony Express Mail Bag on Late Late Show."

"Found in Back of Miss-parked 1934 mail truck."

"You get the idea. Mail your suggestions to us. We may print them, if they get here," the Lapeer paper concluded.

QUESTIONS ON H.R. 6767, THE TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, prior to the beginning of the hearings on H.R. 6767,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Trade Reform Act of 1973, I requested the assistance of the Ways and Means Committee in obtaining answers to an initial list of questions—many technical in nature—which I raised concerning the bill.

Because of the importance of this legislation to all Members of Congress and to the entire Nation, I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point the questions, the answers prepared by the Office of the Special Trade Representative, and in some cases a further response from myself.

I am making this data public, because I believe it is important for each Member to examine this bill most carefully, to raise general policy questions as well as specific questions on details and language.

The questions and responses follow:

1. Question: Sec. 2 (a) refers, as part of the statement of purposes, to "formulation of international standards for investment and tax laws and policies." Where is this stated purpose carried out in the actual language and authorities described in the Act?

Answer: Section 2(a) states that a purpose of the proposed Act is to provide authority in the trade field supporting U.S. participation in an interrelated effort to develop reforms in the world economic system generally.

2. Question: Sec. 103(e)(3) refers to disapproval of an agreement by a "majority of the authorized membership of that House." Does this mean a majority of all members (218) or a majority of a quorum (110)?

Answer: A majority of all members.

Vanik response: This raises a serious issue as to whether or not we are to permit legislative language which will require, in essence, more than a majority vote on legislative vetoes.

3. Question: In Sections 111, 112, 113, and 114, there seems to be some confusion or at least little rationale in what is covered under the hearing and advice procedures. Should not Section 103 actions be covered under Section 111 and 114—as they are in Section 112 and 113?

Answer: It is difficult to provide the Tariff Commission with information on non-tariff barriers in advance of negotiations similar to that provided with respect to items which will be subject to tariff concessions. Non-tariff barriers are very complex and agreed solutions will not be apparent in the usual case in advance of the negotiations.

Vanik response: But the removal of Non-Tariff Barriers can be just as serious or damaging to an industry and its workers as Tariff reductions.

4. Question: In Sec. 201(b)(4), should the phrase be "compete more effectively with imports" or "against" imports?

Answer: The meaning is intended to be the same under either formulation.

5. Question: If the U.S. Tariff Commission is split, will that still constitute an affirmative finding of the Commission under the provisions of this new bill?

Answer: If the Commission is split, the President can break the tie either way under authority of Sec. 330(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended in 1954.

6. Question: In Sec. 202(b), definite time periods are set for Presidential action with respect to 202(a)(1) but there appears to be no time requirement for implementing action under 202(a)(2) providing for assistance to workers through the Department of Labor. Shouldn't there also be a time requirement for action under 202(a)(2)?

Answer: Since the Presidential action is confined to requesting the Secretary to expedite petitions for adjustment assistance, a time limit does not appear appropriate in this case.

May 17, 1973

Vanik response: Vagueness in the area of worker adjustment assistance caused much of the difficulty under the 1962 Trade Act.

7. Question: Further, in Sec. 202(b), it states that if the President decides not to take action, he shall submit a report to Congress "immediately". Is the term immediately to be understood to be the sixty days referred to elsewhere in the paragraph, or since there might be uncertainty, should the word "immediately" be clarified to indicate that action within 60 days is intended?

Answer: The term "immediately" means immediately after reaching a decision. The President has 60 days in which to make the decision.

8. Question: In Section 202(b), if the President reports a negative determination to the Congress, can the Congress do anything about it? In other words, I do not see any provision for the passage of a "corrective resolution" by the Congress.

Answer: Congress can enact legislation.

Vanik response: This would be a difficult legislative process. An amendment should be provided to permit a "Legislative Veto" of such determinations.

9. Question: In Section 203 relating to import relief, the President may suspend the application of items 806.30 or 807.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. As I understand the headnotes to this portion of the Tariff Schedule, this will mean that American items exported, with value added in foreign countries, and then imported into the United States will not, as per the provisions of 806.30 and 807.00 pay duty just on the foreign value added, but will, when these provisions are suspended, pay full duty on the value of the total imported product. Is this reading correct?

Answer: Yes. The reading is correct.

10. Question: In Section 203(d)(4) there is a reference to the "factors described in 202(b)." Should this reference actually be to "factors described in 202(c)"?

Answer: Yes. The correct reference is Section 202(c).

11. Question: Under the compensation authorities described in Section 404, would there be a system of hearings, advice, etc., as provided in Section 111ff.

Answer: Section 410 provides for public hearings prior to the conclusion of any agreement or the modification of any duty pursuant to Section 404.

Vanik response: This does not appear to be as detailed or as specific a hearing process as provided through Sections 111 and following:

12. Question: In Section 221(a), workers may petition for assistance and relief. The phrase found in 201(a)(1), "which is representative of an industry" is missing. Does this mean that the workers of any single company, plant, or shop, can seek relief, even though the industry in which they are employed is, perhaps not suffering as a whole from import injuries?

Answer: The worker adjustment assistance provisions are designed to aid workers whether or not an entire industry is impacted. A significant number or proportion of the workers in a firm or appropriate subdivision of a firm who are totally or partially separated may receive assistance.

13. Question: (a) Section 222 defines group eligibility requirements for worker relief assistance. The criteria are that a significant number or proportion of the workers in the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become so, that sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased, and that imports have contributed substantially to this situation. What is the "relationship" between the three conditions? Must all be met?

(b) Could not a situation exist where sales and production of a firm would be up, but through automation and increased produc-

tivity, workers are being separated and, because of the volume of imports, additional jobs are not being created in the domestic economy, commensurate with the increased sales of the product?

Answer: (a) All three criteria must be met.

(b) Under the proposed Trade Reform Act, as well as under existing law, adjustment assistance is directed towards import caused underemployment.

14. Question: In section 231(B), is the Committee aware of any reason for the deletion of the 78 weeks out of the last 156 weeks employment conditions presently contained in 19 U.S.C. 1941(c)(1). In addition, how long are unemployment benefits good for? Are there no special periods of extended unemployment benefits for older workers (as provided in present law under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962)?

Answer: The deletion of the 78 week requirement is motivated by a desire to diminish the administrative burden and resulting delay of researching each individual's employment record. In addition, this restrictive requirement unnecessarily excluded workers from benefits. The unemployment benefits are co-extensive with the period that benefits are available in the worker's state of employment. There are no special periods of extended unemployment benefits for older workers.

15. Question: It is true that the \$5 per day subsistence allowance provided in Section 234, relating to training, is the same figure as was provided in the TEA of 1962?

Answer: Yes.

16. Question: In Section 236, relocation allowances are provided for an affected worker "who is the head of a family." Since there is a dollar limitation on the amount of relocation assistance, shouldn't relocation be provided to any worker, regardless of his family or marital status?

Answer: The dollar limitation on the lump sum payment in the proposed bill does not constitute a significant change in the overall relocation allowance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act. The proposed bill continues the Trade Expansion Act requirement that the worker be a head of a family. The more important limitation on relocation allowances is that it is directly related to reasonable and necessary expenses.

Vanik response: Relocation assistance should be provided to all workers, whether married or single.

17. Question: With respect to Section 239 and payment to the States for supplemental benefits for workers, has the Administration supplied the Committee with any estimates on the cost of these proposals. If so, would these estimates permit a calculation of the number of American workers who will be hurt by imports?

Answer: Estimates will be submitted as part of the hearings on the bill.

18. Question: In Section 245, relating to definitions, why have Guam and the Virgin Islands been excluded, particularly now that they have delegates in the Congress?

Answer: The Trade Expansion Act definition has been retained.

Vanik response: This is not an answer to the question.

19. Question: In Section 301(a)(B), the term "country or instrumentality" is used. Does the word instrumentality apply to the EEC? To what groups does it apply?

Answer: The term instrumentality does apply to the EEC and, for example, to any customs union with a common external tariff.

20. Question: In Section 203, establishing purchase prices, is it the Committee's understanding that this applies to the traditional form of Value-Added Tax as used in Europe? Is this section intended to permit the use

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of anti-dumping and other unfair trade provisions against those Nations which have an export-rebatable form of VAT?

Answer: The amendment of Section 203 would affect rebates of taxes under the Anti-Dumping Act in only one respect. It would require that taxes being rebated be related directly to the products exported to the United States or components thereof. Accordingly, it would not have any effect on Treasury's present treatment of rebates of the value-added tax under the Anti-Dumping Act.

21. Question: In Section 350, relating to protection against patent violations, has the Committee received any communications indicating that this type of protection should be applied in copyright cases?

Answer: There is no necessity to extend the protection afforded by section 337 of the Tariff Act to copyright cases in light of the provisions of title 17 of the United States Code (enacted by act of July 30, 1947, ch. 391, 61 Stat. 652). Sections 106 through 109 of title 17 provide effective remedies in respect of the importation of prohibited articles, including provisions for the forfeiture and destruction thereof.

22. Question: In Section 401(b)(1)(A) and 401(b)(3)(A), there is the word "substantial" as applied to balance of payments deficits and surpluses. Has the Committee received any communication as to what is meant by the word "substantial?"

Answer: This is a judgmental factor which must be weighed by the President at the time that action under the section is contemplated.

Vanik comment: This is the type of response that should cause all of us in the Congress to examine this legislation with the utmost care. There is entirely too much Executive discretion throughout the bill.

DR. KISSINGER TURNS TO EUROPE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Henry Kissinger now is turning his considerable diplomatic talents from Southeast Asia to Europe and, in a recent major policy speech to the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York City, gave what was described as an unusually frank analysis of the problems there.

His analysis disturbed me, not because of the nature of the problems he listed but because he seemed to have ours and the Europeans' grouped together as of equal diplomatic concern. Complaints here about Europe, he said, are that the nations there ignore their wider responsibilities in pursuing their own economic self interests and that they are not carrying enough of the common defense load. Europe's complaints, he added, are that we appear to be out to divide them economically, or desert them militarily, or bypass them diplomatically.

I submit that these complaints are on two very different levels. Ours against Europe are based on what actually is taking place and each constitutes a heavy financial burden upon us. We are getting little European economic cooperation as the state of the dollar and our trade deficits attest. And Europe's dodging on NATO's cost has meant great sac-

rifices of American money and manpower. Conversely, the European complaints are mere suppositions—notions that we might be plotting something they do not like. These gripes have no substance—no reality—and they could mean nothing at all.

I hope Dr. Kissinger in his efforts to build what he terms "a new Atlantic Charter" will not trade off, as though dealing with matters of equal validity, our real complaints against those of Europe which in truth are quibbles and suspicions. If he does so, then his new European agreement could prove to be as shaky in the test as has been the one he negotiated on Vietnam.

THE WELFARE MYTH

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

MR. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been inundated with accusations, innuendos, facts, and fictions about what is commonly called the welfare mess. The information and misinformation has come from public officials, the media, and the man on the street. The result is a confused and too often unfair picture of the welfare recipient.

COPE, the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO, has put together a fact sheet on welfare, aptly headlined "Welfare: Everybody's Whipping-Boy." We should use the facts of welfare not the fictions as the base for our discussions of this difficult problem. COPE's memo contributes greatly to the necessary rational discussion. Mr. Speaker, I include the following:

WELFARE: EVERYBODY'S WHIPPING-BOY

Welfare . . . it's as unloved as athlete's foot. Office-holders know they're guaranteed prime press space by attacking it. Conservative groups and leaders make careers inveighing against it. In a government administering thousands of programs, welfare is probably the least popular and most misunderstood. It's everybody's whipping-boy.

The Greeks created no more myths about their gods than we have about welfare. Time and again we are told of the welfare client who arrives in a fancy car to pick up the check that comes from taxpayers' money, and goes home to his color television and vintage champagne. He is strong, able-bodied and employable, we are told . . . but he just doesn't want to work. He's a loafer.

If the welfare client is female, we are drawn a horror picture of repeated illegitimate births for the sole purpose of increasing her welfare benefits. She's a loafer, too.

We are advised that welfare provides such opulent living its clients would be crazy to give it all up and go to work. We hear repeatedly that welfare clients are cheats and welfare programs are rampant with fraud.

We even are asked to believe that hordes of poor people scrutinize statistics that come out of federal and state agencies, locate states and communities where the highest welfare, benefits are paid, and choose their spots accordingly.

We believe, too, that the majority of welfare recipients are blacks.

Perhaps the attitude of a great many Americans toward welfare was reflected in a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

campaign statement by President Nixon: "We are faced with the choice between the 'work ethic' that built this nation's character, and the new 'welfare ethic' that could cause that American character to weaken." The statement seems to encompass and reinforce most of the myths about welfare.

As the new Congress swings into action and may confront again, as it did last year, the welfare issue, it's a good time to look more closely at the facts, not the myths. Following are 10 key facts about welfare.

Fact No. 1—People wind up on welfare not because they are cheats, loafers or malingering, but because they are poor. They are not just poor in money, but in everything. They've had poor education, poor health care, poor chances at decent employment, and poor prospects for anything better.

Fact No. 2—But even most of the poor are not on welfare. Some 15 million Americans receive some form of welfare benefits. There are more than 25 million officially below the poverty level of \$4,000 a year for a family of four. Another 30-50 million are just barely above it. And \$4,000 a year, as everyone knows, does not afford extravagance.

Fact No. 3—Of the 15 million receiving welfare, about eight million are children under 16 years of age. Anyone for "work-fare" for children more than half a century after child labor laws were enacted?

Fact No. 4—Less than one percent—about 150,000—of welfare recipients are able-bodied employable males. Many of these are in their late-middle years. Most are uneducated. All are required by law to sign up for work or work training. A government study shows more than 80 percent want to work, rather than draw welfare, and among the fathers in this group one in three is enrolled in work training.

Fact No. 5—Apart from children and the relative handful of potential employables, on welfare are more than two million aged, more than one million totally and permanently disabled or blind, three million mothers. All of these are in programs roughly supported 50-50 by state and federal funds. Another group of less than one million is aided by state and local non-federally supported programs. These are single adults and childless couples, most of whom work full time but are paid less than they would be on welfare. These are the working poor.

Fact No. 6—No one is getting rich on welfare. It allows, at best, bare-bone living. In no state does the average welfare payment bring a family up to poverty level. Maximum payments for a family of four range from the \$700 a year in Mississippi to \$3,600-plus in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut. Thirty-nine states pay less than their own established standard of need.

So instead of the high living often portrayed among welfare recipients, the facts boil down to an average nationally of \$1.68 per recipient per day with a range in the states from 48 cents to \$2.58 per person per day. Out of this comes food, clothing, housing and other essential cost items. A survey of welfare mothers showed that if they received higher benefits, half would spend it mostly on food, 28 percent on clothing and shoes, most of the others on rent or a combination of essentials.

(Figures are based on the major federal-state matching program called Aid to Families With Dependent Children, which covers the largest percentage of welfare recipients.)

Fact No. 7—Cheating and fraud in welfare are minimal. There is, of course, some cheating and dishonesty among welfare clients. Try to imagine any program involving 15 million persons that is entirely free of fraud. But the Department of Health, Education and Welfare estimates there is cheating among fewer than one percent of welfare cases. Add to this another 2-3 percent on the rolls due to misunderstanding or technical bureaucratic error, and there is an upper range of 4-5 per-

cent receiving benefits who are either completely or partially ineligible. It is likely that this range of cheating, plus error, exists in income tax payments of citizens and in many other areas of activity.

No one argues that any cheating should be permitted when discovered, but the public idea of massive fraud in welfare is wrong.

As for invading hordes of welfare clients moving from state to state to achieve higher benefits, facts don't support this myth. In New York, which pays the highest benefits, less than two percent of new recipients have lived in the state less than two years; more than 85 percent of all recipients have lived there more than five years. The facts show that poor people, like the rest of us, move around mainly to find better job opportunities.

Fact No. 8—Welfare mothers are not churning out illegitimate children. Nearly 70 percent of all children in welfare families are legitimate, according to the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW. Thirty percent of welfare families with any children have only one child; 25 percent have two; 18 percent have three. The remainder have four or more.

Economically, anyway, the myth is nonsense, since the average payment per additional child nationally is only \$35 a month, hardly an incentive toward mass production.

Fact No. 9—More than 48 percent of welfare families are white; about 43 percent are black. Most of the remaining are American Indians, Orientals and other racial minorities. The reasons for the high percentage of blacks are self-evident: More than 34 percent of the black population in the U.S. have incomes below the poverty level, compared to 13 percent of the white population.

Fact No. 10—There is no evidence to sustain the belief that welfare is necessarily habit-forming, that is that "once on welfare, always on welfare." Half the families on welfare have been on the rolls 20 months or less; two-thirds have been on the rolls less than three years. Fewer than one in five have received welfare for five years or more. One in 16 has been on 10 years or more. About 65 percent of welfare cases at any given time are on for the first time; about one-third are repeaters.

These, then, are some of the major facts about welfare. Sad to relate, there is no fresh revelation among them. They have been printed in many places, many times. Yet, the myths about welfare, and the objections to it, persist.

A major objection, raised both by those who want to reduce it and even many of those who want to improve it, is its cost. It is true, welfare costs money—about \$12 billion a year in the major programs jointly financed on about a 50-50 basis by the states and federal government. Another \$100 million a year is borne by states and communities in general assistance programs not aided by Washington.

The federal share of the cost represents about 2 1/2 percent of an over-all budget of \$270 billion that President Nixon is shooting for next year.

So welfare really costs less than 2 1/2 cents of every dollar paid into federal taxes. Indeed, closing just a few major tax loopholes for corporations and wealthy individuals alone could bring in enough additional federal revenue to cover present welfare outlays.

Buried in the emotions surrounding, and misunderstandings of, welfare are some other important matters that should not be ignored:

AFDC, the major welfare program, was conceived to provide help for dependent children. As Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO Social Security Department noted in a recent speech, "Our whole approach to welfare reform ought to be, therefore: What is best for these millions of disadvantaged and under-privileged children?" He called "dis-

May 17, 1973

advantaged" and "under-privileged" fancy words "to describe kids who are hungry and ill-clothed and living in rat-infested tenements surrounded by filth, despair, degradation and often disease."

Instead, Seidman said, "their plight is ignored and all the attention is placed on the alleged sins of the adults . . . but whatever may or may not be the sins of their parents, the guiltless children share heavily in the punishment."

It is too simple to say, as some do, "send the mothers to work." In the first place, surveys show many would like to work. But where are the jobs, and if there were jobs what do you do with the children? Who will be there when they get home from school? If they are pre-school, where are the day care centers to look after them properly? The President vetoed day care legislation a couple of years back.

If there were sufficient jobs and adequate day care facilities, what are the ethical implications of a must-work program for welfare mothers? Some welfare opponents have split personalities. In one breath they oppose day care legislation on the grounds it would weaken the family structure; in the next breath they extol "work-fare" and the "work ethic." You can't have it both ways.

Experience with non-federal must-work programs for welfare clients in several states has been a jolt, with one of the key roadblocks to any success being "the documented reluctance of employers" to hire welfare recipients, according to a congressional study.

Welfare probably will be a matter of heated controversy for years to come, and it is likely to remain massively misunderstood. The shape of any true reform was described by Seidman this way:

"In summary, any genuine welfare reform must, first and foremost, emphasize the children's welfare. It should rely primarily on non-welfare programs to develop and assure suitable jobs at decent wages supplemented by improved social insurance, health security and other programs aimed at eliminating poverty."

"With this multi-faceted approach, welfare, whatever it is called, could become a residual program providing a decent level of living to people who can't work at all or ought not to be required to work if they wish to devote themselves to their children's care. Under these circumstances, welfare would be far less costly and the 'work ethic' would be irrelevant to welfare. The nation might even turn once again to helping instead of punishing the poor."

THE SERIOUS PROBLEM OF EMPLOYING ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill which would disallow employers from deducting from their gross income the salaries the employers pay to their illegal alien employees.

I realize that the House just passed a bill that places a greater responsibility on the employer to hire only American citizens, and that if he does not he is subject to legal action, but I feel that it is unfair under our present tax laws to allow an employer to list all salaries paid to these employees as business expenses on this tax return regardless of whether some of these employees are in the United States illegally.

It seems to me that it is not proper to let an employer who hires illegal aliens to be given an unjust advantage over the employer who hires legitimately.

At this time the number of illegal aliens pose a serious challenge to the workers in Texas and the United States in general, and I feel this bill is another way to attack this serious problem of employing illegal aliens.

PREVENTING HEART FATALITIES

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in a heart attack, the enemy is time—the time it takes for the ambulance to arrive and to get to the hospital. The time it takes to get the victim of an attack under care.

Would it not be great, if you felt you were having a heart attack, to have at hand a method of letting your doctor hear your heartbeat, see your cardiogram and prescribe a medicine you had with you, so that you had a better chance to survive until you got to a hospital and were under treatment?

This is possible today. Officials of Montgomery County, Md., which I represent in Congress, have been discussing the implementation of such a system with the county heart association and a local firm, which has developed a CardioBeeper for use over the telephone and a kit containing two injectors providing two alternative medical emergency treatments.

As an outgrowth of the single heartmobile that the association operated, a program has been proposed for the use of rescue squad vehicles, with specially trained operators, to provide the whole county with heartmobile techniques. A central communications system between persons with cardiac kits and their doctors might be tied into this system.

I hope that Montgomery County can show the way to a reduction in the 1,000 heart attack victims who die each day in the United States before even reaching a hospital.

A potentially important key to reducing these deaths, the emergency cardiac kits developed by Survival Technology, Inc., is described in this report from the Montgomery County Sentinel of March 22:

SELF-INJECTING "PEN" AIDS HEART PATIENTS (By Hank Plante)

"The enemy is time," and with those words Dr. Stanley J. Sarnoff hopes he may be on to one of the most important medical breakthroughs in decades.

About 600,000 people die every year in the U.S. from heart attacks, and about 350,000 of them (or 1,000 people every day) die from the attacks before they even reach the hospital. It is those precious seconds that are Sarnoff's enemies, and after five years and untold dollars of research, the weapon against those fatal hospital trips may be forthcoming.

Sarnoff, 56, is President and Chairman of the Board of Survival Technology, Inc., one of those Bethesda medical firms that are

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tucked in the county's corners producing specialized, practical life-saving tools.

It was at his business's birth, in 1958 as Rodana Research Corp., that he developed a small, penlight-sized injector that is familiar to anyone who has gone through military service since that time.

The Atro-Pen injector contained atropine, which served as a quick, self-administered antidote to nerve gas. About 35 million of the small pens have been sold for those purposes to date, giving Sarnoff and his 35 employees a rather respectable living.

But atropine is an old drug, and one of its other uses has long been to speed up a heartbeat in the event of an emergency. About two milligrams of atropine will do the job, generally, and that just happened to be the amount already being used in Atro-Pens as a gas antidote. Sarnoff looks to the ceiling when he recalls the coincidence and says, "Somebody up there must like us."

For another kind of heart problem, that accompanying an irregular heartbeat, lidocaine has frequently been used, and it too has been packaged into a somewhat larger Lido-Pen.

The resulting kit, containing two pens, a trainer pen, and another Survival Tech invention called the CardioBeeper, fit into a small leather case about the size of a pocket radio, and, after clinical studies have been completed and the Food and Drug Administration has approved Survival Tech's device, the package should be available for about \$250 each. Here's how it works:

A patient is in the hospital after a heart problem, and his doctor brings in the small leather case and produces a "trainer" Atro-Pen. Right then and there, he learns how to use the device, and how to teach his secretary or wife how to use it as well.

He pulls the yellow safety cap off the small plastic tube, and presses it against his thigh. He never sees the needle—which Sarnoff says is an important psychological advantage of any self-administering advice—and as he applies about two pounds of pressure against the tube, the needle injects either two mgs. of atropine or 300 mgs. of lidocaine, whichever is appropriate.

Atropine and lidocaine have been used intravenously in hospitals to combat heart problems for some time. Survival Tech's "Heart Plan," calls for a different dose of the drugs and a different route: intramuscular injections.

Backing up about two minutes, here's how he determines which tube to inject. The CardioBeeper, also in the leather case, is the first thing he reaches for as soon as he suspects something may be wrong.

The small plastic box has a phone number written on it, he dials it and reaches his doctor's office or his medical answering office where a doctor is on call. There are two wires coming out of the Beep, and he places one under each arm; there are no lubricants to apply, nothing to clip-on stick-in, but as soon as he has the wires' plastic ends under his arms he hears a beeping sound that coincides with his heart beat, and an accompanying blinking light—either green or orange.

Holding the Beep up to the phone, the doctor can "hear" his heartbeat, and touching a small button on the Beep, he produces a steady, unbroken "Beeeeep," he is sending his electrocardiogram over the phone and his doctor is receiving it on a special pick-up unit. The physician then tells him which tube to inject, either the orange one or the green one. Lest there be any confusion, the blinking light on the Cardio-Beeper will either be an orange one or a green one that coincides with the needed injector.

The doctor, in the meantime, has already phoned for an ambulance to pick up the patient, and the whole process, from start to finish, has taken about four minutes.

To the patient, all he has done is follow simple instructions, but to others like Ire-

land's Dr. P. Frank Pantridge, who developed the mobile "Heartmobile" concept, that patient has not become one of the 49 per cent of heart sufferers who in the first 30 minutes of a coronary have the slow rates and low blood pressure that may lead to death.

To Stanley Sarnoff, after his Princeton A.B., his Johns Hopkins M.D., his Harvard associate professorship, and his role as head of NIH's Cardiovascular Physiology lab, those four minutes may be his brainchild and social contribution come true.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHNNIE M. WALTERS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Johnnie M. Walters was recently invited to address a joint session of the South Carolina General Assembly. This great honor was extended as South Carolinians are proud of the distinguished national service of our native son. Johnnie Walters, as Assistant Attorney General of the United States and as Commissioner of the Internal Revenue, rendered our country dedicated, devoted and constructive service. In a sensitive position of leadership, he administered justice fairly, uprightly and with great ability. Every American can be proud of Johnnie Walters and his record of superb achievement for the Nation. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress and the American people Mr. Walters' splendid address:

REMARKS BY JOHNNIE M. WALTERS

I. INTRODUCTION

Being proud South Carolinians, you can appreciate how pleased I am as a native to be with you today. To be a South Carolinian is a notable distinction; to be invited to address this distinguished General Assembly indeed is a high compliment and honor. I keenly appreciate this, and thank you sincerely.

Years ago—when I was in high school, I was privileged to visit with a distinguished citizen who was about to address the General Assembly, the Honorable A. L. M. Wiggin of Hartsville. He asked me a question that evening in 1938 about which I've thought often, and particularly since the date of your concurrent resolution inviting me here today. Stating that he was trying to decide what to say in his speech, Mr. Wiggin asked: "McKeiver, if you were going to address the General Assembly, what would you say?" That was a difficult question in 1938, and it still is difficult. My concern with this question lately has generated all sorts of ideas—too many for us to discuss today. Having a real appreciation of the value of your time, I want to say something meaningful, yet without being pedantic.

II. FINANCES

I am not a politician, although I try to be politic. I am a tax lawyer and have been since 1949. It has been a high honor and privilege to serve the Nation since January 1969 first as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Department of Justice's Tax Division and then as Commissioner of Internal Revenue. With this experience, I think it is appropriate today to make a few observations about our Federal tax system and finances. While the Commissioner has noth-

ing to say about how the Federal government spends its money, he is charged with collecting practically all of it.

I do not hesitate in South Carolina to speak of efforts to balance the budget. In South Carolina you have paid particular attention to this for a long time. Under the able leadership of the distinguished Speaker and Senator Edgar Brown, the General Assembly has contributed mightily to the sound financial record and reputation of the State. Also, the present distinguished Governor, his predecessors, and loyal officials of the executive department have worked closely with the leadership in this commendable effort. Over the years, South Carolina has done a better job in living within its budget than has Washington. All of us—and especially you—should take great pride in the outstanding financial management of the State.

On the Federal scene, President Nixon is struggling to achieve greater balance between income and expenditures. This is not easy, as you know, but it is essential that we at least begin changing directions so that at some point our Federal financial affairs will be in better shape. As you so well know, this is an issue in which every knowledgeable citizen should take an interest, and particularly those who are state legislators because of the impact Federal finances have on state and local affairs. As responsible officials, you fully realize that the President needs, and is seeking, help in the effort to achieve sounder Federal financing. Having participated to some extent in the effort, and believing firmly in both its necessity and wisdom, I urge you to add your support.

If we want America to survive and prosper, we must get a grip on Federal finances. We must collect them even-handedly, fairly, and vigorously. We must spend them constructively, effectively, and wisely. We should recognize that in neither area have we achieved perfection and that those now responsible for collecting and spending Federal revenues are striving for improvement. They need our help. We should not let them down!

III. LAW AND MORALITY

Having been party to the efforts since 1969 to increase the observance of law and order, I consider it appropriate today to note significant progress toward this goal. Yet, at the same time, I sadly must acknowledge some significant failures to observe law and order. The disturbing crime waves of the 1960's are coming under control. Just last year we saw the first actual decrease in crime in 17 years (3%). The revolutionary disturbances of a few years ago no longer plague us. All this is good. Nevertheless, it is not enough.

Americans are loyal law-abiding citizens, with relatively few exceptions. They expect their neighbors and public officials to observe the rules of law and order. And, in particular, public officials—at all levels of government—have high tests to meet. They are leaders, and good Americans look to them to set the standards. At any time our leaders fail to set and observe high standards, our great national fabric—our national soul—is damaged and torn.

In administering our Federal tax system, we have seen many instances of misbehavior on the part of public officials and other leaders. Prosecuting sitting members of Congress is most disturbing in that it demonstrates a lack of morality in the leadership area. Likewise, prosecuting Federal and State judges shows the same thing. It is almost inconceivable that anyone would presume to place himself in a position of leadership and yet not act responsibly in matters of law and morality.

Right now the Watergate affair is the shining example of wrongdoing. And particularly the kind of wrongdoing we can neither afford nor tolerate. It is too early to assess the full damage of the Watergate affair. That will take years. Yet we already know the damage

is monumental, and that without regard to administrations or parties. The severest damage is to the great American belief and trust in fair play and honesty—particularly in the governmental area.

Despite the personal and national tragedy of Watergate, we can take heart in one aspect of it. The law is prevailing. In many, if not most, other countries the Watergate affair would not see the light of day. In our great country, we shall see the majesty of the law prevail. Amongst others, we must give credit for this to our democratic system, to the freedom and tenacity of the press, and to the good loyal American's insistence on the truth! For all of this better side of this sordid spectacle we ought to and must be grateful! It demonstrates that America still is a land of law and not of men!

We have surmounted other wrongdoings, and we will this. Yet we should recognize the very real national danger in wrongdoing—and particularly by those in positions of leadership and trust. We must pray and work for greater integrity and morality on the part of everyone, including ourselves. We should do to another only that which we would have him do unto us. Having suffered great damage at the Watergate, we now should work together in healing our wounds. It will not serve the Nation well to do otherwise.

IV. CONCLUSION

I am very proud of South Carolina. I always shall strive to have South Carolina proud of me. I appreciate and thank you for the high honor of being with you today. God bless each of you, this great State, and our great Nation!

VOTER REGISTRATION: IN HUMAN TERMS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have placed before the House of Representatives, the National Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973 (H.R. 4846) which would serve to renovate and modernize our system of voter registration.

In considering this proposal, it would be absolutely tragic if my colleagues thought of voter registration as only numbers and various statistics, or only in terms of financial costs, or whether the proposal does or does not invite fraud and corruption. Much more importantly, we must reflect on what voter registration has meant in human terms in recent American history.

In the summer of 1964, 650 volunteers from all across the country journeyed to Mississippi to participate in the Summer Freedom Project. The program was sponsored by such groups as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality and the Mississippi branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The primary objective of this project was to register eligible black voters. "Letters From Mississippi," edited by Elizabeth Sutherland, is a compilation of letters written by the volunteers during those summer months. I now submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, excerpts from

the book to show what voter registration truly means.

LETTERS FROM MISSISSIPPI

VALLEY VIEW, August 25.

The right to vote is completely controlled by the registrars—one to each of 82 counties. They alone decide whether an applicant has passed the test, they inform him only after a 30-day wait, and they don't have to tell him why he failed the test.

The registrar could always find a reason for flunking a Negro applicant: the undotted "i," a misspelling, or especially an error in question 19 which required the applicant to copy out and then interpret any one of the 286 sections of the Mississippi Constitution specified by the registrar. Some of the sections run as long as two pages, all in legalese. Negroes with Ph.D.'s were flunked, while white men with only a grammar school education were passed.

But more discouraging to the Negro than these technical traps was the fact that the names of all applicants were published in the newspaper for two weeks or more. It wasn't difficult to tell white and Negro names apart, as the white names were dignified by Mr., Miss, Mrs. And once identified. . . .

BATESVILLE

Fear of The Man, fear of Mr. Charlie. . . . Occasionally it is the irrational fear of something new and untested. But usually it is a highly rational emotion, the economic fear of losing your job, the physical fear of being shot at. Domestic servants know that they will be fired if they register to vote; so will factory workers, so will Negroes who live on plantations. In Mississippi, registration is no private affair. . . .

GREENWOOD, July 15.

We are trying to get people to go down to the courthouse to register. In Mississippi there are no deputy registrars, the only place that people can register is at the Courthouse at the County Seat. The county seat for Leflore County is Greenwood. This in itself restrains Negroes from voting because they don't like to go to the courthouse, which has bad connotations for them. Behind the courthouse is the Yazoo River. The river also has bad connotations; as Albert Darner said, it's "Dat river where dey floats them bodies in."

MC COMBE, August 20.

The voter registration program, despite its shortcomings, is a beautiful thing to watch. Such a big step for these people! The voter registration classes are slightly tense, but what is more present is hope, positivity. The people dress up carefully. They shake each other's hands, await eagerly the return of those who have gone down to the courthouse already. Two functional illiterates have come, and so many others have so much trouble filling out the form. But they're going down—a cemetery caretaker, a blind man, a cafe owner, a domestic . . .

MILESTON, July 6.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: Mileston, where I'm staying, is in the flat Delta section of Holmes County. The Negro farms here were once part of huge plantations. In 1939 the federal government confiscated the land when the plantation owners failed to pay back taxes, and the land was divided up among Negro families who had applied for it. Land reform (on a minuscule scale) has had an enormous effect on the people . . .

Last year Hollis Watkins, a SNCC staff member, began a voter registration drive here. He got about 14 Negroes to go to the court house with the intention of registering to vote. Sheriff Smith greeted the party with a six shooter drawn from his pocket, and said "Okay, who's first?" Most of the Negroes remained cautiously quiet. After

several seconds a man who had never before been a leader stepped up to the Sheriff, smiled and said, "I'm first, Hartman Turnbow." All registration applications were permitted to be filled out and all were judged illiterate. The next week, Turnbow's house was bombed with Molotov cocktails. When the Turnbows left the burning house, they were shot at, and they shot back until the attackers fled. A couple of days later, Mr. Turnbow, Hollis Watkins, Robert Moses and a couple of other people were arrested for arson; Turnbow was accused of having bombed his own house which wasn't insured. Sheriff Smith was the one witness against them. Mr. Turnbow was convicted in a Justice of Peace Court, but the conviction was overruled in a federal district court . . .

The Negro people we are living with have enormous hope and are extremely practical about achieving their goals. This community is an oasis of hope in a desert of broken minds: the plantation sharecroppers who have little reason for hope . . .

Love,

JOEL.

These young people died in the cause of pushing and selling American democracy to disenfranchised and discriminated-against individuals. They put their lives on the line to register people. I hope that we, in Congress, can follow the lead of these kids and open up the political process by opening up our voter registration system.

WELFARE SCANDAL—XXII

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it's not enough for some welfare clients to live self-satisfied lives dependent on public welfare and supported by their communities and the Nation's taxpayers. Some cheat.

Perhaps it is fair to blame the system for encouraging such abuses. But the fact remains: welfare clients are bad risks in many cases. Not paying rents, doctor and dentist bills, or even moving bills has victimized many businessmen who have welfare clients as customers.

It's past time to tighten up our administration of welfare programs. Congress must recognize its responsibility to prevent fraud, waste, and mismanagement of public programs by more realistic and effective legislative requirements. It's time for welfare reform, now. The article follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel]

MOVING FIRMS TO SUE AM UNIT

(By Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk)

The owner of two Milwaukee area moving firms has instructed his attorney to file suit against the Milwaukee County Welfare Department to obtain payment of more than \$6,500 due the firms for moving welfare clients.

The suit may also test the legality of a department policy limiting the amount paid for moving to \$100.

John M. Malley, Jr., owner and president of North Star Van & Storage Inc. and City Van & Storage Inc., both at 4545 N. Port Washington Rd., Glendale, said he had di-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rected his attorney, John Collentine, to file the suit.

It will seek collection for unpaid bills dating back to 1966, including \$4,873 due City Van & Storage and \$1,776 due North Star Van & Storage Malley said.

Collentine said he had discussed the unpaid bills several times with the department and "the only thing they said was that they paid the recipients so they (the department) aren't liable."

Malley and Collentine intend to find out if that is true.

Collentine is executive secretary of the Milwaukee Furniture Movers Association.

Collentine said he also believes that the department's policy of paying a maximum of \$100 for a move is in violation of Public Service Commission (PSC) regulations.

"It's contrary to state law," he said. "The Public Service Commission says that we (commercial movers) cannot charge more or less than our tariff (rates) provides."

As the department operates, it will allow \$100 for moving even if the bill is more than that amount, Collentine said.

Arthur Silverman, welfare director, said Monday that the \$100 maximum is set by the State Department of Health and Social Services and not by the local welfare department.

"Consequently, we abide by what is the state rate in moving costs" Silverman said. "To exceed that rate would be to forgo federal and state reimbursement" for money in excess of the \$100 maximum, he said.

A PSC official in Madison said Monday that movers are required to charge according to their rates on file with the commission and that they are prohibited from either charging more or accepting less.

"They cannot accept just \$100," said Lester L. Dietrich, director of the commission's tariff bureau.

Neither the welfare department nor anyone else can arbitrarily pay more or less for a move, he said.

"We have known that this situation has existed for years in the welfare department, and the carriers are faced with a problem," Dietrich said.

The moves for which Malley will sue to collect were ordered by the department's caseworkers and done by his companies, Malley said.

INSTRUCTIONS TO ATTORNEY

He said he had directed Collentine to "take the necessary action so that we get paid for these moves, even if it means taking Mr. Silverman to court."

"The department has been completely unco-operative regarding unpaid bills. They've listened, but they've done nothing," Malley said.

He said there are four or five moving companies in the Milwaukee area with unpaid bills of \$5,000 to \$10,000 each for moving welfare recipients on authorization of the department.

Silverman told The Sentinel that if the department has given the moving allowance to a recipient, "then to make a second payment to the mover would be duplication. Duplication would not receive any federal or state reimbursement, but would be totally out of county funds."

Silverman said that if moving grants were made to recipients, "then the recipients owe them (the movers) the money."

He also pointed out that in order to get federal and state reimbursement, the money must be given directly to the recipient—and not to the mover.

MANY RELUCTANT

Malley said that most movers don't want anything to do with moves ordered by the welfare department.

As a result, he said, two companies are

getting the bulk of the welfare department's business for client moves.

One, he said, is soliciting the business because it has learned how to collect—apparently in excess of the \$100 the department allows.

The company refuses to unload the furniture at the new location until the full amount is paid, Malley said.

"They take the van with the furniture on it back to the terminal and simply refuse to return and unload it until they're paid," Malley said.

CLIENT GETS MONEY

In the meantime, the welfare recipient goes to the department, tells someone what happened and gets the money for the full cost of the move, often in excess of \$100. After the recipient gives the money to the moving company, his furniture is unloaded.

The department ends up paying \$30 to \$40 more than the move should cost because the company also charges for extra travel time and tieup of the van going to and from the terminal, Malley said.

He said he would not resort to holding furniture to obtain payment.

Silverman denied any knowledge of cases of movers holding furniture in order to collect bills in excess of the \$100 maximum.

"We know of no such situation," said Silverman. "If he (Malley) knows of such a situation, we would suggest that he let us know the name of the mover involved."

Collentine said that moving companies are not allowed to donate their services because of PSC regulations, but that getting paid \$100 for a \$120 moving bill, in effect, amounts to donating \$20.

MOST TOP \$100

Malley said that the bills for most local moves run slightly more than \$100.

John Dwyer, vice president of Malley's firms and president of the Milwaukee Furniture Movers Association, said that "most of the 22 movers in the association don't want to have a thing to do with welfare moves."

He estimated that the costs of moving welfare clients is more than \$100,000 a year.

Under common carrier regulations, a moving company cannot refuse a move, Malley said.

However, he said, an increasing number of companies are "too busy" to accept welfare moves.

But Malley said that some welfare recipients are getting wise to the situation and do not tell movers that they are on welfare.

WAIT FOR UNLOADING

"Sometimes they'll call you as if it were a private job and not till you finish and get unloaded do they tell you they're on welfare."

"Then they say, 'Bill the welfare department.' And we have to whistle Dixie," Malley said.

He said his companies had handled welfare department moves for more than 20 years and until the middle 1960s had no trouble.

Then, he said, the department changed its policy of making payment direct to the mover and began, instead, giving the money to the recipients. But, he said, the movers were not notified of this change.

"I don't believe any of the movers knew about this change for 6 or 12 months," he said.

BILLED DEPARTMENT

"We were billing the department with a copy of the bill sent to the recipients," Malley said.

Then, he said, unpaid bills began to grow in number and amount.

Between 25% and 50% of the recipients pay them, Malley said, but the remainder collect the money and don't pay.

In most cases, inquiries to the department bring the reply that the money for the move

was given to the recipient, he said. It's extra money for the recipient, but it leaves the mover unpaid, he said.

Malley said that some welfare recipients go to a mover, get an estimate, then turn it in to the department and get paid the amount of the estimate. Then, he said, they move in their own car or get a friend with a truck to help them, and they pocket the money they got from the department.

Case aides confirmed that some recipients keep the moving money given them by the department and move the furniture themselves.

DEPARTMENT PAYS

Malley said the department is paying for a commercial moving job when the person is actually either moving himself or giving a few dollars to an unlicensed trucker to move him.

All of the welfare moves carried on his companies' books as unpaid bills were authorized by the department through its caseworkers, Malley said.

But he said, when he inquires about payment for them, "the answer seems always to be that the caseworker who authorized the move is no longer with the department or else the recipient is no longer on the local welfare rolls."

He produced a letter from the department in answer to one inquiry concerning lack of payment for the moving of 20 welfare recipients.

"Look at this one," Dwyer said, pointing to one of the recipient names on the letter. Concerning the recipient, the department had written "according to our records, the client changed his mind and didn't move." "We moved him," Dwyer declared.

SAYS CLIENT GOT MONEY

In most of the 20 cases included in the letter, the department's reply was that it had given the money for the move to the recipient.

In two cases, the amount charged was believed to be excessive so authorization for payment was refused by the caseworker, the department letter said.

A caseworker cannot make such an arbitrary decision, the PSC said.

No one can decide that a moving bill based on approved rates is too high and refuse to pay it for that reason, Dietrich said.

Collentine said that he expected to file suit for Malley's firms within the next 10 days.

INDEPENDENT GAS DEALERS ENDANGERED

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, an ominous trend has developed in the response of our major oil companies to the growing gasoline shortages. The very real danger is that the major suppliers of fuel will continue to service the chain service stations while drastically reducing, or in some cases, even stopping gasoline delivery to the smaller, independent operators.

For Congress to sit back and allow the big oil suppliers to drive America's independent service stations out of business would be tragic. Yet it is already happening. In my own district in southeastern Massachusetts, independent gas stations in the town of Hull, on Cape Cod, and elsewhere are in danger of being

forced to close for lack of gasoline to sell.

Mr. David E. Lynch, writing for the Brockton, Mass., Daily Enterprise, has documented how the major oil companies have made a policy of driving the smaller, independent operators out of business, and how President Nixon's latest energy message only serves to increase oil company profits rather than getting at the roots of the problem or taking decisive action to save the independents.

In order that all Members may have the benefit of Mr. Lynch's article while we still have time to enact legislation to stop discriminatory practices against independent dealers, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE ENERGY CRISIS: FACT, FICTION OR CONSPIRACY?

(By David E. Lynch)

WASHINGTON.—To M. A. Adelman, the world energy crisis is a fiction. "But," the Massachusetts Institute of Technology energy expert says, "belief in the fiction is a fact."

To the federal government and the oil industry, the current crisis is a fact that is nature's way of telling us "the era of cheap and plentiful supplies of energy is over."

(Popeye is running out of cheap spinach," former Commerce Secretary Peter G. Peterson told us last November.)

To Martin Lobel, a former energy expert for the Joint Economic Committee, the energy crisis is an oil industry "conspiracy" to drive the independent refiners and marketers out of business and to raise prices.

To the general consumer, this fact, fiction or conspiracy will add anywhere from five to 10 cents a gallon on his gasoline bill this summer. And if the shortage gets as severe as some predict, no amount of money will be able to buy the automobile fuel in certain places at certain times.

How this all came about is difficult to determine.

Adelman blames it on environmental safeguards, the unrealistic regulations of natural gas and international "collusion."

The industry and the federal government agree with his first two reasons and add two of their own: import quotas and the lack of tax incentives for domestic exploration and production.

Lobel contends that the so-called energy crisis is the result of the oil industry's historical policy of purposely underestimating the demand in an effort to keep the supply and demand curve in their favor.

Internationally, the "fiction" or energy crisis, Adelman recently wrote in the authoritative journal, Foreign Policy, "makes people accept higher oil prices as imposed by nature, when they are really fixed by collusion among the OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) governments."

Lobel who has gone into public interest law and is fighting the oil companies' request for a gasoline price hike, agrees with the international collusion theory and thinks the domestic "conspiracy" is the most important threat to American consumers today.

He contends that the major oil companies have manufactured the current shortages of crude oil and gasoline by providing the government with "phony statistics" indicating that domestic supply supplemented with small foreign imports would meet demand when they knew there would not be enough fuel.

This, Lobel says, prevented any governmental "jawboning" that would face the oil industry to produce the needed fuel that would have prevented the shortage.

With the shortage at hand, the oil companies blamed the lack of fuel in unprece-

dented demand and had an excuse to cut off supply to independent refiners and marketers, thereby clearing the way for price increases.

This shortage, he says, was "manufactured" by the oil companies in an effort to keep supplies tight and prices high.

He documented this claim in testimony before the Cost of Living Council's investigation into home heating oil price increases in February.

He asked the council to find out from the oil industry why:

"The major oil companies uniformly assured the director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness in September 1972, that 'there should be an adequate supply of number 2 oil during the coming winter' and that 'the industry has the necessary refining capacity and necessary feedstocks to insure an adequate supply' even though the American Petroleum Institute's own public reports showed that stock levels of distillates, primarily number 2 on Sept. 1, 1972, were 27.8 million barrels below the same date in 1971?"

"The following major oil companies assured the Texas Railroad Commission in August 1972, that their desired stock levels of distillates, primarily number 2 home heating oil, were adequate even though they were below the 1971 level and demand was anticipated to grow and indeed had grown by about seven per cent since then?"

"The government did not take any steps to increase production in August when public reports indicated that 'there was about an 18 per cent reduction in available crude oil from 50,966,000 barrels to 41,425,000 barrels between 1971 and 1972 despite an increase in demand of about seven per cent?'"

The public interest lawyer says this "phony" shortage drove some independent refiners and marketers out of business last winter and will put more out of business this summer because of the gasoline shortage.

"This is what it's all about," Lobel said during a recent interview, "the major oil companies are now saying the home heating oil shortage forced them to refine number 2 oil three weeks into the gasoline refining season, creating a shortage of gasoline."

"This," he said, "gives the majors a perfect opportunity to cut supplies to the independents, eliminating the most competitive part of the market and clearing the way for price increases."

The independent refiners and marketers are now asking the federal government to step in and force the majors to provide them with at least the same amount of fuel they received last summer.

These independents for years have provided a convenient market for the major oil companies' surplus crude and finished products. And because they are smaller, had no advertisement costs and kept overhead costs much lower than the majors, the independents were much more efficient and could afford to sell their gasoline for three to five cents a gallon less than the major companies.

Before supply began to get especially tight in the early 1970s, this arrangement worked very well for both sectors of the market.

In fact, a marketing expert told the Joint Economic Committee recently, the independents were "forcing the majors to incorporate their efficiency and self-service that could have resulted in substantial savings to the public."

"But," Fred C. Alvine, a Georgia Institute of Technology professor continued, "the competitive pressure of the efficient independent discount gas marketers are no longer being felt."

The major companies, Lobel says, "don't want the independents cutting into their market, so they're going to cut off supply."

Alvine points out that the price of gasoline to major brand dealers in 100 cities has

increased by approximately 2.1 cents per gallon for 1973 in comparison to the same period in 1972. "This in turn means pump price increases of about three cents per gallon."

It is now generally agreed by all sectors of the industry and the government that there will be gasoline "run-outs" of short duration throughout the country this summer.

But it is difficult to determine what this will do to the eventual price.

Some are predicting that gasoline will go up to anywhere from 60 cents to a dollar a gallon. But William E. Simon, the deputy secretary of the Treasury, who admits prices will increase, denied that they will "rise to astronomical levels."

Another aspect of the gasoline shortage is the fact that the majors are getting into the discount business at the same time the independents are being forced out.

Exxon is now marketing discount gas under the Alert brand name at 18 stations in four states. Economy and Bulko are the two new brand names for Gulf's discount operation. Shell markets it under the name Cello. Phillips Petroleum discounts under Blue Goose and Red Dot Gas.

This new operation comes at a time when the majors are closing their unprofitable brand name stations all over the country. The stations that are more than 300 miles from a refinery and have only a few pumps and no auto repair are the ones that are being closed.

Exxon is in the process of closing 150 of its 400 retail stations in Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Indiana. Gulf has put up for sale, 3,500 stations in 21 states from Illinois to California and the Northwest. BP has already pulled out of the Northeast and Sun Oil Co. has withdrawn from Tennessee and most of the upper Midwest. Cities Service, Atlantic Richfield and Phillips Petroleum are also closing stations.

Mr. Adelman's solution for the real domestic shortage is compel the oil producers to having the federal government market their own oil instead of going through OPEC; imposing import quotas and increasing domestic energy sources, which would force world prices to decline.

Until early this year, the federal government and the major oil companies would have gladly accepted most of these recommendations, especially the import restraints.

Both had been defending the import quotas for keeping cheap imports out and "fostering the growth of a strong domestic producing industry capable of exploring for and developing new domestic reserves."

But now it seems the government and the oil industry are blaming the import controls for the current shortage of crude oil the domestic refineries need to convert this crude into the desperately needed gasoline.

People like Rep. Silvio O. Conte, R-Mass., and Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., who have been arguing all along that the quotas never did anything except allow the domestic shortages of home heating oil, are wondering why their continually rejected arguments against the program are now being accepted by the government and the industry.

These lawmakers and others from New England have continually rebutted the national security rationale for the quotas by pointing to the fact that the quotas were never very effective in encouraging domestic exploration, production and refining.

Now, listen to what Silvio O. Conte, by far the sharpest critic of the import quotas, said at McIntyre's hearings in 1971:

"The rationale for quotas is that higher prices through the quotas are needed to produce sufficient profits to encourage further domestic exploration and development. Isn't it interesting though, that the majors are eager to spend tremendous sums to drill for and produce oil in the North Sea, in the Atlantic off Canadian shores and elsewhere—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

all to be sold on the world market at prices far cheaper than domestic prices. Why don't we see similar serious exploration efforts in the lower 48?"

Senator McIntyre at that same hearing asked Hollis Dole, an assistant secretary of Interior, why, in light of the fact that the quotas were set up to encourage domestic production and refining, have there been so few refineries built in the United States?

Dole pointed out to the environmentalists' opposition to refinery siting as part of the problem, but he did produce statistics showing that there were 30 new refineries and 14 major refinery expansions between 1960 and 1961.

If Adelman is correct about the international collusion and Lobel is correct about the domestic conspiracy may never be determined.

But it appears that OPEC and the U.S. major oil companies will continue to increase their profits with the help of President Nixon's latest Energy Message.

The central thrust of his April 18 address is aimed at increasing domestic production by providing new incentives and opportunities for exploration and development of America's energy reserves while calling on foreign crude as a short-term solution.

The chief executive actions in that message was the termination of the 14-year-old oil import quota system and a partial decontrolling of natural gas prices.

The refinery construction and expansion will be encouraged by reduced import fees for new and expanded refineries. The Administration says that since April 18, the majors have announced plans to build eight new refineries. More are expected.

To encourage new exploration the President asked Congress to extend the investment tax credit provisions to the oil and gas industry by providing a seven per cent tax credit on dry or unsuccessful, new wells and a 12 per cent tax credit for wet, or successful wells.

The message contained no mention of any possible changes in the existing 22 per cent oil depletion allowance.

The president also called for delays in the implementation of the Clear Air Standards to permit the continued production of most plentiful energy resource—coal.

To Martin Lobel, this message is the fruits of the "conspiracy." The oil companies, he said, "blackmailed" the government into providing new incentives that will allow them to continue to "blackmail the consumer."

To the government, this message is admittedly not the final solution, but the federal officials involved in compiling this document are pretty well convinced that it will provide a partial solution for the short and long-term problem.

To the oil industry, which has been surprisingly silent on the President's message, the proposal will help in the long run. But, according to Texaco's Amos Card, price controls must be lifted to allow the importation of European gasoline that is now selling at five to 10 cents more than it can be profitably brought into the East Coast.

YOUTH ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes, as we pass legislation, we do so without a clear understanding of what the impact of that legislation will be. I would like to enter the following contest-winning essays, by two young people in the Second District of

California, dealing with the subject of pollution, in the RECORD. A subject which, incidentally, we were quite engrossed with during the 92d Congress, culminating in the Water Quality Act of 1972, and, if all indications are correct as I read them, will be of great importance throughout the 93d Congress. Here are the views of two concerned young people who express a view that should be kept in mind as we begin to consider legislation dealing with the environment:

PLANTS

(By Linda Walker)

Where ever they can find sunlight, air or a little earth plants will grow.

On the north coast of Greenland the arctic poppy peeps out from under the ice. In the wastes of the antarctic grow mosses and tussock grass.

Flowers of vivid colors and great variety force their way up through the snow on the mountainsides. In the heart of burning desert the aloe and cactus find a way to live.

Steaming hot pools, such as those in Yellowstone National Park, they are beautiful and are beautifully colored by tiny plants called Algae. Rivers, lakes, and swamps are filled with water plants. Very simple plants such as certain bacteria yeasts, and molds don't need sunlight and earth but live on and multiply in darkness. The only place one can find almost no plant life is in the blackest parts of the sea. The Scientists who study plants (Botanists) have named and described between 350,000 and 400,000 different kinds of plants.

But how much more time will they be living, growing, and pollinating? Surely not very long with the pollution, smog, dirty rivers and streams.

Thousands of animals, fish, and birds die of this.

What are we doing about this?

Soon every plant and animal and even people will be gone. There will be no life on earth.

Avoid pollution.

A TRIP DOWN OUR RIVERS

(By Lee Monchamp)

Will you join me for a trip down our rivers? Now let's get ready for our trip.

On your left you can see a broken bottle out in the middle of the current. That is one of our more common sights you'll see along the way.

Now let's move on, around the bend you'll see where the field was stripped of all its top soil. There is a rare sight to see, kids picking up the litter.

That's something different, they usually drop the garbage in the river and not pick it up.

On your right you see a pop can. Look! over there? It's a fish, belly up from the pollution in the river. Let's move on.

From here we'll have to walk. The garbage here is too thick to get through. We'll have to walk for about 100 yards. This is the worst part of the river.

From here on it will be easier to move on. Now let's get back in the boat. Be careful you might slip on that broken piece of glass.

"Don't! drink the water please" the river has a waste inlet, right behind us. This is just one of the many along the river.

Let me stop here. I think you know what I mean. The rivers aren't that bad yet. But if we don't try to do something about it it could become that bad.

I feel we should try to do something about pollution now. If we wait it might be too late. Let's join together and help stop pollution of our lakes and rivers, so we can see clean lakes and clean rivers again.

ENERGY CRISIS IS NOW

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of the growing number of Members who have tried to alert the Congress and the public to the realities of the energy problems facing the United States on both a short- and a long-run basis. I want to call the attention of the House to a very real present and most serious aspect of the energy crisis: The fact that today the volume buyers of diesel fuel and gasoline are being told that there is no fuel for them or that their supply will be seriously restricted. Bus lines in our cities, contractors using heavy equipment, refuse collection fleets, and general trucking firms are all immediately threatened with curtailment or a complete halt in their operation. The economic, ecological, and social damage that will result is going to be catastrophic. The construction industry alone employs over 4.5 million people and amounts to 11 percent of our Gross National Product. If fuel for bulldozers, trucks, and paving equipment is not available, we will put 4.5 million men on our unemployment rolls. Not only will this mean an increased outflow of money from the Treasury, but a reduced inflow since these men would not be paying taxes while they have no income. Furthermore the public will be denied the roads and buildings for which there is high demand.

If the bus lines serving our central cities are forced to curtail service due to a fuel shortage—who suffers? The poor and the elderly who do not have the availability of a car. Many of the presently employed residents of Los Angeles and other cities depend on bus transit to get to work. Are we going to allow a misallocation of natural resources to rob the people of employment and mobility—to rob them of transportation to health care, to places where they can shop? I cannot accept the simplistic callousness that says "This is the result of natural economic forces that should not be tampered with."

If we do not care about transportation for the elderly and poor or about the 4 million workers in construction jobs, then let us look at what the diesel fuel oil shortage means to the average middle-class suburban consumer who owns two cars and drives from home to a suburban shopping center. They will find that the goods they want in the stores would not be there because the trucking company that would have brought them could not buy fuel. I am not talking about a doomsday in the next century—I am talking about a crisis that will hit many localities within the next 8 weeks unless something is done to guarantee the availability of fuel to these users.

I would ask my colleagues to indulge me for one more, perhaps more telling example—not at all hypothetical. Something that will happen to some of my

constituents in the next few weeks. Last evening I was informed that two of the fleets of trash trucks which service Orange County, Calif., have been notified that in another month there will be no fuel for them. Many of us in this Chamber have discussed on a very broad level the dual crisis of energy and environment. But here we find the two coming together in a very dramatic way. Serious environmental damage is going to occur for many of our people if the shortage of fuel is not averted.

The Congress and the President must realize that the energy crisis is no longer an academic subject. It is going to damage the lives of many Americans in the next few months. If we are to avert this, we must find the means through public policy to induce or if necessary, require the larger oil companies who control a vital national resource to allocate that resource in a way consistent with the national interest and the needs of all segments of our society. This crisis just around the corner is not the result of a shortage of crude. It results from the fact that automobile gasoline is the most profitable end product of crude and, therefore, the oil companies, motivated by short-term profit and nothing more, produce gasoline for suburban cars rather than fuel for trash trucks and suburban buses.

We must not allow this socially, economically, and environmentally disastrous allocation of a natural resource to exist simply out of a blind allegiance to a narrow view about what is meant by a free enterprise system. We must ask—freedom for whom?

THE FUTURE OF PACIFIC AIR CARGO

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, the second annual Pacific Basin Air Cargo Conference was held in Honolulu. The meeting was called by Governor Burns and was sponsored by the Department of Transportation of the State of Hawaii. Hawaii is destined to become the air cargo transportation center of the entire Pacific area.

The keynote address for this conference was given by Mr. James K. Carr, president of the Airport Operators Council International. Mr. Carr, who is presently director of aviation, County of Sacramento, Calif., is a former staff member of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and was Under Secretary of the Interior in the Kennedy administration. Mr. Carr set the tone for the meeting by discussing the need for cooperation and planning in developing the coming "Common Market" in the Pacific.

I know that many of my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Carr's remarks and, therefore, I am including them at this point:

THE COMING "COMMON MARKET": OUR COLLECTIVE CONCERN—THE FUTURE OF PACIFIC AIR CARGO

(By James K. Carr)

To adequately cover the scope of this conference in a keynote address the speaker should be, preferably, at least a combination of a Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce, member of the Tariff Commission, Economic Advisor to the President, shipper, airline official, and Operator of airports.

Only in the latter position do I have any credentials at all.

It was pleasing therefore, that despite my limitations, Governor John A. Burns, a long-time friend and a distinguished public servant, invited me to make some remarks at the opening of this Conference.

We are grateful also to Dr. Fugio Matsuda, Director of Transportation, and the many others who arranged this gathering. It gives all of us an excellent opportunity to discuss the coming "Common Market"—the future air cargo traffic in the Pacific Basin.

The air cargo trade between Pacific Basin nations follows routes that crisscross and skirt around more than sixty million square miles of ocean. The Pacific is the greatest expanse of water on the face of the globe. The Pacific covers an area more than twice the size of the North and South Atlantic combined.

The seeming obstacles of distance are made-to-order opportunities for modern-day jet aircraft. The nations of the Pacific are on the brink of new world trade traffic patterns which have never before been possible. It becomes possible because of large, jet powered, cargo capacity.

This phenomena results from several other factors, a few of which I shall mention.

The Pacific Basin is unique: It lends itself to superjet air cargo traffic as does no other area.

The Pacific Basin produces valuable agricultural products in abundance all year long at one place or another. When it is winter in the Northern Hemisphere it is summer in the South Pacific and Latin America.

A continuing build-up in air traffic volume, passenger and freight, is the key to economical trade by air. It can surpass men's dreams of a relatively few years ago. If we string the strands of air cargo commerce intelligently, it will more than double in the Pacific Basin within the next ten years. Already commercial exchange among the Pacific Basin nations exceeds \$100,000,000,000 a year. In the same area some three dozen air carriers compete for the air cargo traffic.

Let me take two phases of this growing market to illustrate more specifically the unparalleled potential for world trade by air, namely movement of "Agricultural Products" and what might be termed "The Extended Assembly Line".

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Fruit, lamb, and other New Zealand and Australian agricultural products are no strangers to the marts of North America, China, and Japan.

Berries and beef, fruit and vegetables from California, Oregon, and Washington end up on the tables of Hawaii, Japan, and the South Pacific. Likewise the agricultural bounty of Mexico's growing agricultural industry is sold in the same areas.

In distant, "down-under" lands housewives await the annual arrival of California strawberries, apricots, plums, and asparagus.

Conversely, in opposite months supermarket patrons pick up peaches and other products from the South Pacific.

The point need not be belabored. Jet aircraft cargo has these products flowing back and forth across the Pacific in quantities of economic significance for the first time in history. This is only the beginning.

EXTENDED ASSEMBLY LINE

The so-called "Extended Assembly Line" is even a more interesting development in air freight. It is based on the availability of lower-cost labor and the economics of jet transport.

For example, material for electronic components moves from Mountain View on the deep San Francisco Peninsula to Singapore, Korea, Japan and Mexico. The components move back by air to the Peninsula. The completed products are assembled and then shipped by air to America's mid-west and easterly heavy industrial manufacturing centers. No such size of "Extended Assembly Line" activity has developed between Europe and North America.

RIM TRAFFIC

The Pacific Rim traffic is as busy as the cross ocean traffic. Other new markets are developing.

For instance, with its advantages of low cost labor and leather, Mexico will soon be producing large volumes of Italian shoes on Italian lasts to be sold by Italian companies.

These illustrate the forthcoming remarkable and unique developments that will create new air cargo trade in the coming "Common Market" of the Pacific Basin.

COOPERATION A "MUST"

Cooperation is a "must" if we are to achieve the goal. Working together and knowing one another better we can curb inordinate self interest, excessive nationalism, and the kind of isolationism that set back world trade some forty years ago.

The development of one region economically almost always helps the other region. We should have learned that lesson from past experience.

There is an awful lot of work to do, however, by aircraft manufacturers, shippers, freight forwarders, financiers, airlines, airport operators, and governments.

JOINT USE OF FACILITIES

In Tokyo last week two rival department stores have agreed to use the same trucks to deliver their goods to their customers. It prevents congestion and is a better use of their total resources. It saves energy and reduces pollution.

Isn't it time that airlines and governments take a closer look at the ridiculous inefficient handling of cargo by different entities?

A move toward better utilization of facilities with less "pride of ownership" would reduce costs. It would represent conservation of resources. Joint use would represent the highest form of international thrift in a field of extensive, but limited, resources. Joint use would improve the financial health of all the airlines and could lower freight rates as well.

STANDARDIZED CONTAINERS

The design of standardized containers is an area where much, much study is needed. Considerable progress has been made, but there is ample room for a lot more.

Containers have tremendous interchange ability. They adapt to transhipment in a manner that permits contact to almost any city in the world within a matter of hours.

The LD-3 container system on wide-bodied jets is like adding the equivalent of a 707 freighter on the bottom of the plane already carrying passengers and baggage. In some instances the "daylight" loaded LD-3 is nearly cutting in half previous air freight rates. Maritime rates are rising so air cargo is definitely closing the cost gap with ocean borne commerce.

THE "FASTEST WAY" BECOMES "THE WAY"

The future looks very bright. "The Fastest Way" of moving traffic down the centuries has always become "The Way". The Romans improved on sporadic winds and sail power with galley slaves. Intercontinental

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rial railroads in the United States took the business away from ships going "around the Horn" or "over the Isthmus of Panama". In the future, "superjet airships" will be "the way" of moving freight across the Pacific.

DEMAND BOTH TYPES

Traffic needs, however, will demand both types of cargo capacity, passenger plane "belly cargo space" and all-cargo freighters.

Even in the last few days Easter flower shipments from California were delayed because huge loads of passengers and baggage reduced the "lift capacity" for freight forwarders on scheduled wide-bodied jets. We will need both types of cargo operations and more.

If all the people of China step up trade with the rest of the world, the aircraft manufacturers will have a difficult time meeting demands for new aircraft.

AIR CARGO FACILITIES

As for cargo facilities at airports in the Pacific Basin, I should like to comment briefly.

With the incredible variety of products that are flowing back and forth from one airport to another in the different nations, and the different needs, it would be poor planning to overstandardize the overall airport facilities themselves although it makes sense to standardize containers and other tools of the trade.

COOPERATIVE PLANNING

Instead, we face a challenge of cooperative planning that is in many ways much more complex than the planning that was done a few years ago for air passenger traffic. Probable volumes, variety of products, ground distribution, and, above all, financing are proper ingredients of airport planning.

Some of you will recall that in the mid 1960's airport operators complained that they were only in a position to make plans to receive certain aircraft when they would read in the newspapers that a particular airline had purchased a special type of aircraft.

Thanks to Stuart G. Tipton, President of the Air Transport Association, the Boeing Company, and other aircraft manufacturers, meetings were held in 1967 to set criteria for a much more intelligent planning of passenger facilities. It was the beginning of The Industry Working Group.

We are now face to face with this more difficult planning problem. Airport operators must meet now with airline aircraft manufacturers and government representatives to determine what the specific needs for cargo will be at key airports.

Superjet cargo "Airships" will come in the future. It may happen fairly soon. Special facilities will be needed to handle such large aircraft.

Others that should not be overlooked if planning is to be effective are the shippers themselves and the freight forwarders. Too often shippers have been more or less told to accommodate to container design instead of seeing whether specially shaped containers would fit the shipper's needs. All of these factors must be brought to bear to resolve air cargo facilities problems and it cannot be done too soon. Fortunately, this very conference represents a beginning toward intelligent air cargo facilities planning for the Pacific.

SUMMARY

To summarize, the extent of the coming "Common Market" of air cargo in the Pacific, if imaginatively developed, could produce air commerce almost beyond the imagination.

This air cargo effort must use tourism to lead the way. Nothing replaces person-to-person contact or person-to-person advertising in the development of air routes.

A great future exists for feeding the people of the world because of the unique charac-

teristics of the products of the Pacific Basin. It depends on cooperative planning.

The "Extended Assembly Line" possibilities are already defying people's dreams of a few years go.

In conclusion, my commendation again to Governor Burns, to Dr. Matsuda, for calling us together in Hawaii—a most logical place to discuss the air cargo movement of the Pacific Basin.

May you and I and the people who succeed us make no small plans in developing the coming "Common Market"—our collective concern—the future air cargo traffic of the Pacific Basin nations.

A NOMINEE FOR SAVIOR

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, there appeared an article in the Des Moines Register entitled "A Nominee for Savior" regarding my good friend, H. R. Gross. I regard Mr. Gross as certainly one of the most valuable Members of this House. A multitude of others would agree with me, including Mr. Don Kaul of the Des Moines Register. He agrees with me to the extent that he has nominated Mr. Gross to run for President in 1976. Unfortunately, Mr. Gross tells me that he is not available. But I would hope that he will still be available to continue his long service as the conscience of this body.

It is in this vein that I recommend to the attention of my colleagues an article by Don Kaul entitled "A Nominee for Savior":

A NOMINEE FOR SAVIOR

There's nothing wrong with this country's political system that a good savior couldn't cure.

But, things are bad. You can't tell the difference between the President's original cabinet and the FBI's Ten Most Wanted list. The CIA is considering uniforms that feature caps with bells on them and Frank Sinatra has stopped going to the White House for fear of ruining his reputation.

But all that's needed to restore public confidence in the institution of the presidency is a new face in the White House, one that inspires trust.

Just look at the record. The last time the public's confidence in government was at a similarly low ebb was during the administration of Warren G. Harding. It was an administration wracked by a series of scandals that shook the very roots of public faith.

Yet that faith was restored because we had a man standing in the wings who could command the confidence of the American people in its time of doubt. That man was Calvin Coolidge.

Cool Cal was perfect for the role. He was a tight-faced New Englander who, by word and deed, projected honesty and integrity.

He not only wouldn't say something that wasn't true, he wouldn't say anything. And he possessed to a remarkable degree that single trait that inspires the confidence of the American people in their leaders—a total lack of imagination.

That's what we need now—a new Calvin Coolidge.

There has been a certain amount of speculation as to the possible presidential candidate in 1976, but none of them fit the Coolidge image.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Spiro Agnew is too widely associated with the Nixon administration. John Connally is much like Lyndon Johnson. Charles Percy too has a sissy name. On the Democratic side, only Ted Kennedy stands out, and not for reasons of probity.

No, what's wanted is a new face, one that America can depend on.

It so happens there is such a man, a mature man who has been in politics for decades without once feeling the cool shadow of scandal.

He is recognized by friends and enemies alike as completely honest and, importantly, he looks it. (As a matter of fact, by comparison, he makes Calvin Coolidge look like Dorian Gray.)

Furthermore, he is an Iowan.

Yes, folks, the man I'm talking about is none other than our own H. R. Gross.

Think about it. If we put H. R. Gross in the White House, do you think we'd be beleaguered with Watergates, Vescos, Bobby Bakers and oil-land giveaways.

Not on your life.

Would we have every two-bit government flunkie riding around in a chauffeured limousine, a runaway defense budget, three White Houses and expensive presidential trips all over the world?

No way.

The first thing Mr. Gross would do would be to install a pay phone in the White House. The second thing he'd do is dig up the Rose Garden and plant a cash crop. The third thing he would do is trade in the presidential Lincoln for a used Ford or Chevy. He probably wouldn't do anything else, but so what?

The people could begin to believe in their President once again.

H. R. Gross for President. Remember, you read it here first.

nities on a more equitable basis, and lodged responsibility for carrying out the program in the chief elected officials of local communities. The House Banking Committee proposal is described in House Report 92-1429, on pages 54-64. The Senate and House proposals were fundamentally similar. They were adopted after extensive hearings and studies and, in the House, after open executive sessions during which administration officials had ample opportunity to offer modifications or raise objections to various provisions. I believe it fair to say that the community development block grant proposal as passed by the Senate and approved by the House Banking Committee was one of the least controversial parts of an otherwise highly controversial omnibus housing bill.

In view of this background, the administration's proposed "Better Communities Act" is a serious disappointment. In all significant respects, the administration has turned the clock back to the spring of 1971 when it introduced its earlier special revenue-sharing proposal, a proposal that was overwhelmingly rejected by the Congress.

All of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—want to act expeditiously on community development legislation so that the cities can continue and expand their rebuilding and preservation efforts. Yet it appears that the administration is unwilling to make any significant compromise or accommodation with the views of the Congress as expressed during the past 2 years.

Both the House and Senate bills called for grant allocation provisions which would have distributed funds equitably through a population and need formula, while at the same time protecting—through a "hold harmless" provision—against sharp cutbacks in ongoing community development activities in scores of cities throughout the country; the "Better Communities Act" virtually abandons a meaningful "hold harmless" concept by forcing many cities with high levels of community development activity to cut back over a 5-year period to significantly lower program levels;

Both the House and Senate bills contained statements of national objectives—the elimination of slums and blight, the provision of improved housing for lower income families, and the provision of better community facilities and services—toward which cities were required to address their community development efforts; no statement of national objectives is contained in the Better Communities Act, and the administration has made clear it wants no review responsibilities of any kind in connection with applications for grants;

Both the House and Senate bills provided for a strong link between local community development activities and housing efforts; there is virtually no reference to housing in the "Better Communities Act";

Finally, both the House and Senate bills recognized the need to provide for a smooth transition period between the termination of existing programs and the initiation of the block grant program; the "Better Communities Act" ignores

May 17, 1973

this need, and the administration imposes a moratorium on new commitments under the existing community development programs during fiscal year 1974, the transition year.

Virtually all of these basic elements of the House and Senate bills were overwhelmingly agreed to by the Senate as a whole and by the House Banking and Currency Committee. Yet the "Better Communities Act" recognizes none of these elements, which are of such obvious importance to the Congress.

In my view, these fundamental differences between the Congress and the administration on the shape of a new community development program, coupled with the lack of any housing programs to support and supplement such a program, foreclose the possibility of any truly productive hearings on the "Better Communities Act" at the present time. Instead, in order to speed up consideration of community development legislation in a way that clarifies, and hopefully narrows, the issues involved, I plan to ask the administration to provide the subcommittee with a thorough explanation of the major differences between the "Better Communities Act" and the House and Senate community development proposals of 1972, making clear why the administration rejected the Congress's views on these important issues. Hopefully, with this information in hand, we will be able to move forward with a careful analysis and discussion of the issues, narrow our differences, and arrive at a point where productive hearings resulting in a reasonable consensus become possible.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S "BETTER COMMUNITIES ACT"

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the administration recently submitted to the Congress a proposal entitled the "Better Communities Act," which in its principal features is very similar to the "Community Development Special Revenue Sharing" legislation proposed early in the 92d Congress. The administration also has made available a directory of eligible recipients under the act, with estimates of the annual amount of financial assistance each recipient would receive during an initial 5-year period beginning in fiscal year 1975.

I have received numerous inquiries from House Members concerning the possible impact of the legislation on their communities and the prospects for action by the Housing Subcommittee in this area. I would like to take this occasion, as chairman of the subcommittee, to make clear my position on the administration bill and to outline my proposed course of action.

Members will recall that during the 92d Congress the Senate passed and the House nearly passed a community development block grant proposal which would have consolidated several HUD grant programs into a single, flexible block grant, provided funds to commu-

OHIO UNIVERSITY WIND ENSEMBLE

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the opportunity to attend the Kennedy Center to hear a most delightful and enjoyable concert performed by the Ohio University Wind Ensemble from Athens, Ohio.

This was a unique privilege. Unique in respect to both the quality of the performance and to the circumstances surrounding the ensemble's appearance—it being the first time a university group had been permitted the opportunity to perform in the Concert Hall at Kennedy Center.

I would like to briefly touch upon the highlights of this eventful evening and on its participants in that I believe the achievements of this fine group should be shared.

The ensemble's eight piece program was very ably conducted by Dr. Thomas Lee and Mr. Adrian Gnam, faculty members of Ohio University's exceptional School of Music. Mr. Gnam, a widely renowned oboist, also captivated the audience with a beautifully played solo in the world premiere performance of a highly innovative and exciting work by Cincinnati based composer Paul Cooper.

Mr. Cooper, the composer-in-residence of the College-Conservatory of Music, at the University of Cincinnati, was on hand for his composition's maiden performance.

The talented 54 member wind ensemble played exceptionally well and received repeated accolades from all who attended.

The ensemble was made up of the following musicians:

MEMBERS OF ENSEMBLE

Tracey Topping, Dianne Ritz, Andrea Minnelli, Tana Beistel, Bertrude Van Auken, Jeffrey Roquemore, Sue Warne, Diana Funta, Dale Bechtel, Linda Moriarty.

Kathy Lightfoot, Peggy Lester, Catharine Canning, Nancy Anderson, Gregory Gibson, Sheila Coffindaffer, Deborah Campana, Clifford Boye, Joan Ollof, Connie Karns.

Debra Kuhns, Carolyn Rometo, Eric Christianson, Nancy Gilder, Donald Rader, Candace Cotton, Richard Mingus, Eugene Carinci, Marjorie Cohen, Dennis Imhoff.

Keith Applegate, Richard Pond, Jeffrey Myers, Janine Price, Joseph Johnson, James Warrick, Peter Couladis, Steven Calantropio, John Creachbaum, Joseph Chitty.

Peter Stephenson, James Chickrell, Michael Rubin, Hal Walker, Ronald Hensley, Jerry Lawson, Mychael Langford, Martin Osborne, Denis Winter, Daniel Ward, Paul Young, Dan Williams, Rebecca Reynolds, Fred Wyss.

In closing I would like to compliment the Ohio University Alumni Association for their foresight in bringing the ensemble to Washington and to thank them and officials of Ohio University for the excellent arrangements they made in support of this performance.

AMERICA—A TEENAGER'S VIEW

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and said about American teenagers and their supposed "changing values." I have never been convinced that the stereotype teenager which the mass media has projected the past several years was a true picture of American teenagers today.

Recently, I received a letter from a typical American teenager who has never been projected by the press. Miss Deborah Gail Reisinger of 8346 Meadowlark Drive, Indianapolis, Ind., is the author of the letter which I now present for the RECORD:

MAY 1, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am a nineteen year old white female American citizen and proud of it. I'm sure that I speak for many people when I say I'm really disturbed about what is happening in America. I'm also a Christian, but that doesn't give me a monopoly on loving America and fearing for her future freedom.

Do you know that the Communists have planned the overthrow of our country by or before 1975? Why 1975? So that America will not celebrate her two-hundredth birthday in freedom. America is the last stronghold in the struggle to spread Communism throughout the world. Once the Communists have us in their power, the rest will be comparatively easy. Oh, it's not anything sudden. This overthrow has been subtly planned and executed in this country for a long time.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

How are the Communists planning to do this? Why, ten years ago, the drug-, sex-, and revolution-oriented songs that we hear on the radio today, disc jockeys wouldn't have dared to play. Movies which would only have been shown in "blue" or "porno" houses are now leniently rated and even shown on television. No subject is taboo on television anymore. Bigotry and foul language can keep a show on top with ease.

America was founded on Christian principles and ideals—one of which is the freedom of worship. But how much longer will we have this freedom or any of the others? Unless Americans wake up out of their lethargy and begin to fight this creeping evil, America is lost. That's not just a melodramatic statement, either.

Communism has subtly corrupted our youth. How? By rock 'n roll music, to name just one way. Rock 'n roll is banned in Russia because of its harmful influence. Shouldn't that tell us something? But no, the message of drug abuse, revolution, and illicit sex constantly surrounds teenagers. It's just a steady infiltration of revolutionary ideas. And the worst of it is that many of our young people applaud these ideas. These "Americans" show it by evading the draft, living in communes, and the senseless abuse of drugs. Incidentally, the word "commune" is just a derivative from the root-word "Communism".

It's not just the young people, though. What has happened to the patriotism that made America as one against the threat of the Nazis during World War II? We face an even greater threat now, but what is being done? I'll tell you what's being done—anything and everything to counteract the good in America. Bills like the equal rights one which, Thank God, wasn't passed in Indiana are just subterfuges the Communists are using. They look innocent enough on the outside, but when you look beneath the surface you see that they're harmful for America. This equal rights bill demands complete equality between men and women. That means women would be eligible for the draft, and required to work, thus having to leave their children in day schools, where they can be influenced wrongly. So many things seem deceptively innocent on the surface but the Communists can twist these bills to suit their purposes, and certainly not for the good of America.

Remember, I'm speaking of my generation, but I'm ashamed to be counted among the majority of them. Sure, there are many good, proud American teenagers, but I'm afraid that they are a small minority compared to the thousands of young people that can be found listening to a rock concert, or freaked out on drugs, or living in a commune.

It's not too late to fight for America's future.

In conclusion, I ask you, as a concerned American, to vote against any future bills and legislation which would not be beneficial in the best interest for America.

Thank you for your time and may God bless you.

"The youth of today are tomorrow's leaders."

Sincerely,

(MISS) DEBORAH REISINGER.

CONSUMERS AND TAXPAYERS PAY COST OF SOVIET GRAIN "DEAL"

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers, it now turns out,

have been heavily involved in supporting the U.S. grain deal with the Soviet Union. This arrangement, consummated in July of 1972, is substantially subsidized by the Department of Agriculture with U.S. Treasury dollars.

The consumers and taxpayers of our country are paying the cost of this arrangement in many hidden ways. I believe—now that more of the facts have become known—it is important that my colleagues carefully consider the total ramifications of this grain sale to the Soviet Union. The Comptroller General, Elmer B. Staats, and his General Accounting Office, have now had a greater opportunity to review all the aspects of this agreement, and I believe it is imperative that we, too, as individual Members of Congress, become totally aware of what occurred in this consummated arrangement. It is our responsibility to make sure that in future agreements neither consumers nor taxpayers be so heavily called upon to cough up hard-earned money without knowing in advance what is truly involved.

Congressman BEN BLACKBURN, of Georgia, and his staff assistant, Miles M. Costick, have been kind enough to accumulate many of the facts on this Soviet grain deal, and I ask my colleagues to review them:

THE COSTS OF THE SOVIET GRAIN "DEAL"

The huge grain sales to the Soviet Union resulted in a wide variety of costs which can be classified into the following categories:

1. Costs to the Consumers
2. Costs to the Taxpayers
3. Costs to the Economy as a Whole
4. Political Costs to the United States
5. Costs to the Free Economies

COSTS TO THE CONSUMERS

According to the figures supplied by the Comptroller General, Elmer B. Staats, the massive grain sales to the Soviet Union raised domestic prices of wheat from about \$1.63 per bushel in July of 1972, to \$2.49 a bushel in September of the same year. CBS news has computed the total cost to the American consumers for the 9-month period starting July 1972, and according to these figures, the total costs to the consumer for the purchase of bread and other flour-based products as a result of the Soviet wheat deal, will be at least \$300 million, and that is a conservative estimate. As far as beef and pork (and beef and pork-based products) are concerned, the additional costs the American consumers will have to absorb during the same 9-month period is \$1.2 billion in order to eat the amount of meat that he has been consuming. However, the actual increase in food prices imperatively adds an additional 12 percent to the combined figure of \$1.5 billion.

The cost of feed grain plays a large role in determining the price of poultry, eggs, and dairy products. The increase in those prices vary from 12 to 25 percent, and that adds—for the 9-month period—an additional cost to the consumer of about \$800 million.

COSTS TO THE TAXPAYERS

The direct subsidy for the Soviet grain deal, at the expense of the American taxpayers, exceeded \$300 million. The subsidy for the transportation of grain, so far, has amounted to over \$400 million. This figure coincides with figure, estimated by CBS News.

COSTS TO THE ECONOMY AS A WHOLE

These are the most difficult to estimate because they reflect a variety of costs and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

factors which are extremely intricate in nature. Some of them, such as market distortions, transportation tie-ups, and loss of good will with established customers for agricultural products (for instance, Japan) are almost impossible to measure.

The grain deal has been financed with a credit of \$750 million by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) at 6 1/8% interest, repayable in three years. The interest rate is lower than what it cost the U.S. Treasury to borrow in the market place. By contrast, the Treasury is paying 6 1/2% and 6 5/8% on recent market borrowings.

The freight rates on the railroads increased by about 10% and, in addition, the economy experienced the most acute railroad car shortage in the history of the American railroads. This shortage in the Midwest resulted in the shortage of some rail carried products, such as fuel oil. The overburdening of the transportation system with transportation of grain for the Soviet Union, resulted in delayed deliveries of numerous industrial products from steel and machinery to various component parts for a variety of industrial commodities.

Another cost to the economy resulting from the Soviet grain deal is the increased price of agricultural machinery. The increase has been reported to be about 10 percent.

National and independent bakers are complaining because wheat shipments to the Soviet Union have resulted in a price surge at home. The price surge at home resulted in the increase of the price of flour the bakers buy. This resulted in a large number of bankruptcies among the independent bakers which, so far, have cost ten thousand people their jobs. For example, the added annual cost of one particular enterprise—American bakeries—is estimated at \$9.2 million over the 12-month period starting August 1972.

For the farmers, the cost of the Soviet grain "deal" was at least \$120 million by September 1972—both because they sold wheat too early (spring of 1972 which is usual) to benefit from higher prices and, more importantly, because the higher prices cut the subsidy available to many Southwestern farmers.

If we sum up the cost of the Soviet grain deal to the American public, then we reach a sum which for the 9-month period exceeds \$3.2 billion.

POLITICAL COSTS TO THE UNITED STATES

The lack of any political trade-offs in regard to the Soviet Union could be clearly defined as a political cost.

The fight against inflation failed primarily because of increases in food prices which are directly associated with the Soviet grain deal. While the increase in the Consumer Price Index was at the annual rate of about 5%, the increase in food averaged (for the same period) some 25%. This is a clear indication that the fight against inflation might have been completely successful had it not been for the Soviet grain deal. The increase in food prices is primarily responsible for the present inflation hysteria around the Congress and the country as a whole. The consequences of it for the welfare of the United States and its economy are not difficult to foresee: Distorted markets; large economy fluctuations; and all this due to irrational behavior on both the supply and demand side.

COSTS TO THE FREE ECONOMIES

The costs to the free economies primarily take the form of distortion effects on the market forces, both within the financial market and markets for agricultural products. In financial markets, the market interest rate is suppressed by Soviet absolute demand monopoly and ability to use political power for the purpose of coercion. In agricultural markets, strongly fluctuating and

sudden exaggerated demands for the grain stuff, and playing competitors on the supply side against each other, resulted in tremendous distortions on prices and supply. And both elements, distortions in financial and agricultural markets, are responsible for highly negative influence on the World economy.

LEGAL SERVICES MUST BE PRESERVED AND IMPROVED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Community Action for Legal Services—CALS—the umbrella agency for OEO Legal Services in New York City, has just passed a resolution calling for increased legal services funding, a truly independent and national legal services corporation, and the continuance of the very valuable backup centers in the OEO legal services program. The resolution also asks that there be no restrictions imposed on the representation offered by legal services lawyers to their clients and commends the CALS attorneys throughout New York City "for their maintenance of high standards in the practice of law on behalf of their clients" and urges them "to continue those efforts in these troubled times."

I wish to include the full text of the Board's resolution in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks and also to add my own approbation for the top quality representation and advocacy which these fine lawyers provide for their clients. The guiding principle here should and must be that an indigent client of a legal services attorney is entitled to representation as good as that which a wealthy client of a private attorney receives; such a principle has no room for inadequate funding and support for that attorney or artificial and punitive constraints on his representation.

The text of the resolution follows:

MAY 8, 1973.

RESOLUTION

POINT ONE

Whereas, Community Action for Legal Services, Inc., with its ten delegate corporations, twenty-one offices, 188 attorneys and \$5,156,896 annual budget from OEO Office of Legal Services is the largest operating legal services program in the nation; and

Whereas, in calendar year 1972 the CALS program represented 47,313 separate new clients, giving help in such areas of law as landlord-tenant, family, divorce, consumer, welfare, unemployment, health, education, day care and civil rights; and

Whereas, the need for attorneys in the poverty communities of New York City far exceeds the present capacity of even this large a program, with over 3,000,000 people eligible for legal services by reason of their low income; and

POINT TWO

Whereas, various persons with influence within the administration of the current legal services program have acted in ways that has threatened the future of the program and have indicated misgivings about the roles being played by legal services attorneys and have acted in ways that brought confusion and uncertainty to the current employees of legal services programs; and

Whereas, questions have been raised concerning the future of the specialized legal services "back-up" centers that provide training litigative assistance and other forms of program support for the attorneys working throughout the country to represent the poor; and

Whereas, the future of the Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyers Fellowship Program, funded by the Office of Legal Services, has also been put in question; and

Whereas, the OEO Office of Legal Services has announced that its regional offices, including one in New York City, will be closed on or before April 28, 1973; and

Whereas, some consideration is apparently being given to the use of limited purpose revenue sharing as a funding method for legal services, rather than funding the program on a national level through a single, independent National Legal Services Corporation; and

POINT THREE

Whereas, the Board of Directors of Community Action for Legal Services, Inc., (CALS), is composed of members drawn from every bar association in the City of New York, including the minority bar associations, from the law schools, from the public sector and from the poverty communities throughout the city; and

Whereas, the Board of Directors of CALS has for the last six years overseen and observed the work of its attorneys on behalf of poor people during the past four years and studied the many suggestions made during these years for altering the legal services programs; and

POINT FOUR

Whereas, it is the experience of the CALS Board of Directors:

1. That far too little money has been made available, either to CALS or to legal services nationally to meet the need for legal services to low income people; and

2. That the "back-up" centers provide critically needed assistance to CALS attorneys representing the poor in New York City; and

3. That the Fellowship Program has been by far the most effective agent for recruiting, training and providing local programs throughout the country with minority lawyers of high skill; and

4. That the regional office of the OEO Office of Legal Services has been of substantial and continuing value to CALS, and that its closing before a new legal services program is created will cause discontinuity in the representation of the poor and in the efficient management of legal services programs across the country; and

POINT FIVE

Whereas, a limited purpose revenue sharing approach to the provision of legal services throughout the nation would fragment the legal services programs, make it highly susceptible to local and state political manipulation and pressure and endanger the very concept of legal services for the poor "without fear or favor" in some sections of the country; and

Whereas, the Presidents of the American Association, the New York State Bar Association and the Association of the Bar of the City of New York have all spoken before a sub-committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress within the past sixty days, and have all expressed their strong support for the concept of an independent National Legal Services Corporation, operating without political influence and without restrictions on the representation available to the poor; and

Therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Directors of Community Action for Legal Services, Inc., that:

1. Substantially increased funding for legal services programs throughout the country should be provided by Congress;

May 17, 1973

2. A National Legal Services Corporation, free of all political control, should be established to directly administer a program of providing legal services to the poor;

3. No revenue sharing approach to legal services should be adopted;

4. The "back-up" centers and the Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellowship Program should be maintained in their current form;

5. The regional office of legal services should not be closed or cut back during this period of reorganization;

6. All poor people in New York City, and throughout the country, are entitled to the full services of attorneys, without restrictions on the types of clients represented and the legal remedies employed by such attorneys in behalf of their clients. There should be no limit to the use of federal or appellate courts, class actions, or legislative and administrative forums, or to restrict the representation of groups;

7. CALS attorneys throughout this city are to be commended for their efforts and for their maintenance of high standards in the practice of law on behalf of their clients and are urged to continue those efforts in these troubled times.

ISRAEL'S 25TH FOUNDING ANNIVERSARY OBSERVED IN SPRINGFIELD, MASS., WITH MEMORABLE PARADE AND CELEBRATION; SPECIAL "SALUTE TO ISRAEL" SECTION PUBLISHED BY SPRINGFIELD SUNDAY REPUBLICAN EDITOR JOSEPH W. MOONEY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 25th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel was marked by a gala parade and celebration in my home city of Springfield, Mass., last Sunday. I had the honor of participating in this memorable Israel Independence Day event.

The Springfield Sunday Republican joined the community, the only city under 1 million population in this country to have a parade, by publishing a special Salute to Israel section. Editor Joseph W. Mooney wrote of his exclusive interview with David Ben Gurion, former Premier of Israel, in the Ben Gurion home in Tel Aviv in November 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks the Springfield Republican's "Israel's 25th Anniversary" editorial, Editor Mooney's interview with David Ben Gurion, the Sunday Republican article "25 Years: A Sequence of Wonders," by Joel A. Leavitt, president, Springfield Jewish Federation; the Springfield Republican interviews with Rabbi Stanley M. Davids of Springfield's Sinai Temple and Rabbi Jordan S. Ofseyer of Beth El Temple entitled "A 'Second Chance'—A 'Dream Realized'"; and the Springfield Union's Monday morning newscast on the parade and celebration headlined "Israel Gets Ecumenical Birthday Salute," by Lenore Magida.

ISRAEL'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Israel is celebrating its 25th anniversary, a milestone in one of the most remarkable human achievements in modern history.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

When David Ben-Gurion, first premier, proclaimed its independence May 14, 1948, the new nation had only 650,000 people, mostly survivors of Nazi concentration camps.

In an interview with the editor of The Republican and The Union, Ben-Gurion recently said Israel now needs three things: another 6 million Jews, a single language (Hebrew), and "peace with our neighbors."

The new country was attacked the next day, May 15, by the armies of surrounding Arab states, determined that no Jewish state should exist in Palestine.

Israel's heroic struggle for survival is a classic of military valor. Twice more, after that, the new state had to engage in all-out battle to preserve its integrity, in 1956 and 1967. Relatively minor frontier clashes have occurred all during the quarter century.

In spite of enormous obstacles, Israel has grown to 3 million people, about half of them immigrants. It is strong militarily and economically, and is the most solidly democratic nation of the Middle East. Despite its continuing risk of conflict with Arab states, Israel is highly popular with tourists, having deep religious significance for both Jews and Christians.

It is one of the ironies of history that Israel's foundation was indirectly assisted by Adolf Hitler, whose murder of millions of Jews shocked the conscience of the world. This resulted in overwhelming support for re-establishment, in their ancestral land, of a new home.

Israel's outstanding success is due primarily to the courage and sacrifices of its own citizens, substantially aided by the generosity of people in many lands, especially the U.S.

Shalom, touvim—peace, to the good life.

AN ISRAELI-ARAB PEACE FORESEEN BY BEN GURION

(By Joseph W. Mooney)

Israel's past is history.

But what about her future?

In an exclusive interview with David Ben Gurion, former premier of Israel, in November, 1971, in his home in Tel Aviv, I got the answer while touring Israel on a mission sponsored by the United Jewish Appeal. It's as timely today as it was then.

Ben Gurion was asked how he saw the state of Israel in another 50 years and did he think there would be peace by then.

SEEK THREE THINGS

Content to cut back his assessment from 50 to 25 years, BG (his diplomatic nickname) said he would like to "see three things, because without them there would be no Jewish state."

In his modest Tel Aviv living room his formula for Israel's success was a tall order. Most countries fighting for their independence had failed to accomplish what Ben Gurion was setting his sights on.

"One is—we need another six million Jews.

"I don't believe that every Jew will come to Israel. I would like it, but it depends on him. He is entitled to what he likes." The 1971 estimated population of Israel was 3 million. Adding another six million to the New Jersey-sized country would place it ahead of the Jewish population in the United States today.

LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT

One other requirement Ben Gurion insisted on was that all Israelis speak Hebrew. He cited that the way of life of India's millions . . . is no different now than before independence from Great Britain.

"They speak the same languages, as they spoke before. Their way of life is just the same. The same thing applies to all the other states which became independent. It is not the same thing as this Jewish state. You can't compare it. They (Jews) did not talk

the same language because Jews have spoken lots of languages, depending on the country in which they were living."

Ben Gurion's point was to make Israel's aware that Hebrew, not Yiddish, was their language.

" . . . I was told by Jews in Israel that it (Hebrew) is a dead language. I know this was nonsense. Now there are more than 2½ million Jews in Israel, and all of them speak Hebrew—the children, the grandchildren, great-grandchildren—it is their language."

The second thing BG insisted on was that the desert be settled. In that way everyone would have enough room in which to live as well as developing the desert.

"The area we had before the Six-Day War—80 per cent of that area was a desert. If you go from Tel Aviv to Haifa and look at both sides of the road when you are travelling, you will see there is desert. So 80 per cent of the country was a desert. And not settled . . . I remember when the state was proclaimed, there were many Jews who said—a desert is always a desert. Now nobody will say that. We have built many villages and even towns in the desert and we are building more and more. Still, the greatest part of the country remains a desert."

And the third thing Ben Gurion said was vital to the continued life of Israel "is peace with our neighbors."

"When the state was proclaimed, it declared an appeal to all the Arab states on all sides of Israel. We want to work with you. We must build our country and develop it and we will help you to develop your country. And to live in peace.

"Before the state was proclaimed, when the United Nations accepted the resolution to have a Jewish state, to divide Israel—half a Jewish state, half an Arab state, they declared—no, there will be no Jewish state."

According to Ben Gurion, there were only 650,000 Jews living there then. He said the Arab nations said their armies numbering 30 million "will be here" the day Israel became a state "and they were here."

AIDED BY RUSSIA

The only country to help Israel after it obtained statehood, Ben Gurion said, was Russia.

"At first, people thought that the Jews would be destroyed. But then the United Nations decided that there should be a rest for one month after the first month . . . this was our great help, because then the youth organized and when we proclaimed the State, we called in the youth of a certain age to become soldiers—not to fight, because the UN decided that for 30 days there should be no fighting—but they should learn to fight, which they did.

"It helped us a great deal and also the government which helped us then—now in our time it's unbelievable—the only state which helped us then was Russia. Russia decided to provide us with all the necessary arms to fight. Not that she gave it herself, but she told Czechoslovakia that they should sell the Jews all the equipment necessary and they stood behind us until the war was over.

"They were the only government in the world that stood with us. America had imposed an embargo."

EGYPT'S POSITION

On other subjects Ben Gurion said that he doubts Premier Anwar Sadat will make peace even though he feels there are reasons and forces in Egypt which need peace badly. He felt that out of the then 120,000 university graduates, either in Egypt or in other countries, there are not at least 30,000 to 40,000 who know the position of the Arab peasants who want to improve the poor, population and health conditions of their own people.

The white haired BG said that before Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser died he had changed his mind about wanting to destroy

Israel. Instead, Ben Gurion said, Nasser wanted to rebuild Egypt.

"Throughout all the years he (Nasser) had one idea. He wanted to maintain the ideal for all the Arab countries to destroy Israel. But in his last year he came to the conclusion he had made a mistake. What his people needed was not to destroy Israel. They needed better conditions of life. Better education. But he died."

Ben Gurion said he heard this from an American journalist who came to Israel to tell him Nasser's change of heart.

"There are many in Egypt who know what the position of Egypt is—the economic position. And therefore I believe that while this year there will be no peace, I cannot imagine that within the next 10 years—nobody can tell when something exactly is going to happen in history—but when I say 20 years it may be eight or 12—then there will be peace."

Nasser's "mistake" coupled with Ben Gurion's optimism may just result in peace in the Middle East in the second 25 years of Israel's existence.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS: A SEQUENCE OF WONDERS

(By Joel A. Leavitt)

The first 25 years of Israel's independence have witnessed a sequence of wonders.

After the most excruciating afflictions suffered by our people in their tragic exile, they have returned—brands plucked from the flames of the extermination camps of Europe, brothers grieving in Arab lands, others dismayed by fear of spiritual extinction in affluent countries.

They have returned thirsting for redemption, determined to take part in the herculean effort to build a free Jewish society in the historic homeland after 2000 years of wandering. Our people have ceased to be stateless; Israel has become its heart and anchor of salvation.

What has Israel accomplished during these 25 years?

She has defended her independence and has assured the survival of her people.

She has made a home for Jews from all corners of the earth whether in need of refuge or in search of an independent Jewish identity.

She has developed a most humane society, preserving ancient Jewish values while responding to the needs of a modern democratic society composed of Jews and Arabs living together in productive harmony.

She has developed her material resources and raised her people's quality of life.

She has guaranteed freedom of access to the religious shrines of all faiths.

Modern Israel is a nation reborn, living proof of the continuation of a history that began with Abraham and developed through periods of slavery and redemption and two millennia of exile. Israel is the regathering of the remnants of a nation persecuted and tormented; it is the reshaping of a people into a cohesive, unified organism; it is the reaffirmation of the indestructible qualities of the human spirit—an example to all mankind.

But during these festive days of Israel's 25th Anniversary we recall our kin, prisoners of hope in the Soviet Union and other lands. May this year see their freedom and their redemption as we remember the words of the prophet Amos:

"I will restore the fortunes of my people Israel, And they shall rebuild the ruined cities and inhabit them;

They shall plant vineyards and drink their wine, And they shall make gardens and eat their fruit.

I will plant them upon their land; And they shall never again be plucked up Out of the land which I have given them."

A "SECOND CHANCE"—A "DREAM REALIZED"

The state of Israel represents the granting of a "second chance" to the Jewish people, according to one Springfield rabbi.

Rabbi Stanley M. Davids of Springfield's Sinai Temple said Israel gives Jews a "second chance to deal with the world in fully normal terms. Israel is a challenge to the Jewish people not to be a wandering, homeless people and, above all, not to be a dependent people."

"The relevancy of Judaism can only be tested in the crucible of the real world, and Israel is a real test," Rabbi Davids said.

"Israel stands as a real testing ground for the entire message of Jewish civilization," Rabbi Davids said.

Rabbi Davids said one of the "crucial problems facing the Jewish community is to balance the demands of the Jewish communities all over the world and helping Israel survive."

"A problem too often overlooked by Jewish leaders is the growth and survival of local communities in the United States. We need to be more responsive than in the past to Jewish education and Jewish life in this country," Rabbi Davids said.

Rabbi Jordan S. Ofseyer of Springfield's Beth El Temple said that the state of Israel represents the "realization of the hopes and dreams and prayers of Jews for more than 2000 years."

"It is a very humbling realization that it was granted to our generation—after more than 100 generations of dispersion—to witness the founding of Israel," Rabbi Ofseyer said.

Rabbi Ofseyer said Israel presents a "special challenge to the Jewish people to see that it succeeds in every sense, spiritually and materially, and that it continues to fulfill its potential in calling for moral responsibility and in technological growth."

Rabbi Ofseyer said there is a "mutually fructifying relationship" between Israel and the world Jewish community, a "spiritual fellowship and kinship that Jews feel towards each other."

"The establishment of Israel has given a new sense of purpose and a sense of pride to Jews of the world. It has become a focus for Jewish interest and concern and haven to Jews who are forced to flee their countries," Rabbi Ofseyer said.

ISRAEL GETS ECUMENICAL BIRTHDAY SALUTE

(By Lenore Magida)

Israel is a young state with old dreams, and its 25th anniversary commemoration in Springfield Sunday was created and celebrated by both the young and the old.

Israel is a country of many peoples, and the local parade in its honor Sunday included a Scottish and an Oriental band, several church corps and a black marching group, as well as many contingents from the Western Massachusetts Jewish community.

Israel is a land of stamina and pride, and Springfield parade participants finished the 2.2-mile route with wide smiles and waving arms and then went into the Jewish Community Center for an afternoon of other activities.

And most of all, Israel is now "young and alive at 25"—her independence declared May 14, 1948—and that was plenty of reason for upwards of 5,000 Western Massachusetts residents to celebrate Sunday.

SACRED AND JOYOUS

For to her supporters, Israel is a nation which could easily adopt the slogan on the B'nai B'rith float in Sunday's parade: "A

Tradition With a Future." And to those who love "Eretz Yisrael"—the land of Israel—both the tradition and the future are sacred and joyous.

So they packed the sidewalks of Sumner Avenue from Forest Park to the "X" as the Springfield Jewish Federation-sponsored parade began, and they waited by the hundreds for the lively procession to wind its way down Dickinson Street to the JCC.

The reviewing stand outside the center was filled with Western Massachusetts government officials, who took the reviewing position after marching the parade route, and with local Christian dignitaries who joined the celebration after Sunday morning church services.

DISTINGUISHED MARCHERS

Officials who marched along with local Jewish leaders were Springfield Mayor William Sullivan; U.S. District Court Judge and former Springfield Mayor Frank H. Freedman; U.S. Reps. Edward P. Boland, D-Springfield, and Silvio O. Conte, R-Pittsfield; state Sen. Alan D. Sisitsky, D-Springfield, and state Reps. Iris K. Holland, R-Springfield, Theodore J. Trudeau, D-Springfield; James J. Bowler, D-Springfield; Anthony M. Scibelli, D-Springfield, and Peter H. Lappin, D-Springfield.

Waiting for them and the rest of the marchers on the reviewing stand were the Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield; Msgr. David P. Welch, editor of the Catholic Observer; the Rev. Joseph J. O'Neil, assistant editor of the Catholic Observer, and the Rev. Ronald G. Whitney, associate executive director of the Council of Churches of Greater Springfield.

ONE OF A KIND

What they and the other spectators saw and heard was, according to Salute to Israel Week Chairman Herbert Levi "the only parade in a community of under a million people in this country."

And it was a distinctive parade. Instead of the usual preponderance of veterans groups this procession had unit after unit of even younger than Israel kids, although the Jewish War Veterans and the elderly persons of the Jewish community also were represented.

"Hava Nagilah," "Fiddler on the Roof" and other Jewish-oriented tunes replaced parade songs in praise of America. And the floats showed kibbutzim, the Wailing Wall and other Israeli scenes instead of Betsy Ross and beauty queens.

The afternoon celebration in the JCC also had a special flavor, part of which was the featured food treat, falafel, a sandwich-type snack filled with a fried chick pea mixture and salad vegetables.

SPORTING EVENTS

Anniversary-goers were kept busy with a book sale and several Israeli movies and elementary school children had a chance to try their skill at swimming, running, soccer, foul shooting, broad jumping and an obstacle course in special "Maccabiah Games."

The big day of tribute came to a close with the awarding of Jewish pendants to the top performers in the games and the presentation of plaques for the best floats. Kodimoh Synagog of Springfield and Sons of Zion Synagog of Holyoke tied for first place in the float competition.

Sunday's hoopla does not mark the end of local commemoration of Israel's first quarter-century of life. Levi said a special Springfield library exhibit will continue through the week and that today, the actual anniversary of the declaration of Israeli independence, flags will fly in downtown Springfield and the Kodimoh Young Peoples' choir and band will perform at Baystate West.

**NEW ELECTION REFORM: CLOSING
THE GATE, AFTER THE WATER
HAS LEAKED**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the latest affront to the American electorate is the announcement from the White House that the President recommends creation of a nonpartisan commission on Federal election reform. In fact, he even accompanied his message with a copy of a proposed bill that he would have Congress rubberstamp into law.

In his message to the Congress, the President said:

Many separate proposals for such reform are now pending before the Congress in light of recent disclosures of widespread abuses during the Presidential campaign of 1972, . . .

Overlooked for some reason in the statement is any acknowledgement that the Congress had already enacted in April of 1972, the Federal Election Campaign Act. Nor does the President mention that many of the "widespread abuses" complained of, came about, because the passage of such legislation caused desperate efforts by some to avoid disclosures after the act became effective.

Now the President, reacting to emotional front page publicity of "widespread abuses during the Presidential campaign of 1972" and without giving the existing law enacted by Congress a chance to work, seeks to use the taxpayers' money to create another study group which would cause more election interference, redtape, and control over the masses of elected officials not involved in any of these "widespread abuses."

The new blue ribbon commission would be authorized to, among other things:

First, consider the advisability of changing the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives, or the Senate, or the President of the United States, and

Second, make recommendations for such legislation, constitutional amendment or other reforms as its findings indicate, and in its judgment are desirable to revise and control the practices and procedures of political parties, organizations, and individuals participating in the Federal electoral process.

Certainly the laws of the United States already cover every suggestion made by the President. The American people or their representatives already have the power to change any of the laws should they so desire, with or without the establishment of a new election overseer.

All the laws in the world do nothing, but offer false security if the laws are not followed or enforced.

The American people should by now be aware that we cannot legislate morality, let alone honesty. It seems to be another

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

instance of the pot calling the kettle black. Perhaps a more accurate comparison would be closing the gate, after the water has leaked.

I include in the RECORD the following related newsclipping:

SENATE PANEL VOTES BILL TO CREATE AN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

(By Morton Mintz)

The Senate Commerce Committee yesterday approved a bill to create an independent elections commission empowered to investigate and prosecute violations.

In addition to stripping the Justice Department of enforcement authority, the bill would also:

Put a ceiling of 25 cents a voter on expenditures by presidential and Senate and House candidates;

Make it easier for Democratic and Republican presidential and vice presidential candidates to get free television time.

Require all contributions and expenditures in presidential contests to be accounted for by the national committee of each candidate's party rather than ad hoc groups.

The bill, approved without objection in an executive session, now goes to the Senate Rules Committee, which must hold hearings and act on the measure within 45 days.

And President Nixon, in a related development, sent to Capitol Hill his recommendation for creation of a nonpartisan study commission on election reform.

Yesterday, the full Commerce Committee adopted an amendment in which in sparsely populated states a candidate for the Senate or for Congressman-at-large could spend a minimum of \$175,000. A House candidate running in a congressional district could spend at least \$90,000.

Mr. Nixon's proposal for a study commission led Democratic National Chairman Robert S. Strauss to express concern that it may be "another delaying tactic and whitewash effort." John W. Gardner, chairman of Common Cause, said the commission "can only serve to stifle action."

The President vetoed one reform measure in 1970. Before the present law took effect his fund-raisers collected \$15 million to \$20 million with an assurance to contributors that they would avoid disclosure.

Mr. Nixon said in a radio broadcast yesterday with the message that the proposed study group would have a mandate "as broad as the federal election process itself," including possible public funding of campaigns and the relation of tax laws to contributions.

With quick congressional approval, the study commission could provide the basis for reforms "in time for the 1974 congressional election," the President said.

MEDICAL CUTS ENDANGER CANCER AND HEART DISEASE EFFORTS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, as part of its campaign to reduce federal funding of health programs, the administration has proposed the phaseout of the National Institutes of Health research training grants. No new commitments are to be accepted for research training grants, and only those grants approved before January 29, 1973, with continuing com-

ments will be funded during the 1974 fiscal year.

It has been argued in defense of this proposal that private money will be able to make up the difference caused by the sudden loss of Federal funds. Yet, every indication that I have received suggests that there is insufficient private money to fill the gap, and that the only results of the termination of the NIH training grant program will be fewer researchers, fewer medical educators, and far fewer opportunities for men and women who want a career in medical research. To my mind, at least, these are not desirable goals.

At the hearings on the proposed medical cuts that I held on May 5, 1973, in Newton, Mass., I received a statement from Dr. Thomas J. Ryan, professor of medicine at Boston University Medical School, head of the section of cardiology, and chairman of the Research Allocations Committee of the Massachusetts Heart Association.

Dr. Ryan spoke directly to the question of the degree to which private institutions like the Massachusetts Heart Association would be unable to satisfy the financial needs accompanying advanced medical research and research training. The lesson of his testimony is, I believe, that while there is a need to prevent abuses of the training grant program, such abuses as may have occurred are not adequate justification for the complete termination of the research grant program. The changes necessary should be made not with a bludgeon, but with a scalpel. It is also notably ironic that Dr. Ryan's comments suggest hard times ahead for research on heart disease—supposedly along with cancer are two diseases upon which the administration wants to focus both attention and money.

Testimony of two other physicians dealt with the current "public enemy No. 1" disease, cancer. Dr. Leo Stohlbach is the chief of medicine at the Pondville Hospital in Walpole, Mass. He is also an assistant professor of medicine at Tufts University School of Medicine. He was accompanied by Dr. William Fishman, director of the cancer research center at Tufts.

These two doctors pointed out that for all the noise about the conquest of cancer, the truth is somewhat less imposing. The President has consistently failed to release the entire sum of money appropriated by Congress for cancer research. In addition, other reductions in health and medical programs will have telling effects upon the conquest of cancer efforts, particularly in the forms of personnel shortages, elimination of the regional medical program, and the proposed change in grant application policy which would substitute solicited contracts for grants.

Heart disease and cancer are among the greatest challenges facing mankind. I hope that my colleagues will take the time to read the testimony of these three doctors who are actively engaged in research into heart disease and cancer.

TESTIMONY OF DR. THOMAS J. RYAN

I commend you, sir, for your efforts to date in the Legislature to reinstate those funds cut from the fiscal 1974 budget that the Congress, in past years, has allocated for the support of postgraduate medical training and research. I attend this meeting as one of your many constituents from the medical community who is deeply concerned about the impact of these budgetary cuts that clear reason indicates strike at the very foundation of our medical system.

As a graduate of an NIH training grant a dozen years ago and, presently, as the director of a Federal training grant in cardiology at our institution, I, albeit in the very good company of many of the previous speakers, could be cast in the role of an individual with vested interest. It is most important that we step clear of this charge. We are well aware of the cogent points raised against the Federal subsidization of postgraduate clinical training and the possibility that such a specialty trained physician may one day become a "fat cat." There are many ways of dealing with that particular inequity, however, without precipitously shutting down the whole system. The whole system includes the teacher of the trainee. His greatest requirement is time protected for teaching. Who pays for protected time? The whole system includes the trainee whose mind is fertilized by the experience and from whence new ideas sprout up. This will lead to fruitful investigation only if the individual is provided protected time. You cannot harvest productive research without protected time. And who pays for protected time?

I can tell you from my experience with the Massachusetts Heart Association that it cannot come, in any substantial manner, from the private sector. Heart fund monies available for research and training in this state totaled \$255,028 this past year. The Research Allocations Committee received grant requests totaling \$898,911. It should be pointed out that the Massachusetts Heart Association has traditionally limited its total budgetary support to any one project or any one trainee to \$10,000 per annum, in the belief that it was important to support the initial investigative efforts. With this vital seed money the investigator was then able to develop the project to the point where it could compete more successfully at the Federal level and receive realistic budgetary support. Time and again this has proven to be the successful formula for productive research. At the fountainhead stands the extramural grant award program of the NIH. Here exists the ultimate of peer review. It has no counterpart in any other branch of the Federal government or in the private business sector. It remains the core of all other funding programs. If this central role of NIH is diminished by inadequate budgetary support, it will adversely effect those research programs funded by voluntary non-profit organizations such as the Heart Association, the Cancer Society, the National Foundation, etc. The research supported by these agencies has been meaningful and productive. To lead it down a blind alley with no hope for meaningful Federal support for those projects and researchers whose work has been demonstrated to be worthwhile by virtue of their seed money is true folly.

Few, if any, will contend the pre-eminence of American medicine in the world today. The influx of foreign physicians for training in this country is well known to us all. In terms of the World Market, one of the priceless American commodities still remains an American medical education. This says something for the present system.

It is my firm conviction that the research and educational programs funded by the federal government through NIH stand as the fountainhead of our current medical

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

system and to alter its financial support abruptly would result in total collapse of the world's leading medical system.

TESTIMONY OF DR. LEO L. STOLBACH AND DR. WILLIAM FISHMAN

As Chief of Medicine at Pondville Hospital, the State cancer hospital in Walpole, Massachusetts, I am responsible for the care of patients with cancer and participate in the clinical research necessary to improve methods of treatment. Pondville participates in the activities of the Tufts Cancer Research Center and I am also speaking as a representative of the Tufts Clinical Cancer Unit which is involved in patient care, research and physician education at Pondville, the Lemuel Shattuck and New England Medical Center Hospitals.

There has been much publicity in the past year regarding a major commitment by the federal government in the area of cancer research and cancer care. However, despite the President's "Conquest of Cancer" pronouncements, our cancer program at Tufts (like those at many other medical schools throughout the nation) has been faced with major cutbacks which limit research, patient care and medical education. The HEW bill for 1973 still has not been signed by the President. Because of this many grants have been approved without funding in the cancer field, just as in all other areas of medical research. It should also be emphasized that during the past few years the President has consistently released considerably less money for cancer research than has been appropriated by Congress.

Dr. William Fishman, Director of the Tufts Cancer Research Center, will discuss the effects of the federal cutbacks on basic research in the cancer field at Tufts University. I would like to stress the effects of such cuts as they relate to the care of patients with cancer at the Tufts affiliated hospitals. In my opinion, these three areas of clinical concern deserve top priority:

1. SHORTAGE OF PERSONNEL

The Tufts Cancer Unit involves the cooperative efforts of physicians at the New England Medical Center, the Lemuel Shattuck, and Pondville Hospitals. These physicians have been participating for the past eight years, through NIH support, in a program to train physicians in cancer work. This program will be terminated on June 30, 1973, thereby eliminating necessary fellowship and medical staff positions. Only one half (six, instead of twelve) of our projected number of trainees can be accepted for the coming year. The loss to our program of 50% of our trainees will definitely reduce the number of patients who can be cared for at our facilities. In addition, it will decrease the number of available physicians trained in various disciplines to deal with this disease. There is a documented need for medical oncologists, radiotherapists, cancer surgeons and rehabilitation personnel, yet training programs in these specialties are being discontinued.

2. ELIMINATION OF THE REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM

Until April 30, 1973 the Tufts Cancer Unit actively participated in the Regional Medical Program in Cancer of both Tufts University and Boston University. The goal of this program had been to improve patient care in the community hospital through conferences and consultations by physicians, nurses and social workers. The abrupt termination of the Regional Medical Program in its fourth month of the current grant year curtails this important opportunity for communication between specialists in cancer patient management and community hospital personnel.

3. CHANGE IN GRANT APPLICATION POLICY

During the past year there has been a shift of funding from research project grants to

research contracts solicited by the National Cancer Institute. This approach tends to stifle original thinking in the development of new approaches to cancer problems. Furthermore, it establishes a pattern of focus on immediate goals rather than long-term objectives.

ALFRED P. SLOAN AWARDS FOR DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE TO HIGHWAY SAFETY AWARDED TO WENDELL COLTIN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

MR. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this year's winner of the highest award of the Alfred P. Sloan Awards in the print media category went to Wendell Coltin for "distinguished public service to highway safety."

Wendell is a long-time friend of mine and my family and the author of the "Safety Crusade" column since May 20, 1956. The column appears in the Boston Herald American. He has received more than 70 awards for the column during its 17 years.

The column has pointed out problems on many streets and highways, and by bringing these safety hazards to public attention, seen to it that they were corrected.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to Wendell Coltin for his excellent job in this area. A story in the Boston Herald American on May 11, 1973, explains Wendell's fine efforts in detail, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The column follows:

WRITER WENDELL COLTIN HONORED—ROAD SAFETY AWARD TO HERALD AMERICAN

Wendell H. Coltin, Boston Herald American Safety Crusade columnist, was announced yesterday as the winner of the top award of \$1000 in the print media, in the 25th Annual Alfred P. Sloan Awards for "distinguished public service to highway safety."

The announcement of the highest "individual creative award" to Coltin was made by Roy D. Chapin, Jr., board chairman of American Motors Corp. and chairman of the Highway Users Federation, at the 80th Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Highway Association in the Pleasant Valley Country Club, Sutton.

The Sloan Awards are offered by the Highway Users Federation "to encourage vigor and innovation in the development of public service programs aimed at the reduction of traffic accidents, injuries and deaths."

The awards are in memory of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., a former president and chairman of the General Motors Corp. and a pioneer in the organized highway safety movement. The awards' program is conducted by the Highway Users Federation under a grant from the Automotiv Safety Foundation.

The awards recognize performance of the print and broadcast media in the continuing campaign to improve safety on the nation's highways. Coltin has been writing the Safety Crusade column since May 20, 1956 and it has received more than 70 awards, many of them top national honors.

He was the first newspaperman to win the American Trucking Associations' Safety Story Competition two years in a row; was the first dual winner for the best series and individual story; and received several other awards from the ATA.

In addition to writing the Safety Crusade column, which will be 17 years old May 20, Coltin has also spoken before numerous groups and at safety conferences on the subject of highway safety and the *Herald American* Safety Crusade.

His Safety Crusade column has been credited by public officials and others in Massachusetts and New England through the years in focusing on a variety of problems in highway safety, which have led to such legislation in Massachusetts as a No-Fix Traffic Ticket Law, chemical tests for suspected drunken drivers, eye examinations on renewal of drivers' licenses, tighter semi-annual inspections of motor vehicles, reflective number plates to help prevent nighttime accidents on streets and highways; and optional anti-jaywalking legislation for cities and towns to adopt.

Coltin's column has called attention to hazardous conditions on streets and highways that have needed correction and in many instances have ultimately been corrected, including removal of death traps in openings along median strips of such roads as Routes 1, C-1, 9 and 128.

It has cited the importance of driver education; and it has also singled out for recognition truck drivers whose operating manner and safety achievement has reflected credit on their firms and pointed up the good public relations a firm receives from such driving performances; also its beneficial rate as far as insurance is concerned.

Heads of the Registry of Motor Vehicles in Massachusetts, the Massachusetts State Police, individual police chiefs, the Massachusetts Highway Association and Public Safety Secretary Richard E. McLaughlin, a national officer in the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, have publicly commended Coltin for his Safety Crusade column and its contribution to the cause of highway safety.

Coltin also writes the Medicare Mailbox column in the daily *Herald American* and Sunday *Herald Advertiser* and is regarded nationally as one of the most knowledgeable persons in the news media on Social Security and Medicare. The Medicare column has been honored on many occasions.

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS DOMINATE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, unless my mail differs greatly from that of my colleagues, the Members of this body are plagued with frequent questionnaires on how you voted or how you will vote on a given issue. The questions on these forms are frequently such an oversimplification of the issues involved that it is either impossible to give a simple and direct answer, or as a result of amendments to a bill, or the availability of additional information and further study, you find you have made a declaration you cannot, in good conscience, keep.

We are all aware that lobbies and interest groups keep scorecards which are used by the members of those groups to determine whether our retention in Congress is in their interest or not. This is true despite the fact that these tallies may be very misleading.

I am submitting today an editorial from the *Wheeling Intelligencer*, of Wheeling, W. Va., that I consider to be

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

most provocative and one that should be of considerable interest to Members of Congress, political scientists, and constituent groups, alike. I do not agree that Congress is a captive of special interest groups, but I do agree that perhaps it is time to look at a new scale upon which to weigh our work.

The editorial follows:

LAWS—SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS DOMINATE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Dr. Perry E. Gresham, chairman of the board of trustees of Bethany College, spoke a few days ago to the George Washington Society of Harvard and Radcliffe College at Cambridge, Mass. The society is an affiliate of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute.

In a portion of his address, Dr. Gresham said the American system suffers from excessive special interest-group legislation. We believe a few excerpts from his remarks bear repeating:

"So pervasive is this chummy philosophy that our laws are written for interest groups and our government administers the laws with the interest group in mind.

"The Department of Labor, for instance, has become a servant of the unions. The Department of Agriculture works for the agriculture interests, and the Department of Commerce represents the trade associations.

"The net effect of the interest-group philosophy is contempt for law which dares to oppose the group interest . . .

"This trend results in a hopeless jungle of class-oriented laws, vaguely written, subject to administrative bargaining and dealing, rather than simple clarity and enforcement.

"We have laws for the veterans, the farmers, the unions, the builders, the railroads, the motor companies, the colleges, and almost any other interest group that comes to the mind and attention of some eager legislation.

"The country would be better served by legislative sessions dictated to the repeal of the superlative laws rather than the relentless creation of new ones. It is the shame of our age that a legislature takes pride in the number of bills it has passed to clutter the books and reduce human freedom."

Perhaps it is time to look at a new scale upon which to weigh the work of our state legislators and members of Congress.

HALT U.S. BOMBING OF CAMBODIA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I joined recently with nine of my colleagues in a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of continued American military activity in Cambodia and the threatened resumption of full scale hostilities in Vietnam without congressional approval.

We are once again at a critical juncture in our foreign policy determinations and national history. Having extricated ourselves from the quagmire of Vietnam, we are tragically and incredibly embarking upon another venture in Southeast Asia—one which threatens to develop into another nightmarish horror.

One would have hoped that 1 million dead, including 50,000 Americans and the expenditure of more than \$125 billion would have drilled home the heart-

rending lessons of Indochina. But no—this administration—and, until last Thursday, this Congress, have been backing into this new abomination in the same way we ensnared ourselves in the last.

Under our Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war. Congress has not exercised this power in regard to Cambodia. It has passed no legislation or joint resolution declaring war. Nor has Congress enacted any statute which expressly and intentionally authorized war. Thus, in carrying on the bombing in Cambodia, the executive branch of the Government is conducting a Presidential war, wholly without constitutionally required congressional authorization.

The efficacy of our constitutional right to vote in Congress, in deciding whether this country should fight a war, has been negated by the Executive's action in prosecuting this authorized war. This right was affirmed, recently, in *Mitchell* against *Laird*, decided by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. This ruling held that Members of Congress have standing to sue to determine the legality of military operations conducted by the President in the absence of a declaration of war by Congress.

In carrying on a war which has not been authorized by the only branch of our Government granted the constitutional right to do so, the executive branch has clearly violated the basic constitutional concept of separation of powers. Separation of powers is so essential to our form of government, and so threatened, that we are taking a step which is unusual for Congressmen, but which we believe to be imperative. We are filing a brief asking the judiciary to uphold separation of powers and the declaration of war clause by ruling that the Executive has been and is acting illegally.

Aside from the constitutional questions raised by our full-scale bombing raids on Cambodia, there are several other compelling reasons why our participation in this latest madness must be halted now.

U.S. military operations currently under way in Cambodia violate the intent of several laws passed by the Congress. The Military Procurement Authorization Act for fiscal 1972 (Public Law 92-156; 85 Stat. 423) provides that all U.S. military forces should be withdrawn from Indochina subject only to the release of all American POW's, and accounting for MIA's. As we know, the prisoners have been released and are now home. The Pentagon has indicated that it is satisfied that no other Americans are still being held by the Communists in Indochina. Hence, conditions set by the law have been met—why then are we again dropping tons of explosives? The Defense Appropriation Act of 1971 (Public Law 91-668; 84 Stat. 2020) provides that our military should not be used to support or assist efforts to aid the governments of Laos or Cambodia. Yet, this appears to be precisely what we are doing.

Our activities are not protecting American troops or safeguarding a withdrawal. Neither are they aimed at forc-

ing a release of prisoners of war. These reasons can no longer be used as excuses for continued American involvement in the bloodshed.

We have no treaty commitments to Cambodia—and never have had any. Cambodian Government have consistently and specifically rejected all American offers of alliance in SEATO or any other treaty organization.

The struggle currently going on in Cambodia is, to all observers, a civil war. The primary protagonists are the Lon Nol government and the domestic insurgent Khmer Rouge. Outside aid to each side has essentially been limited to supplies and war materiel. Even American Embassy officials in Phnom Penh were forced to admit this in a recent statement. There is no cause for our Government to participate in what is fundamentally a civil war between Cambodians.

Last and most crucial is the point that our national interests simply are not threatened in Cambodia. The Nixon administration has not even claimed that American security is at stake there. Vietnam, if nothing else, taught all of us that backing corrupt dictatorships in Indochina is not the course that our foreign policy ought to be taking. In fact, we have learned that to do so is to flirt with national tragedy.

Why then, we must ask, are we being dragged into yet another war by an administration which has received no acquiescence, but rather, growing resistance from the Congress?

The answer, as it has been in so many other instances in the past several months, is arrogance. The arrogance which prompted widespread sabotage and bugging that culminated in the Watergate; the arrogance which led to unprecedented subversion of our free and open political process; the arrogance which allowed the President to impound funds duly authorized and appropriated by the elected representatives of the people are all examples of the arrogance of power which threatens to destroy us with another Vietnam.

The American people cannot—must not tolerate this brazen usurpation of authority. The courts and the Congress must unite to halt this latest threat to our constitutional government.

THE SCOURGE OF INFLATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there is, at the present time, much concern over the rapid increase in prices, particularly in the price of food. To express this concern citizens have gathered together in boycotts of products such as meat. Others have called for the imposition of wage and price controls over the entire economy.

However well meaning, those who advocate such approaches to the problem of inflation are dealing with symptoms,

not with causes. The cause of inflation is, in large measure, the rapid increase in the money supply as a result of deficit spending and of the policies of the Federal Reserve Board. It is an illusion to believe that inflation can be stopped until the budget is balanced and until each dollar in circulation possesses the real value of a dollar.

Americans should have learned this lesson long ago. The American Revolution provides our earliest example of the failure of deficit financing and of introducing new dollars into the money supply without proper backing.

Prof. Clarence Carson notes that:

When government enters the marketplace it becomes a bidder among bidders for the supply of goods and services available. . . . Before government can become a bidder in the market, it must acquire goods and services, or their equivalent, for making exchanges . . . the government as government is not a producer of goods nor provider of services and has none of these to offer in exchange. Before it can operate in the market, then, government must acquire these, or their equivalent, from those who provide and produce them.

What government ordinarily does is to raise money through taxes. Professor Carson points out that:

Money can enable a government to use the marketplace as a major source of goods and services . . . government must respect the nature and character of money . . . What a given unit of money will command in goods and services in the marketplace is a ratio between the quantity of money and quality of goods and services . . . If the quality of money is increased and all else remains the same, the price may be expected to rise in proportion to the increase.

During the American Revolution, the Congress and the States did not impose taxes but attempted to finance the war effort primarily by the issuance of paper money, what is known as "Continental currency." Without any backing, Professor Carson writes:

This process of issuing more and more set in early. The initial issue was to have been for \$2 million, but before it had been accomplished, Congress authorized another \$1 million. Before the end of the year \$3 million more was issued.

The more money the Congress issued, the less it was worth. As a result, larger and larger issues were made, and an unprecedented inflation set in. By 1778, the Armed Forces were finding it difficult to acquire goods with paper money. George Washington wrote in 1779 that "a wagon load of money will scarcely purchase a wagon load of provisions."

Professor Carson concludes at:

The American cause was not lost as a result of the inflation. It was won despite the inflation . . . the consequences of inflation . . . followed into the Confederation period. But the lessons of the experience were not lost on the leaders of that generation. In time, they were used to try to prevent a recurrence of mistakes. Unfortunately, we cannot report that these lessons are still remembered to the seventh generation.

Boycotts and controls of wages and prices will do no more to effect inflation in the long run than did similar policies in the colonial period. Only when the cause of inflation is itself effectively dealt with can we hope to end it.

I wish to share with my colleagues the

discussion of inflation during the colonial period by Prof. Clarence Carson. The article, which appeared in the July 1972 issue of the *Freeman* follows:

THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

(By Clarence B. Carson)

Men at ease and in comfortable circumstances must find it difficult to comprehend the sufferings of the Patriot armies during the War for Independence. These armies had to suffer, in addition to those tribulations incident to war, from lack of clothing, blankets, sufficient food, drink, transport, and many other of the necessities of life. Yet it is the judgment of the generality of historians that most of this deprivation was unnecessary and unwarranted. There was food aplenty in the states, and there was at least the potentiality of enough clothing. It may be added that there were enough men of the right age to have constituted overwhelming forces against those the British actually sent to America, and there was a potentiality for manufacturing adequate munitions for the war. (For example: "In 1775 the Union produced 30,000 tons of crude iron—one seventh of the world's total output." It is quite probable that the war could have been brought to a successful conclusion long before it was had these resources been devoted to the effort in sufficient amounts. They were not.

The main reason why men and materials were not brought to focus adequately on the war effort was the method used to finance the war. The successful prosecution of a war—any war—requires that a sufficient amount of energy and resources be diverted from other uses in order to accomplish the end of winning the war. To acquire the necessary goods and services, government enters the market.

Government may enter the marketplace in such a way as to take advantage of the services offered in a market, or it may intervene in the market in such ways as to make that instrument virtually useless for its purposes. When government enters the marketplace it becomes a bidder among bidders for the supply of goods and services available. What the government acquires there, others are denied, or vice versa.

Government Takes Goods

Before government can become a bidder in the market it must acquire goods and services, or their equivalent, for making exchanges. This necessity poses what is the most enduring problem of government: the government, as government, is not a producer of goods nor provider of services, and has none of these to offer in exchange. Before it can operate in the market, then, government must acquire these, or their equivalent, from those who own or produce them. In effect, government must take goods and services from those who provide and produce them. For this to be done equitably and justly, experience indicates that this appropriation should be spread over and apportioned among the producing citizenry.

Money has afforded a means for apportioning taxes and a way for government to enter the marketplace for trading without interfering destructively with the function of the market. In short, money can enable a government to use the marketplace as a major source of goods and services which it needs, particularly in war. For this to happen, however, government must respect the nature and character of money. Money is a medium of exchange, i.e., it is that through which are made exchanges of goods for goods, services for services, or any other combinations of these. What a given unit of money will command in goods and services in the marketplace is a ratio between the quantity of money and quantity of goods and services, as modified by the strength of the desires of all who have any of these in their pos-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

session or wish to acquire them. To put the matter concretely, if a bushel of wheat brings one dollar this means that the quantity of money is such, the quantity of wheat is such, the desire for wheat is such, and the desire for money is such, that one dollar is the price that will effect an exchange. If the quantity of money is increased, and all else remains the same, the price of wheat may be expected to rise in proportion to the increase of money. A money tax enables the government to reduce the supply of money available to private bidders, and thus to become an effective bidder for its needs in the market.

Monetary manipulation

It is theoretically clear, then, what the consequences would be if the government attempted to get its needs by simply increasing the money supply. It would reduce the quantity of goods and services a given unit of money would command. But why could the government not do this as a means of taxation, thus avoiding the onerous necessity of a direct appropriation of money? Of course, it could do this. Thomas Paine declared that this is just what the Congress did during the War for Independence. It would have cost ten or twelve million pounds sterling, he estimated, to have financed the war by ordinary taxation; "and as while this money was issuing, and likewise depreciating down to nothing, there were none, or few valuable taxes paid; consequently the event to the public was the same, whether they sunk ten or twelve millions of expended money, by depreciation, or paid ten or twelve millions by taxation; . . . And therefore . . . [the] debt has now no existence; it having been paid, by everybody consenting, to reduce as his own expense, from the value of the bills continually passing among themselves, a sum, equal to nearly what the expense of the war was for five years." Thomas Paine was, as usual, an adept pleader of special causes, but he was no scholar, and certainly not an economic historian. His statement that everybody consented is simply not true, and he ignores both the ruinous train of consequences following upon the inflation and the question of whether or not it was effective in its object of providing for the armed forces.

It is not necessary, however, to explore the theoretical impact of the inflation further; it unfolds in the story of the financing of the war. The Congress and the states did attempt to finance the war effort primarily by the issuance of paper money. Congress issued what is known as Continental currency. The notes did not bear interest, as such currency sometimes did, but they were supposed to be redeemed by the states at a later date.

All accounts agree that Congress issued more and more of the currency over the years through 1779. A recent estimate of the sums issued goes as follows:

1775	\$ 6,000,000
1776	19,000,000
1777	13,000,000
1778	63,500,300
1779	90,052,380

This process of issuing more and more set in early. The initial issue was to have been for \$2 million, but before it had been accomplished Congress authorized another \$1 million. Before the end of the year \$3 million more was issued. This despite the fact that Congress had intended only one issue at the beginning. And, there were those who attempted to prevent the escalation. Benjamin Franklin said: "After the first emission I proposed that we should stop, strike no more, but borrow on interest those we had issued. This was not then approved of, and more bills were issued."

The process of issuing more and more of the currency and raising the amounts of

single issues is easily explained. Once the money had been issued, it fell into private hands in return for goods and services. The government no longer had access to the currency. Congress then made further issues in order to have money to spend. The more it issued, the less the money was worth; larger and larger issues were made in the attempt to get the results that could be obtained by smaller issues earlier. Reliance on paper money has—for these reasons, and more complex ones where there are combinations of taxation and fiat money financing—a pyramiding effect.

Money vs. Currency

The real reason for the Continental currency issues, then, was that Congress and the states were attempting to finance the war without levying taxes directly. They are entitled to some sympathy for the difficult situation in which they were trying to function, but no amount of sympathy alters the consequences of actions. Congress had no authority to levy taxes. With equal validity, it can be said that Congress had no authority to issue money. The truth of the matter is that Congress had as little and as much power as it could manage to exercise during the period under consideration.

It had no constitution, hence, no constitutional limits on what it could do. Its members, however, were delegates from the states. It may well be that had Congress attempted to levy taxes it would have been repudiated by the states or by the people. At any rate Congress did not even attempt to levy taxes. It was not that the members could see no need for taxes. Congress declared, on many occasions, that the states should levy taxes. Elaborate schedules were devised for apportioning the costs of the war among the states. Solemn proclamations were issued urging the states to tax. For example, in 1777 Congress admonished the states to "raise by taxation in the course of the ensuing year, and remit to the treasury such sums of money as they think will be most proper in the present situation of the inhabitants. . . ."

States Under Political Pressure

Instead of taxing to retire the Continental currency, the states issued large amounts of paper money themselves. "The emission of all the states exceeded \$200,000,000. Virginia led the way, followed by North Carolina; then came South Carolina, Georgia, Delaware, and New Jersey exercised the most restraint."

A minor stream that added to this flood of paper currency issued by Congress and the states was provided by domestic loans. Loan office certificates and certificates of indebtedness were issued to the extent of \$20 million. The loan office certificates circulated generally, one writer notes, "effecting essentially the same consequences as would have attended the issue of an equal quantity of paper money."

Paper Declared Legal Tender

Successive interventions were made in the market, interventions which followed logically from the use of fiat money to finance the war. The first of these interventions was to make the paper legal tender so that it would circulate as money. The specific actions to do this were by the states.

When he was in command of forces at Philadelphia, General Putnam made this announcement: "In future, should any of the inhabitants be so lost to public virtue and the welfare of their country, as to presume to refuse the currency of the American states in payment for any commodities they may have for sale, the goods shall be forfeited, and the person or persons so refusing, committed to close confinement." In a similar fashion, George Washington was authorized to take goods from those who refused the Continental currency and to arrest and confine them.

Rising Prices—and Control

With such Draconian measures to support it, the Continental paper money did circulate. But the more of it that was issued, the more depreciated. The most noticeable effect of this to the public was a general rise in prices. (Prices of particular goods and services rise and fall as demand and supply fluctuate even if the amount of money in circulation remains stable. And, given blockades and the kinds of demands incident to war, some prices would have risen inevitably during these years. However, the price increases were not only general but some of them are rises in Continental currency in relation to what they could be bought for in specie, which indicates that it was the currency which occasioned some of the increases.) Some of the state governments intervened in the market further by attempting to fix prices. As frequently happens, the legislators sought to control the effect—the rise in prices—rather than the cause—the increase in the money supply. Congress recommended that regional conventions be held to set prices for particular areas. The New England and Middle states held such conventions, but the Southern states south of Maryland steered clear of price controls. After a convention had agreed upon the general features of prices, it was up to the individual states to enforce the tariffs. The following is a description of penalties adopted by Rhode Island in 1777:

"The penalty of demanding more than the tariff price was set at the value of the article—half to the State, and half to the informer. Any one who refused for his commodities the tariff price, and afterward sold them for any other goods, was to forfeit the value thereof, half to the State, and half to the informer. If complaint was made that articles necessary for the army or navy were withheld by monopolizers, the State officers and Judges or any two Justices of the Peace might issue a warrant to impress and seize the same, breaking open buildings. The goods were to be appraised by two indifferent men at prices not to exceed those of the tariff. Anybody who contracted to receive for labour or goods more than the tariff rates was to be counted an enemy of the country, and fined twenty shillings for every article sold of the price of twenty shillings or under, and a sum equal to the value of the article, if it was worth more than that."

The price controls, where they were at all effective, resulted in shortages. John Eliot wrote from Boston in June of 1777: "We are all starving here, since this plaguey addition to the regulating bill. People will not bring in provision, and we cannot procure the common necessities of life. What we shall do I know not." What they did, of course, is what people ever do: evade the regulations, barter, blackmarket, produce a money that will purchase goods, and find a variety of means to perpetuate the market, however inadequate they are compared to the opportunities in a free market.

Army requisitions

By 1778 the armed forces were finding it increasingly difficult to acquire goods with paper money. "Though paper money was taken, with more or less reluctance, in return for most things, some services were rendered only upon promises of receiving specie." George Washington wrote in 1779 that "a wagon load of money will scarcely purchase a wagon load of provisions." The country was in the grip of a runaway inflation. Every man of intelligence knew that the root cause was the increase of the money supply (much as this is known in our day), yet there was not the will to deal effectively with it.

To get supplies and transport, the army had to resort to its equivalent of barter, i.e., impressment and requisition from the surrounding populace. There had been some

impressment, particularly of transport, from the beginning of the war; but by the time of the Yorktown campaign in 1781 this method seems to have been relied upon almost exclusively. There was more and more of this done before 1781, however. By the latter part of 1779, supplies in general were being requisitioned. On December 11, 1779, Congress "voted requisitions on the States for specific supplies of flour and Indian corn. December 14, they established a system of requisitions and contributions of this kind, Maryland alone voting no. February 25, 1780, an elaborate apportionment of requisitions for such supplies was made. . . . Each State was called upon for the staples which it produced."

Unhappy consequences of rampant inflation

Men contemporary with events frequently described the consequences of the inflation as well as could be done. Josiah Quincy wrote these words to General Washington:

"I am firmly of the opinion, and think it entirely defensible, that there never was a paper pound, a paper dollar, or a paper promise of any kind, that ever yet obtained a general currency, but by force or fraud, generally by both. That the army has been grossly cheated; that creditors have been infamously defrauded; that the widows and fatherless have been oppressively wronged and beggared; that the gray hairs of the aged and the innocent, for want of their just dues have gone down with sorrow to their graves, in consequence of our disgraceful depreciated paper currency."

By 1778, John Adams could say that "every man who had money due to him at the commencement of this war, has been already taxed three-fourth parts of that money. . . . And every man who owed money at the beginning of the war, has put three-fourth parts of it in his pockets as clear gain. The war, therefore, is immoderately gainful to some, and ruinous to others."

Decay of public virtue

George Washington wrote: "Speculation, peculation, engrossing, forestalling, with all concomitants, afford too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue. . . ." And a writer to a New Jersey paper assessed the blame for this: "I do not say that the abundance of money is the only cause of the decay of virtue or increase of vice, but I say it is a very principal cause, it operates more this way than any other, yea, than all other causes put together."

The inflation contributed much to the loss of confidence in the Congress, the state governments, and the very cause they were committed to at the time. The idea was advanced, when the first issues of paper money were made, that its becoming currency would help to tie people to the cause of independence. Since the fate of the money—its eventual redemption—would depend upon the success of the revolt, those who came into possession of it would be committed to victory. So it might have been, I suppose, if the Congress had been content with one or two issues, if the states had refrained from issues, and if the governments had then turned to direct taxation. But the effect of issuing more and more was not only to reduce the value of the money but also to undermine confidence in the governments which issued it.

In fact, people began to suspect rather quickly that Congress would eventually repudiate its paper. To counter this fear, time and time again Congress reiterated the determination to redeem it and denounced those who said that would be otherwise. In 1778, Congress adopted the following resolution: "Whereas a report hath circulated in divers parts of America, that Congress would not redeem the bills of credit issued by them to defray the expenses of the war, but would suffer them to sink in the hands of the holder, whereby the value of the said bills

hath, in the opinion of many of the good people of these States, depreciated; and lest the silence of Congress might give strength to the said report; resolved that the said report is false and derogatory to the honor of Congress." One writer notes that "as paper money depreciated more and more, the pledges of Congress in respect to its redemption were more frequent and intense in form of expression."

They tried to stop

Congress resolved in September 1779 to issue paper money only to the total of \$200 million. "Upon this mountain of paper," a modern historian has written, "Congress resolved to make its final stand. . . . But . . . the defiant proclamation of September 1779 proved the signal for another sharp selling wave in Continental money. By January 1780, the army was paying for supplies twice what it had paid in September 1779; and by March 1780, prices had risen four times above the level of September 1779."

At that point, Congress began the outright repudiation of its paper, though the culmination was to come later. In March of 1780, Congress devalued the currency by proclaiming that it should now trade at forty to one of gold or silver. To finance this exchange, new paper money was to be issued to be redeemed by the states by taxation. An elaborate plan was contrived for the retiring of the old currency and replacing it with the new. The plan did not work. There was no reason why it should. If the new money was more valuable than the old, it would not circulate, according to Gresham's Law, assuming the old money was still legal tender. In fact, the new money quickly fell to the same value as the old, and the whole became virtually worthless by 1781. In March of 1781, Congress abandoned the acceptance of its own paper money as legal tender. It was now to be accepted only on a sliding scale that was supposed to represent its depreciation. Thereafter, it depreciated so rapidly that it shortly ceased to circulate at all. Specie came out of hiding and replaced paper money as the currency of the land.

All these untoward events might be accepted as the cost of the war, but only if the currency had enabled the Congress to bring the resources of the country to bear on the war effort. That, however, was emphatically not the case. On the contrary, the paper money plus the absence of significant taxation tended to disperse the resources of the country and the energies of the people. Congress and the states were continually short of money, whereas the populace had an abundance. In consequence, the production, transport, trading, and provision of goods and services were concentrated on the civilian population, and the armed forces received short shrift.

Suppliers refuse to cooperate

In the later stages of the war, as already noted, the army had to abandon the use of the paper money substantially and turn to direct methods to get goods and services. This was not only an inconvenient and inefficient method of gathering material but also made people resent the army. For example, here are reports of the situation in Virginia in 1781—at a time when a major British army was concentrated there and Washington was about to win his greatest victory. An agent sent to impress transport reported: "I have been much perplexed, for after having impressed them, the owners of some, by themselves or others, have taken, in the nighttime, a wheel or something to render them useless; and I don't recollect any law to punish them, if it could be proved." The Quartermaster wrote to the war office: "Let me entreat, sir, that something may be done to draw the people with their means of transportation into the service willingly. I find them so opposed to every measure that is oppressive that it is almost impossible to

effect anything of consequence that way. Many of the teamsters upon the late occasion have deserted with their wagons after throwing their loads out at improper places. . . ."

Nor were taxes in kind a way to get goods where they were wanted. General Washington wrote to the President of Pennsylvania in 1782: "A great proportion of the specific articles have been wasted after the people have furnished them, and the transportation alone of what has reached the army has in numberless instances cost more than the value of the articles themselves." It is not difficult to explain why this was so. The commodities had been taken without reference to a particular need, had been stored where no army might appear, except by accident, and were often spoiled when they were wanted. By contrast with this poor form of barter, the market is an efficient and felicitous device when acceptable money is in circulation; the market tends to make the goods available where and when they are wanted, and money is flexible: it can call forth a variety of goods.

The American cause was not lost as a result of the inflation. It was won despite the inflation. But victory was almost certainly delayed for several years; much suffering resulted; and the people's confidence had been sorely tried. Indeed, we have not finished yet in this work with the consequences of the inflation, for they followed into the Confederation period. But the lessons of the experience were not lost on the leaders of that generation. In time, they were used to try to prevent a recurrence of the mistakes. Unfortunately, we cannot report that these lessons are still remembered to the seventh generation.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this month's First Monday, the monthly publication of the Republican National Committee, has a special report in it titled "Ramsey Clark, Jane Fonda and Company: Dupes of the Decade." The article is totally devoid of polemics or cheap shot debating tactics. It merely juxtaposes quotes from individuals like Fonda and Clark with quotes from the returned POW's themselves. The message is plain, I think, and one worthy of attention from my colleagues. Therefore, I insert it into the RECORD:

RAMSEY CLARK, JANE FONDA AND COMPANY: DUPES OF THE DECADE

LEST WE FORGET

"I think they are lying. I think they are lying and I think they are not only going to have to live with the fact that they were carrying out acts of murder for the rest of their lives. They are also going to have to live with the fact that they are lying on their consciences. It was not—it was not a policy of the North Vietnamese to torture prisoners."—Jane Fonda on the ABC News, April 3, 1973.

"San Diego, April 12—One of the U.S. pilots who appeared at Hanoi press conferences with Jane Fonda and Ramsey Clark said today that he was tortured into doing so. . . . At a meeting with newsmen at the Navy hospital here, Lt. Cdr. David W. Hoffman, 32, said he had been coerced into meeting with Miss Fonda and the former U.S. Attorney General. 'I had a broken arm,' said Hoffman. 'It was in a cast. I was hung by

that broken arm several times and allowed to drop at the end of a rope from a table which was kicked out from under me.' Hoffman said: 'I reject everything I said' in the conferences."—*Washington Post*, April 13, 1973.

"The longest-serving prisoner she saw had been in Hanoi since 1967, the most recent since last month. 'They assured me they were in good health,' she said. 'When I asked them if they were brainwashed, they all laughed.'"—*Excerpt from article in the Washington Post*, July 26, 1972, quoting Jane Fonda after her trip to Hanoi.

"Air Force Col. Robinson Risner said the captors would, 'tie your wrists behind your back . . . and force your head and shoulders down until your feet or your toes were in your mouth, and leave you in this manner until you acquiesced in whatever they were trying to get you to do.'

"'I myself have screamed all night,' said Risner, who was captured in 1965. 'When they torture you enough, then you scream, you holler.'"—*Washington Post*, March 30, 1973.

"The most informed and reliable study now available of alleged torture of American POWs by the North Vietnamese has been made by John M. Van Dyke, formerly of the State Department's Legal Adviser's Office and currently attached to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California, who comes to the general conclusion that there have been instances of unauthorized mistreatment by particular prison guards or by townspeople near the scene of capture, but that there is no evidence at all that North Vietnam is pursuing a policy of torture or vengeance toward the POWs. Indeed, Van Dyke's careful analysis of the most publicized claims of torture by some released prisoners casts considerable doubt on the authenticity of their allegations."—*Professor Richard A. Falk, Princeton University, before the House Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments*, March 31, 1971.

"The other prisoner, he said, was knocked down, 'kicked in the face, stamped in the face, kicked in the genitals' and reduced to a 'cringing' mass 'squealing like a pig.' He, too, was tightly bound with wire and his arms jerked up behind him almost out of their sockets, Kushner said. Two weeks later he was dead."—*Maj. F. Harold Kushner, quoted in the Washington Post*, April 5, 1973.

"San Francisco—An American physician who just returned from a 10-day visit to Hanoi said he found medical care there 'superb' and 'no evidence that prisoners of war have been mistreated at any time.' . . . The health care delivery in North Vietnam is 'really unbelievable, it's superb.' (Dr. George J.) Roth said. 'One couldn't help sense the people had made an enormous investment to taking care of their sick.'"—*Excerpt from article in the Philadelphia Inquirer*, Oct. 26, 1972.

"In Evansville, Ind., Army S. Sgt. James F. Pfister of Evansville said he saw 10 fellow prisoners of war die of malnutrition and poor medical care. He said he did not suffer any torture himself nor did he see any."—*Washington Star-News*, March 30, 1973.

"Hanoi—During last night's U.S. bombing raids, American singer Joan Baez played her guitar and sang songs against war in the fallout shelter of the Hao Binh Hotel."—*Excerpt from article in the Washington Post*, Dec. 20, 1972.

"The catalog of abuse read like an index to the Marquis de Sade. The ex-POWs said that they had faced regular beatings, with anything from bamboo clubs to automobile fan belts. Some complained that their captors had proved more energetic in exploiting wounds than in treating them. 'They'd catch one of us with a broken arm and work it up and down like a pump,' shuddered one of the returnees. Others said they had been tied to anthills, shackled to leg irons for so long

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the metal grew into their flesh, or trussed with rope or wire into human balls with their toes jammed to their mouths. Long periods of solitary confinement—Col. Norman Gaddis counted 1,000 days—and other forms of psychological torture were almost as brutal as the physical punishment."—*Newsweek magazine*, April 9, 1973.

"Nobel Prize winner Dr. George Wald returned from North Vietnam and said that its government 'is way ahead of the Geneva Conventions in its treatment of American prisoners of war. He told a news conference that he based his judgment on a 'private, undisturbed' meeting he had last week with two downed American pilots in Hanoi.'"—*Excerpt from article in the Washington Post*, Feb. 25, 1972.

"Even those who considered their treatment comparatively mild, such as Air Force Captain Joseph Milligan, often suffered enormously. Provided totally inadequate medical attention, Milligan treated—and cured—a badly burned arm by letting maggots eat away the pus, then cleaning off the maggots with his own urine."

"The favorite props of the North Vietnamese captors were lengths of rope, iron manacles that could be screwed down to the bone and fan belts for administering beatings. Prisoners claimed that they were tied up for interminable periods into positions that yogis could not assume. Ropes tied to a man's ankles, wrists and neck were tightened until he was bent over backward in a doughnut shape. Men were also bent forward into a position of a baby sucking its big toe. The ropes cut off circulation, and in several cases, paralyzed limbs for months, even years.

"Handcuffs on the wrists of one prisoner were tightened so much that blood came through the pores. Hands and feet often swelled to unimaginable proportions and turned black. Jaws, noses, ribs, teeth and limbs, the prisoners charged, were deliberately broken and left unset. The sick and wounded were left in their own excrement for days on end. Fan belts or lengths of rubber turned buttocks of beaten prisoners into raw flesh. Sergeant Don MacPhail said that he was hung from a tree over three fresh graves and beaten with sticks. He was told that he would be in the fourth grave."—*Time magazine*, April 9, 1973.

"Mr. Clark said again that the prisoners, in his estimation, were in good health and were being treated humanely. He said they complained of the food, although they had plenty, and that the beds were too small for some of them. . . . Mr. Clark said his own visit to a prison camp persuaded him that the prisoners had not been brainwashed or mistreated. He concluded by charging that those who say these men are mistreated were doing so for 'other motives'—and that these persons 'may care more about the Thieu government than getting the boys home.'"—*Ramsey Clark in an article in the N.Y. Times*, Aug. 16, 1972.

"Navy Capt. James B. Stockdale gave his description of what he called the 'primary mode' of torture:

"Manila ropes or nylon straps were wrapped around the prisoner's arms and neck. His feet were attached to an iron bar. His arms were then drawn back behind his body and his head forced down, while the torturer stood on his back. The technique, Stockdale said, shut off blood circulation to the lower arms, caused a feeling of claustrophobia as the head was forced down, and produced acute pain in the arms twisted behind one's body."—*Washington Post*, March 30, 1973.

"The interrogation process, unlike the situation in the prisons of the Republic of Vietnam (Saigon), is not accompanied by torture; where threatening or harsh treatment has occurred toward captured pilots in North Vietnam it has typically come not at the hands of military or prison authorities

but at the time of capture or immediately after capture at the hands of angry villagers whose houses, fields and hamlets had been attacked from the air."—*Stewart Meacham, Peace Secretary, American Friends Service Committee, before the House Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments*, March 31, 1971

"In February, 1966, when they wanted me to give them a biography, I was tortured seven days and six nights in a pitch black room. They beat me very regularly and brutally while I was in large traveling irons with my hands tightly cuffed behind me. It was very cold and I had no blanket, no bedding, no socks, only sandals and pajamas. When I moved it hurt more. I was like an animal. Not even a healthy animal, like a crippled roach. I was pretty much of a vegetable."—*Navy Capt. Jeremiah Denton, quoted in Washington Post*, March 31, 1973.

"Son Tay was the turning point for many families who had feared to speak out before and who finally realized that now that they were in steady communication with their prisoner relatives, had seen photos of them, exchanged mail and sent packages, and knew them to be alive and well, the prisoners' lives were being endangered, not by North Vietnamese ill-treatment, but by American commandos"—*Cora Weiss, Co-Chairman, Committee of Liaison, before the House Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments*, March 31, 1971.

"Denton said he confessed after days of torture when they 'put a 10-foot-long iron bar on top of my shins and two men walked it up and down.'"—*Washington Post*, March 30, 1973.

"As to actual conditions of treatment, reports vary. Among the visitors to camps from American peace groups, and from such countries as France and Japan, there seems to be general accord that POWs receive more food than do members of North Vietnam's army, that POWs are given medical treatment, that no systematic torture or brainwashing takes place, and that POWs seem in good spirits.

"The real issue is, whether there is a Government policy by North Vietnam, to so mistreat our prisoners, and I believe that no compelling evidence of that has been shown, indeed just the opposite. . . . Now, as I say, it is impossible to know, with any great certainty, what is going on, but I think that a fair look at the evidence shows that there is no policy of mistreatment."—*Richard J. Barnet, Co-Director, Institute for Policy Studies and a member of the Committee for Liaison, before the House Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments*, March 31, 1971.

JANE FONDA AND REAL LIFE

"The great film director Joseph Mankiewicz once told me, 'Distrust movie actors with causes. They live in so rarified an atmosphere of celebrity, their notions of good are so completely derived from film scripts in which good is absolute, that they have no conception of the ambiguity of right and wrong in real life.'

"Yesterday on this report we had an example. Col. James Kessler described the brutal tortures he and his fellows were put to make them say the right thing which is often the false thing to visiting peace militants like Jane Fonda.

"In the same report Miss Fonda said flatly, he and his fellows were liars and murderers. She was unambiguous like a movie script. No thought that those shown her might be, as they were, selected and fattened up for display; no consideration that for years the communists had tortured and murdered individual South Vietnamese villagers at the rate of around 200 a week before we decided, rightly or wrongly, to try to stop it by bombing the source.

"The peace movement has some solid arguments that need to be weighed, along

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

with the hawk arguments, as we now try to put the Vietnam tragedy in its right place in history. But Miss Fonda is a negative contributor. She should stick to movie scripts. Her own closed little mind by itself is clearly not up to making judgments about real life."—ABC's *Howard K. Smith in a commentary*, April 4, 1973.

(Reprinted from the Chicago Tribune)

HANOI DUPES SHOULD APOLOGIZE

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—So it's true. It's true that the American prisoners of war were cruelly abused, beaten, starved, and tortured psychologically by their Communist captors. The prosaic, and patriotic, judgment that this was the way it probably was turns out to be true. The skeptics, fierce antiwar causists, and pro-Hanoi activists were dead wrong.

We can tell the returned prisoners are speaking the truth by looking at their faces as they appear on television. Those are men who strain to hold back the anger, the feeling of hurt, as they struggle to objectively describe what they went thru. They are not the faces of the New Lefters and antiwar critics who spoke blandly a few years ago about how nice the North Vietnamese were treating the American prisoners.

One by one, the Americans tell of having their bodies bound so forcibly that they literally became balls with shoulders popping from their sockets and toes pushed into their mouths; of beatings which splattered blood on the walls; of being shackled to bunks for weeks and thus being forced to wallow in their own defecation; of solitary confinement, six months at a time; of starvation; and being deprived of sleep and medical treatment.

Thru spoken word, the "Bitch Box" loud-speaker, and issues of a Communist paper published in the United States, the prisoners were informed, variously, that their wives were unfaithful; that their children were in trouble; that a prominent U.S. congressman felt the North Vietnamese would be smart to relocate prisoners in cities and areas vulnerable to bombing, and the man Hanoi hoped would win the election, Sen. George McGovern, said that "I would go to Hanoi and beg if I thought that would release the boys one day earlier."

For several years, a diverse lot of perverse activists calling themselves Americans traveled to Hanoi and often came away telling about how well the American U.S. POWs were being treated. They had either seen a handful of specially selected prisoners or were told about POW living conditions by the Communists. This was the basis for their reports.

In the Vietnamese war, one of Hanoi's greatest sources of power [a power that the United States had to overcome to get Hanoi to finally settle] was the notion and impression that the vast majority of American people were against the war and wanted the United States to pull out immediately—thus leaving Viet Nam to the Communists.

Hanoi used this power effectively, just as effectively as they would have used B-52s had they had them, by inviting a collection of duped Americans to serve their cause. In World War II, the Nazis and Japanese also "used" people, and we called these people collaborators, even "Quislings," after [Vidkun Quisling, the pro-Nazi Norwegian traitor]. At war's end, these collaborators and sympathizers were set upon by angry patriots who beat them, shaved their heads, killed them in some instances, and at least jailed them for trials.

Well, the Vietnamese war is too complex, and the degree of involvement of the Americans who helped Hanoi questionable, for a like expression of popular revenge. But since these people stridently demanded public and press attention when they went to Hanoi and pled Hanoi's cause, it is appropriate now

to list their names so that the American people can reflect on their poor judgment and naivete, if not their lack of patriotism. The returned POWs agree that these people not only helped prolong the war by encouraging Hanoi to believe the antiwar movement would win out but they also caused further suffering to the prisoners.

Those who went to Hanoi and served the enemy while hurting the U.S. and our POWs include: Jane Fonda, the actress; the Rev. William Sloan Coffin of Yale University; Cora Weiss of the Women's Strike for Peace; Ramsey Clark, former U.S. attorney general; David Dellinger, apostle of the New Left; Richard Falk of Princeton University; Douglas Dowd of Cornell University; Norm Chomsky of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Richard J. Barnet, co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies; folk singer Joan Baez; and Jane Hart, wife of Sen. Philip Hart [D., Mich.].

Each one of these people owes a public apology to the returned American prisoners of war, and an admission that they were indeed duped by Hanoi and thus given to make impressionistic statements about the prisoners which only served Hanoi's cause.

I doubt that these people will say they are sorry or admit they were wrong. They are all hiding and silent. They shouldn't worry. No one will shave their heads.

WALD WAFFLES

In view of the returning POWs tales of torture, do you still believe the North Vietnamese were "way ahead of the Geneva Convention" in their treatment of our men? *First Monday* asked Harvard biology Prof. George Wald in a telephone interview.

"Well, I think I had not read the Geneva Convention so that there were technical violations not being observed such as open visiting," he replied.

SITTING ON A BASKETBALL

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there are some 125,000 people in this country who are partially or completely paralyzed, who have lost the use of their limbs and control of their body functions because of injury to their spinal cords. Some 10,000 people are paralyzed in this manner in the United States each year. Nearly all of them are young—between 18 and 25—vigorous and active until struck down by perhaps an automobile accident, a diving mishap or other sports-related accident. And, our veterans who have been injured in this way are nearly all young men who would otherwise be leading normal, productive lives.

What happens to these people? Who cares for them? What can they do? I invite my colleagues to find some of the answers to these questions in an address that was delivered last month by a man who has made a tremendous contribution in this area over the years—a man to whom we all owe a great deal.

Dr. Paul C. Bucy, chairman of the National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, has a long and distinguished career as an outstanding neurosurgeon and expert on diseases and injuries of the back—a career which includes association with the Northwestern

University Medical School at Chicago, as professor of neurological surgery.

Dr. Bucy's remarks will, I believe, serve to make us all more aware of how much remains to be done to alleviate the problems of those suffering spinal cord injuries:

SITTING ON A BASKETBALL

(By Paul C. Bucy, M.D.)

In all probability you have never sat on a basketball without being able to feel it. Neither have you imagined such an unlikely situation. For the next few minutes let us give free rein to our imaginations and try to put ourselves in the position of people to whom this is a reality.

A few years ago a paraplegic was asked what it was like to be a paraplegic. His answer was: "It is like sitting on a basketball that you cannot feel and do not know is there." This was a most incomplete description of the situation which confronts the young men who are paraplegics or quadriplegics. Paraplegia is a paralysis of the legs, and quadriplegia is a paralysis of the arms and legs resulting from injury to the spinal cord. But paralysis, the loss of the ability to move one's arms or legs, is only part of the picture. These paralyzed people also have a loss of all feeling in the paralyzed parts. They have a loss of the ability to control their bowels and bladders. They have lost their ability to perform sexually, but not their sexual desires. They are subject to a variety of serious complications, such as pain, bed sores, infections of the bladder and kidneys, the development of bone within their muscles, and the fixation of their paralyzed joints.

Probably none of you know few if any such people. And yet they are not rare. Because of their disability, because of their sores and the offensive smell of urine and feces they all too often slink away out of the public eye, either at home or in some nursing facility. How many are they? There are over 10,000 young people paralyzed in this fashion in this country each year. There are about 125,000 people in the United States permanently paralyzed in this manner. And as our population grows and the causes of the accidents resulting in such paralysis increase, the numbers go up and up.

Who are these people? They are almost all young people between 18 and 25 years of age. Eighty-five per cent of them are young men. They are the vigorous, active young people of our society because it is in vigorous activities that they are injured. About 50% are injured in automobile accidents. Most of the others are injured in sports accidents of which diving accidents lead the list. Try to imagine yourself again as a vigorous young man who is rendered paralyzed in the twinkling of an eye. Your future is gone. If you survive, and today most do survive, you are faced with years of battle against your disability and its many complications. Your sex life is gone. But your sexual desires are not. Your eyesight is there, your mind is there, and the accident did not destroy your testicles. Only your ability to perform has been destroyed.

If you now have the picture let us review the history of the situation. At the time of World War I most people paralyzed by injury to their spinal cords died in a relatively short time. If they had injured the spinal cord in the neck they died because of paralysis of the muscles with which they breathed or because of infection or the accumulation of fluids in their lungs which were functioning so inadequately. If the injury was below the neck they died from infection of the bladder and kidneys or infection in their bed sores. By the start of World War II not quite a quarter of a century later no paraplegic or quadriplegic from World War I was still alive.

Dr. George Riddoch, an English neurolo-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gist and a good friend of mine, who had had close contact with the paraplegics of World War I determined that that was not going to happen again. In the midst of World War II he went to the British government and successfully insisted that a special effort must be made to treat these unfortunate young men better. He recognized that this could not be done with these paralyzed patients scattered about in numerous hospitals, but only if they were concentrated under the care of someone who was interested in helping them, was sympathetic to their plight and had the training and intelligence to improve their care. Finding such a person was almost an impossibility—but not quite.

In 1930 I spent a few months with one of Germany's leading neurologists and neurosurgeons—Professor Otfried Foerster of Breslau. This club has heard of him on October 4, 1954 in a paper entitled, "Der Herr Professor", by Percival Bailey. In Foerster's clinic I met his first assistant, Dr. Ludwig Guttmann. He was a Jewish neurological surgeon, and one of the many Jews in Germany who were convinced that "It can't happen here." First he was driven from Foerster's clinic by the Nazis and took a position in the Jewish hospital in Breslau. Then he was driven from Breslau and accepted a post in Hamburg. Still he hung on, and almost too long. He and his wife were among the few that caught that "last train out." Just before the start of World War II in 1939 they left for England. Here through the efforts of another mutual friend, Sir Hugh Cairns, the Professor of Neurological Surgery at Oxford, Guttmann found a place to work and the means to support himself and his wife. This opportunity was not, however, a position in which Guttmann felt that he really was utilizing fully his training and abilities. He was tolerated but was actually a "fifth wheel," an unneeded man.

It was to Guttmann that George Riddoch went with his proposal. Would he, Guttmann, establish a center for the care of those paralyzed by injury to their spinal cords. Guttmann accepted. Here was the opportunity to help the country which had adopted him and to show his appreciation to the English young men who had given so much in their fight against his enemies. In his wisdom, Guttmann made several very wise stipulations. First, he must be given complete charge and complete responsibility. Second, all military personnel paralyzed in this fashion must be assembled in one center. Third, that center must be an independent unit in a general medical and surgical hospital. With Riddoch's support his conditions were all met and the world's first spinal cord injury center was established in the Stoke Mandeville General Hospital at Aylesbury, England. It is still there.

The number of beds has gradually increased to 230. Civilian paraplegics were soon added to the original military casualties. The care of these patients has steadily improved. A new electrically operated special bed for paraplegics was invented. The care of the paralyzed bladder was greatly improved until today 65% of these patients never develop a urinary infection whereas formerly all of them did. Guttmann developed sports for his patients. They play basketball, swim, bowl, etc. Out of this has grown the International Paraplegic Olympic Games which have now been held in Israel, Japan and elsewhere. Guttmann so improved the care and health of these men that a few years ago he was able to report that 85% of the patients discharged from Stoke Mandeville—now the National British Spinal Cord Injury Center—were employed. This brought another problem which Guttmann promptly met. He established special hostels where those paralyzed men who had no home to go to could live, have the special facilities necessary for their daily life, and either work in the hostel or go out to work.

Soon his successful efforts attracted worldwide attention.

Doctors and nurses came to Stoke Mandeville to learn his methods. They returned home and established spinal cord injury centers in their own countries. Today such centers, modelled after Stoke Mandeville, exist in Germany, France, Africa, Ireland, Scandinavia, Canada, Australia, New Zealand—almost everywhere—that is everywhere except in the United States. Here is our own great country these people are still neglected. Nowhere in the United States can a paraplegic obtain the best care which could now be provided and most of them get the worst care—not much better than was available a quarter of a century ago.

Guttmann's accomplishments have been recognized by England. He is now Sir Ludwig. One can easily imagine the joy of this little short, rotund Santa Claus-like Jewish man, always with a twinkle in his eyes, when the sword of the Queen of England descended on his shoulder making him an English knight. But neither this nor the many other honors bestowed upon him by other countries, including Germany, is the one he cherishes most. He is most proud of being one of the six men in all history who have been named Honorary Citizens of Aylesbury, England. The affection and admiration which the people of England have for him was touchingly emphasized a few years ago when I stood with him in his study to receive a group of English school children. They had marched for miles through England collecting funds to be used by him in his center. They had come to present this money to him personally. I was deeply touched, and I know that he was.

But let us return again to our own country and to World War II. The sad way in which the United States has lagged behind the rest of the world is not all the fault of politicians and people in general. My own profession, or at least some of its members, bear their share of blame. The United States like all countries at war, had its share of paraplegics and quadriplegics as a result of missile wounds, jeep accidents, falls down cliffs, etc. As a result it developed paraplegic wards in a number of its military hospitals.

One of these was at Mayo General Hospital in Galva, Illinois. Two of my former young associates were in charge of that ward. Dr. L. W. Freeman and Dr. Robert Heimburger. They became very much interested in the problems of these paralyzed young men. At the termination of the war they wanted to do something about the situation. They were assigned to the Hines Veterans Hospital just outside of Chicago. They asked for the opportunity to take charge of the paraplegic wards there and to develop a research facility which would study these problems and endeavor to improve the care. Their request was denied; denied by one of the best known professors of neurological surgery in the United States; a man who early in World War II was in charge of all neurological surgery for the United States Army. His reply to their request was, "What do you want to do that for? Their situation is hopeless. They are not going to get better. You will just be wasting your time."

His remarks were closely paraphrased by the dean of Northwestern University Medical School who said to me, when I proposed to develop a spinal cord injury center at the Chicago Wesley Memorial Hospital and Northwestern University Medical School, "Why do you want to waste your time and effort on these people? They are just going to lie around getting bed sores and smelling of urine. I know, I took care of them in World War II." My answer was, "That is exactly why I want to. It is totally unnecessary." And there were others. One of the leading professors of neurology in New York City sat on a review committee considering the allocation of money for research projects.

Bill Freeman of the Mayo General Hospital had not been discouraged by the rebuff which he received at Hines Veterans Hospital. He had become Professor of Research Surgery at Indiana University and had developed a research laboratory devoted to the study of spinal cord injury. But such a laboratory needs money. He had applied for a research grant. The influential professor from New York was responsible for his request being turned down because in his opinion there was nothing that could be done about the injured spinal cord. Bill Freeman continued nevertheless. Almost the only man in the United States who did so for many years. Finally the many disappointments and frustrations which he encountered took his life and abolished a brilliant career.

Fortunately there have been others intrigued by the possibility that something could be done about the injured spinal cord. In 1911 Dr. A. R. Allen had devised an experimental method for injuring the spinal cords of animals and had demonstrated that with appropriate treatment the resulting paralysis in experimental animals could be reversed. He was not taken seriously and his work was soon forgotten. The work of Allen was not really appreciated for over half a century. In the mid 1960s Maurice Albin in Cleveland got the idea that cooling the injured spinal cord might reverse the paralysis, and it did. His work with the neurosurgeon, Robert White, reawakened interest in the entire problem. They demonstrated that the paralysis which develops immediately when the spinal cord is bruised is not necessarily permanent as had been thought and taught for many years. Since their work, which was first published in 1966, a number of others have become involved in the experimental treatment of the injured spinal cord and have shown that several different forms of treatment can be effective in the laboratory. The opportunity to try these experimental forms of treatment in man is not yet available although steps in that direction are being taken. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke just last month awarded funds to establish three Acute Cord Injury Clinical Research Centers. Here spinal paralysis in man will be studied and the effective forms of treatment developed in the research laboratories will be tried in man.

The experimental studies have all agreed upon the very important point. If any treatment is to be effective it must be instituted within four hours after the onset of the paralysis. Whether the same time limits apply to man is not yet known. What happens in and to the spinal cord that gives rise to this extremely short time limit? Only recently have detailed studies been undertaken in our laboratories to determine exactly what happens to the bruised spinal cord. When the spinal cord is struck it immediately ceases to function and the animals become paralyzed in that part of the body below the level of injury. Yet if one examines the spinal cord at that time he will find no changes in its appearance. The nerve fibers and cells within it appear normal. Then why is the animal (or the man) paralyzed? Studies of the flow of blood through the spinal cord probably give an important part of the answer for there is an immediate reduction in blood flow of approximately 50 per cent. It is known that nervous tissues—the brain and the spinal cord—survive interruption of blood flow for only a brief period. If the supply of blood is completely arrested the tissues of the nervous system will die within five minutes. If the supply is only reduced and the tissues survive, the loss of function is reversible.

However, the reduction in blood flow through the bruised spinal cord is only the beginning. Soon other changes begin to appear and to grow progressively more severe. Within four hours these changes will pro-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

duce a permanent destruction of the nerve fibers and cells.

The stories of two actual patients will illustrate the importance of these points. Billy Hill was 15 years old when he dived into a shallow pool, struck his head on the bottom and broke his neck. His arms and his legs became totally paralyzed. He lost all feeling from the neck downward over his trunk and all four extremities. His bladder was paralyzed. Fortunately he fell into competent hands. He was transferred from northern Indiana to Chicago, and was admitted to our hospital within three hours after he became paralyzed. The fractured spine was reduced and medicine was given to reduce the swelling of his spinal cord. Shortly thereafter slight sensation returned to one toe. Gradually he improved and movement began to return. Two months after his injury he was able to stand and walk. His recovery has since been completed. He has returned to school and plays his guitar.

How different is that happy story from another. A young man thirty-five years old was injured in an automobile accident. On admission to the hospital in the evening his only complaint was of pain in the back of his neck. About midnight it was noted that movements of his legs were growing weaker. Soon he lost feeling in the lower part of his body and by 3 A.M. his legs and bladder were completely paralyzed. Subsequently he was transferred to another hospital which was better equipped to care for patients paralyzed by injury to their spinal cords. However, he did not arrive there until about 12 hours after his accident and over 5 hours after he had become totally paralyzed. Although the fracture of his spine was promptly reduced and he was given appropriate treatment he did not recover and still remains totally paralyzed.

Obviously the first requirement for prompt, adequate treatment is early, safe transportation to a medical center equipped to provide proper care. In this, Illinois has been the outstanding leader in this country. Under the direction of the Governor, Illinois has developed a system by means of which patients paralyzed by injury to their spinal cords can be carefully and quickly transported from any point in the state to the Spinal Cord Injury Center at the Northwestern Memorial Hospital here in Chicago. Transportation is by airplane, helicopter or motor ambulance depending upon which form of transportation is best suited to the circumstances. Northwestern has long been interested in this problem. It has developed a special unit in the hospital for the care of these patients. This unit has a corps of doctors and nurses particularly trained in this type of care and intensely interested in these unfortunate patients. Although this system has been in operation only a short time it has already demonstrated its worth on many occasions. Illinois can take great pride in its intelligent leadership in this field. There is no question but that its plans will be imitated.

Fortunately the United States has finally awakened from its long sleep and is now beginning to do what most other civilized countries in the world have done long ago. But much still remains to be done. If we are to deal with this problem appropriately we must insure that every person paralyzed by injury to his spinal cord can be cared for in an appropriate spinal cord injury center. This will require that any person so paralyzed can be admitted to such a center regardless of his ability to pay, regardless of his race, creed or color and admitted within less than four hours after he becomes paralyzed. This will require that such centers be established throughout the United States so that no point will be more than four hours away. How many such centers will it take? Probably at least 50. They must be developed without any reference to political boundaries. These centers should be no smaller than 50 beds and no larger than 100. It is obvious

that a center of this sort and size would not be reasonable in many of our smaller states. It is also obvious that the 15 year old boy injured in northern Indiana should be transferred to Chicago and not to Indianapolis. It is obvious that the Illinois plan in which persons injured in Cairo are transferred to Chicago is not the best plan. They should be transferred to St. Louis. It is obvious that the state of Nevada could not be expected to develop such a plan for transportation and such a center. It has too few citizens. Yet if you are paralyzed in an automobile accident while driving across Nevada you should be given the best possible treatment.

It may be asked, "Why a special spinal cord injury center? Why a center of this size?" Why not just provide for the care of these patients in every general hospital. The answer is that it can't be done. There are many reasons why a spinal cord injury center should have at least 50 beds. The care of these patients requires the attention of doctors and nurses particularly trained for this task, and equipment specially made for this purpose. The centers, too, must be architecturally designed to meet the needs of these patients. Just any doctor, any nurse and any hospital bed will not suffice. To continue with these will only insure that we will do the same inadequate job that we have been doing for years. No hospital can enlist the services of the doctors and nurses specially trained to deal with this problem if they only have a few patients of this type. It would be too expensive to do so and the professional personnel would not find enough to do to maintain their interests.

There are other important reasons for developing such centers. One is the patient himself. Spinal paralysis is a very discouraging thing. If the patient is going to do the most to recover, he must have hope that he can recover. The doctors and nurses can supply much of the optimistic atmosphere required, but not all. It is very discouraging to any paralyzed young man to be surrounded completely with perfectly healthy young men and women—particularly if the young women are pretty, sympathetic nurses. It is important that he be associated with other paralyzed patients. Thus he will realize that he is not alone. That others have the same problem. It is even more important that he sees other patients, paralyzed like himself, who are recovering. Nothing will bolster his spirits more or give him more determination to exert every effort than seeing someone else getting well.

Another important reason for the development of these centers is research. There are still many problems associated with spinal paralysis still to be solved. Nothing will stimulate research, the desire to solve a problem, as much as the problem itself. The young doctors and nurses in such a center will become determined to do something about the problems with which they are confronted. Furthermore, the problems presented by various patients are different. All aspects of spinal paralysis will not become apparent from a few cases. And lastly, the patients themselves must be studied. Reliable answers can not be obtained from a few patients. The 15 year old boy cited earlier does not prove that the treatment given him was responsible for his recovery, nor that the same treatment would be successful with other patients. Neither can we rely on the laboratory animal for our answers. Studies on cats, dogs and monkeys must be made. But ultimately what is learned in the laboratory must be studied in man. We already know that what is true for the cat is not always true for the monkey. We can never assume that what is true for the monkey is also true for man until we have demonstrated that it is.

It may be argued that the plans incompletely outlined here are terrible expensive. Are they? No. They are not nearly as expensive as what we are doing now. The improved care resulting from the development of the

spinal cord injury center at the Northwestern Memorial Hospital has dropped the average necessary period of hospitalization by more than 50 percent. The United States Army has estimated that a soldier paralyzed by injury to his spinal cord will require more than \$900,000 for care in the course of his lifetime. It will not be necessary to cure many of these young men or even to shorten the hospital stay of those who can not be cured in order to pay for these centers and the research that will be required.

In view of the fact that these centers must ignore city and county boundaries and state lines, they must be organized and financially supported by the Federal Government. The question must immediately arise, "Isn't that socialized medicine?" and the answer is, "Certainly!" It might also be added that that is exactly why the spinal cord injury centers have been so successfully developed in England.

However, we must not permit ourselves to get hung-up on words. Although we have seldom called it that, we have had socialized medicine in the United States for longer than any of us can remember. What do you suppose the state hospitals for the mentally ill are? What were the tuberculosis sanatoriums which were for so many years supported by the government? What are the institutions for the mentally retarded, the epileptic, the indigent sick and the many others who are unable to provide for their own care through the ordinary medical and hospital facilities. All of these are socialized medicine. We must never deny proper care to our ill and disabled because of words which have become offensive to us. Proper care for those with spinal paralysis is not now available. It can be supplied for all of those paralyzed in no other way. The responsibility of government is to do for the people what they can not do for themselves.

The question will also be raised, "Isn't it foolish to spend this money for this purpose when our Federal Government is already overspent?" I would be the first to agree with anyone that waste in government spending must be abolished. I would agree also that it is foolish for the Federal Government to spend millions of dollars providing hospital care for people who are perfectly able to provide it for themselves just because they are over 65 years of age. Yet that is what we are doing. What do we do now with those men paralyzed by injury to their spinal cords that are sick with their kidney infections and bedsores and unable to work? We care for them in public institutions at public expense. Is that saving money? Or would it be better to spend less money to provide them with better care initially and either cure them of their paralysis or enable them to support themselves? Who is acting more fiscally intelligent? England where 85 percent of these patients become employed or the United States where only a small handful of them do? Forget the misery, the pain and suffering and think only of dollars. The course we are now pursuing is financial nonsense. When Sir Ludwig Guttmann was asked by a member of Parliament to state in one sentence what he had accomplished, he said, "I have taken disabled, discouraged men and made them self-respecting tax paying citizens." How much longer must we wait for the United States to do likewise?

WHAT DO WOMEN REALLY THINK ABOUT ABORTION?

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, since the January 22 Supreme Court decision on

May 17, 1973

abortion, this controversial issue has aroused the sense of justice in many individuals across the country.

In light of this controversy, I submit an article for the RECORD written by Mrs. Doris Revere Peters, that appeared in Columbia magazine in April 1973. This article clearly examines the stress felt by many women, and the emotional and psychological risk involved in an abortion.

The article follows:

**WHAT DO WOMEN REALLY THINK ABOUT
ABORTION?**

(By Doris Revere Peters)

The women's liberation movement has received so much publicity that every segment of society surely must be aware of its demands. The amount of coverage given to it in the media could lead some to believe that the movement represents a female majority.

Although many women agree with bits and pieces of their demands the majority of women is far from supporting all of its goals. Women's comments range from "I agree with women's lib on a few issues" to "I think they have made a contribution in getting equal pay for equal work." More often the statement is made: "I agree with them up to a point." And in the light of recent developments the "point" alludes to the movement's arguments in favor of abortion.

These feminists contend that most women believe in abortion. But is this contention true? What creditable measure is there for assessing the average woman's views and reactions to the new, easy abortion legislation?

Since the New York law was passed in 1970 and in light of the recent Supreme Court decision in January of this year, it appears that most of the reactions have come from men. One exception is Birthright, a nonsectarian organization devoted to helping mothers-to-be go through with pregnancies even under conditions which seem to be adverse.

One of Birthright's regional directors stated that the Supreme Court decision on abortion was "an uneducated one and not representative of the majority of the American people."

Another source documented by research indicates that the feminists' statistics are erroneous. According to Dr. Judith Blake, an internationally respected social scientist, most women do not favor abortion. In her recent analysis of how the overall American population views abortion, Dr. Blake, chairman of the department of demography at the University of California, concluded that 80% of the population "disapproves the legalization of easy abortion." Also contrary to the radical feminist line, Dr. Blake found that women under 30 as well as college-educated women have negative attitudes toward abortion.

The same study showed that the strongest promoter of easy abortion is the white, upper-class, liberal, educated, non-Catholic male. These results prompted Mary Kay Williams, editor of the Catholic Family Leader, to observe: "In the light of this discovery it well may be that the women's movement is playing into the hands of a group they often denounce as chauvinist."

Yet women by the thousands are having abortions. Who are they? Why do they have them? Now that the physical risk has been lessened, how do they feel emotionally and psychologically? Not enough time has passed to conduct a reliable study. And women understandably are reluctant to talk.

However one group has been verbal. Nurses. Just after England's abortion law was passed newspapers carried stories of nurses of different religious persuasions quitting their

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

jobs because they found abortion procedures "horrendous."

In this country some hospitals are booked solid for months with abortions while genuinely sick patients are turned away or go on long waiting lists. Some nurses regard the demands made on nursing service by "this abortion business" as outrageous. Others resent the time given to abortion cases because it is taken away from other patients who are there to give life. But all agree that it is not only the physical demands.

"It is emotionally draining on all of us," explained a nurse who is planning a family herself. "No matter how disinterested or calloused a woman about to be aborted appears, there comes a time when she goes through some grave doubts. Maybe she is okay right up until the time the doctor injects the saline solution. The nurse is there to sustain her, to give her support. But it's difficult for the nurse to hide her own feelings. Very often the woman feels she is not doing the right thing and she looks to us for encouragement which we are unable to give."

Another nurse asked: "How can we work here and not be drained? In one room we must encourage a woman who already has had four miscarriages and who is hoping against hope that she will have a normal child. In the next room we have to console a 41-year-old woman who desperately wanted a baby and who just gave birth to a monster! From there we go to a girl who opted for an abortion and we have to throw away a perfectly formed fetus. It is not normal to expect us to frame that many attitudes and still be sincere."

One young registered nurse gave this reason for quitting a well-paying job: "I could not possibly go on ignoring the live fetuses or even putting the dead ones in buckets to be sent to the labs."

How does the woman who has had an abortion feel? Is she relieved or full of guilt? There has not been enough time for adequate sampling.

But two doctors, James H. Egan and Eugene J. Mahon, from the division of child psychiatry at St. Luke's Hospital in New York City have conducted a postabortion study. While it involved only 12 teenagers whose mean age was 15 years and 7 months, the investigation did reveal the presence of guilt feelings. Reporting their findings at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry in New Orleans, the doctors found that a "lingering sense of guilt for having destroyed the fetus was present in many of the girls."

They held from three to five in-depth interviews with each girl. The study revealed that guilt prevailed the girls' dreams and found its way into their poems and short stories. In some of the teen-agers aggressive infantile behavior was the result of the guilt while in others it produced fears about the intactness of their reproductive organs and fertility, "fears that could be put to rest only by subsequent pregnancy."

Additional conclusions reached by the doctors were the following:

"It is surprising that such an important event in the developmental life of a young girl is met with so little help from parent, peer or professional.

"To offer elective abortion to an adolescent without offering counseling to her family and boyfriend and of course herself is to prepare her for a postabortion period of guilt, ambivalence and depression that may have significant effects on her behavior and personality."

"It is not surprising that the awesome existential facts of pregnancy and abortion should produce profound but subtle change in an adolescent's psyche."

Continued exploration of the psyche may prove how unnatural and harmful abortion can be.

BAFALIS REINTRODUCES BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to reintroduce my proposed anti-deficit spending constitutional amendment, House Joint Resolution 332, to permit 17 of my colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans—to join as cosponsors.

This amendment, which I first introduced on February 8 in an effort to force the Congress to live up to its responsibility of balancing the budget, now has the backing of 30 Congressmen:

JAMES ABDON, Republican of South Dakota.

WILLIAM ARMSTRONG, Republican of Colorado.

CLAIR BURGENER, Republican of California.

O. C. FISHER, Democrat of Texas.

JIM HALEY, Democrat of Florida.

ROBERT HANRAHAN, Republican of Illinois.

ROBERT HUBER, Republican of Michigan.

WILLIAM HUDNUT, Republican of Indiana.

EARL LANDGREBE, Republican of Indiana.

TRENT LOTT, Republican of Mississippi.

MANUEL LUJAN, Republican of New Mexico.

JAMES MANN, Democrat of South Carolina.

PAUL McCLOSKEY, Republican of California.

CARLOS MOORHEAD, Republican of California.

STAN PARRIS, Republican of Virginia.

J. KENNETH ROBINSON, Republican of Virginia.

WILLIAM WALSH, Republican of New York.

LAMAR BAKER, Republican of Tennessee.

JAMES COLLINS, Republican of Texas.

JOHN CONLAN, Republican of Arizona.

PHILIP CRANE, Republican of Illinois.

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican of Illinois.

HAROLD V. FROEHLICH, Republican of Wisconsin.

WILLIAM KETCHUM, Republican of California.

JOHN ROUSSELOT, Republican of California.

DICK SHOUP, Republican of Montana.

FLOYD SPENCE, Republican of South Carolina.

STEVE SYMMS, Republican of Idaho.

DAVID C. TREEN, Republican of Louisiana.

It is good to have these gentlemen join me in the battle to fiscal responsibility to Government. To me this support means that the demand for sound spending practices is not limited to one party, or one area of the country. These cosponsors represent all segments of the population and all geographic areas and almost every shade of political philosophy. Certainly, this must suggest the universality of the people's desire to see the Federal Government live within its means.

House Joint Resolution 332 states that—

Congress shall make no appropriation for any fiscal year if the resulting total of appropriations for such fiscal year would exceed the total estimated revenue of the United States for such fiscal year.

While this idea seems very simple, it would really put Congress on the spot. Instead of spending money for every program suggested, we in Congress would be forced to set priorities—to look at every program in terms of dollars and cents, in terms of its value in relation to other needs and in terms of the limits on the resources of the people.

The overwhelming response to this legislation has been most heartening. I have received letters from people across the country in support of House Joint Resolution 332 and a balanced budget. I am confident that, if this amendment is adopted by this Congress and ratified by the States, it will be a big step toward cutting back inflation and returning our economy to solid ground.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, PEKING STYLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those great oracles of the public right to know, the New York Times and the Washington Post, have already learned that the Red Chinese regime does not recognize the first amendment freedom of the press.

The Communist Party of mainland China has reportedly threatened to retaliate against the two American newspapers because they dared to print an ad from Americans of Chinese descent which was critical of the President's new China policy in importing a bunch of Red Party diplomats into the United States. The threat reportedly is to deny the two American newspapers a news bureau in Peking.

The tragic note of the whole incident is that the free Chinese had to pay for their aid, while the Red Chinese retaliation to suppress free speech got free news coverage.

If either of the two papers forsakes their free press heritage in order to accept the bribe of a newsdesk in Peking, then their readers should know that the dispatches sent from the bureau are just as accurate as the Peking government will allow. That is freedom of the press, Communist style.

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1973]

CHINA THREATENS NEW YORK TIMES OVER ANTI-PEKING ADS

(By Anthony Astrachan)

NEW YORK, May 16.—China threatened The New York Times today that the government will not allow the newspaper to open a bureau in Peking unless it stops running anti-Peking advertisements.

A. M. Rosenthal, managing editor of The Times, said he had told a Peking diplomat here that The Times regards freedom of political advertising as part of freedom of the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

press and that The Times will continue to accept such ads.

The Times, which has been allowed to send more correspondents to visit China than any other American newspaper, has long sought a bureau in Peking.

Rosenthal said the Chinese had indicated several times in years of "rather informal dealings" that they were unhappy that The Times printed advertisements from "reactionary Chinese groups" in America and Taiwan.

Assistant managing editor Seymour Topping, an old China hand who did the informal negotiating, told the Chinese each time that the newspaper regarded the acceptance of such ads as important in maintaining a free press.

Rosenthal was requested to come to the Chinese mission to the United Nations by Chou Nan, a first secretary who is one of the mission's best English speakers and handles most of its dealings with the press.

Chou told Rosenthal that his government had instructed him to tell the managing editor that it considered these advertisements unfriendly acts which militated against better understanding between the peoples of China and the United States.

Chou emphasized that Peking considered that such advertisements ran counter to the goal of exchanging newsmen between the two countries.

He said The Times should know how the Chinese government felt and stop running the ads.

Rosenthal said Chou asked "if he had made himself perfectly clear. I told him, 'Yes.'"

Rosenthal also repeated the belief that a free press is vital in this country, including freedom of political advertising, and that those who own the presses have an obligation to make space available to people who do not.

The managing editor said he also showed Chou advertisements The Times had run from Communist governments, including one featuring a message from President Kim II Sung of North Korea and others from critics of The Times.

He then asked directly: "Does this mean we will not be allowed a bureau in Peking?"

Rosenthal said Chou smiled and said he had nothing to add to his first statement, "But you can draw your own conclusions."

Chou had with him an ad from the May 10 New York Times in which "The Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association" protested the establishment of the new Chinese liaison office in Washington.

The Washington Post which has also requested permission to establish a bureau in Peking, ran a similar ad May 10, from the Association of Free Chinese in the United States. The Post said today that like the Times, it has always regarded freedom to advertise as part of freedom of the press and would continue to accept political ads that were in good taste and factually accurate.

BRITISH JOURNALIST HENRY BRANDON COMMENTS ON WATERGATE AFFAIR

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the repercussions of the Watergate affair and the other misdeeds of persons associated with President Nixon are being felt far beyond the boundaries of our country.

On a visit to England recently, I found

May 17, 1973

much attention being given by the most respected British journals to the present crisis of confidence in the President.

One of the most perceptive foreign observers of the American scene, Henry Brandon of the *Sunday Times* of London, wrote an article from the perspective of his 23 years as a journalist in the United States in which he said:

For the first time in twenty-three years, I sense a fear that the government may be rotten at the core.

I wish to call Mr. Brandon's article to the attention of my colleagues and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I include it in the RECORD:

WHY THE MORALITY DISAPPEARED

(By Henry Brandon)

Every day brings new tawdry revelations about the moral and political corruption of President Nixon's re-election campaign and of the men who ran it. But the centre of the debate has now shifted to the President's own future. Can he salvage his own prestige? Can he prevent the disintegration of his own Administration? Can he stave off the kind of constitutional crisis that has already begun to undermine orderly government?

Americans are asking such questions. They are well aware of how much depends in this world on a well-functioning US government, and how much their own fate is involved. Profound worry is mixed with disbelief at the moral insensitivity of the men around the President; sadness goes hand-in-hand with a firm conviction that the full truth must be exposed to the light of day.

NIXON NOT POPULAR

Mr. Nixon is not a popular President. The residual sympathy he enjoys in this situation therefore does not go deep. But their basic patriotism and their own sense of security tend to make most Americans rally in support of the Presidency in a time of crisis. So far the President has not given them the explanation of his own innocence that they need. All they know at this moment is that he, his administration and, as a consequence, the United States is in deep trouble.

Every day that passes without the President setting public concern and suspicion at rest, will make it more difficult for him to recover public confidence. Some of his close friends have advised him not to await the indictments by the grand jury, as he has said publicly he is going to do, because he must know by now in his own heart, whom he still trusts and whom he can no longer trust.

Two prominent figures, evangelist Billy Graham and president-elect Chesterfield Smith of the American Bar Association, asked President Nixon to appoint an independent investigator. Several Republican members of Congress warned that unless the White House is cleaned out, support for the administration's programme in Congress and political support for Republicans in the next elections will be seriously damaged.

One American columnist, a lifelong friend and admirer of Mr. Nixon's, told me yesterday how sick at heart he is, how humiliated and ashamed he feels. He is now waiting impatiently for the President to act decisively and so restore his credibility, but he has begun to wonder whether Mr. Nixon may not still believe that he can bluff his way out of this sordid cul-de-sac. It was a *cri de coeur* from a once proud conservative and Republican.

Could it be that the President still adheres to the belief, that as he wrote in his book "Six Crises": "The man in political life must come to expect the smear and to know that, generally, the best thing to do about it is to ignore it—and hope that it will fade away."

There is widespread agreement now that, above all, the President must provide convincing proof that he had no knowledge of the Watergate bugging affairs and that he did not knowingly participate in the subsequent cover-up operation. He has also been asked in many quarters and, most specifically yesterday by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, to appoint an independent lawyer as a special prosecutor to conduct an independent investigation of the Watergate bugging case since the Department of Justice cannot be considered impartial and a conflict of interest exists.

PRESIDENTIAL NEGLIGENCE

There is no doubt that the proper judicial processes are being overtaken by investigative news reporters, but, to a large extent, this is due to President Nixon's own negligence. There were ample reasons for him to initiate the kind of investigation he started on March 21 much earlier and to confront his aides with the right questions sooner, but Mr. Nixon is known to loathe unpleasant personal confrontations. He has a habit of avoiding them and leaving them to his aides. Maybe when it came to confronting those he had trusted most—men like Haldeman (the White House chief of staff); Ehrlichman (the White House chief domestic adviser); and Dean (Pres. Nixon's counsel)—men whom he had used as his own instruments to confront others, he prevaricated for as long as possible.

The President should have been aware that rightly or wrongly, his integrity and his intellectual and moral honesty have always been considered his weak points, especially by the Opposition. It was obvious that in the current scandal these qualities would, justifiably again be placed in serious doubt because of the number of unanswered questions and the mounting evidence of wrongdoing.

Such questions are not asked out of spite by the Press, which has experienced so much abuse by the Nixon Administration, but to make the President in his isolation realise how far the doubts and suspicions among the public have gone.

Under the American constitution there is no "flexible response," to use a term of nuclear strategy, in dealing with presidential misconduct. It can either be ignored or he can be impeached by the House of Representatives and tried by the Senate—but there is no form of limited censure.

Although no evidence has so far come to light directly implicating the President, public opinion polls show that four out of every 10 Americans believe Mr. Nixon had prior knowledge of the Watergate affair. It proves that even as a president Mr. Nixon has not made an impression as a man of great principle or substantial character. It also proves that he is hurt personally by a crisis of confidence in himself and in his judgment. The men he chose to run his official household clearly were unsuited to be entrusted with such high responsibilities.

NIXON ADVISORS INEXPERIENCED

Nobody can quite understand how men on whom such powers were bestowed by the man who inspired such loyalty in them, could have gone astray in such a monumen-tally crass way. In contrast to most of the earlier White House scandals, in this case nobody is accused of having tried to line his own pockets. The crimes committed were all done to ensure Mr. Nixon's re-election.

The best explanation is that Mr. Nixon's entourage is almost devoid of men with political experience, a surprising choice by such a veteran politician as the President. He has surrounded himself instead with tough-minded managers and huckster-type public relations men. The power they wielded inspired little respect. They used it in what

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

many came to feel an autocratic manner to run the entire administration from a very few desks in the White House. The believed in the arrogance of power rather than in its fallibility. They were also contemptuous of politicians and therefore skeptical of that indefinable quality: the public appeal of public men. They were trained to have only confidence in the manipulation and the selling of politicians, not in their innate qualities, and they proved that anything goes when it came to ensure Mr. Nixon's and, in effect, their own, victory.

As a consequence, they had no feel for what is and what is not possible or permissible in politics. It made it hard for them to conceive the role of moral principles in politics and the restraints that exist in politics on deception and on the uses of unlimited funds. To enable them to deploy their power at will, Haldeman and Ehrlichman surrounded themselves with young men, equally cynical and unscrupulous and also without political experience. They were "doers," who would carry out their orders without questioning them. They were enthusiastic, rather efficient opportunists, who had no judgment of their own, who had never earned as much money as they did in the White House and so saw themselves as transmission belts of Presidential power.

They had little respect for the political system, for the game of politics, or for politicians and they treated members of Congress and the Cabinet accordingly. This also explains why the "palace guard" in this supreme crisis elicits so little sympathy anywhere.

During the election campaign, one cabinet member was given orders to attack George Meany, the labour leader, who was said to have made a disparaging remark about the President. He was given a prepared text for the attack and told where to deliver it. The cabinet member then got hold of Mr. Meany's speech and did not find it disparaging of the President. So he called one of the junior "palace guard" and told him that he had decided against making the speech. It did not take long for him to realise that he was being blackballed in various ways.

For a time, Mr. Nixon kept some of his friends among the political pros at his elbow. Men like Bryce Harlow, Robert Finch and Donald Rumsfeld all used to be close to the President. They would all have advised strongly against the conspiratorial approach to the election campaign. But they were gradually squeezed out by Haldeman and Ehrlichman until no politician was left in the White House who understood what it means in the old-fashioned way to pull political strings. A White House without politically experienced men is like a turbine without pressure gauges.

What further complicated relations within the "palace guard" was the rivalry that existed between Haldeman and the former Attorney General, John Mitchell, and their respective staffs. Each considered himself the principal power centre, but, at least on the surface, when Mitchell resigned last July, allegedly because he wanted to spend more time with his wife and daughter, Haldeman reigned supreme. Staff loyalties, however, continued to remain divided and the 34-year-old John Wesley Dean, an eager, hard-driving man with a boyish charm, who had been placed into the White House by Mitchell, remained loyal to his former boss.

JEB MAGRUDER ROLE

When the 38-year-old fresh-faced but rather insecure Jeb Stuart Magruder, a Haldeman protege, began to incriminate Mitchell and Dean as participants in the planning of the Watergate bugging operation Dean immediately warned that he would not be made a "scapegoat" and began pointing the finger at Magruder and Haldeman.

Magruder, who has experience in merchan-

dising cosmetics and women's hosiery, since then has privately explained that the only reason he decided to tell the prosecutors the truth was because President Nixon had asked all those involved to confess the truth. More accurately, though, it was after he had heard that an underling had begun to "sing" that he decided to tell his side of the story in his own defence. And so the floodgates which the "palace guard" had assumed were well bolted, were kicked open by a man whom Haldeman had counted among his most loyal and reliable colleagues.

It was from this point on that Haldeman and Ehrlichman—the true spear bearers in the "palace guard"—began to feel endangered. By now they have not only lost the loyalty of their own team, but they have aroused the ire of a, maybe naive, but honest, ex-mariner, the former acting FBI Director, Patrick Gray, whom they used to destroy two folders of documents which they considered too "hot" to keep in the White House. One of the documents included fabricated State Department cables designed to implicate the late President Kennedy in the 1963 political assassination of South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem. The other was a dossier on Senator Edward Kennedy and the Chappaquiddick accident. Gray, now in his righteous anger, is another loyalist willing to tell the truth to the prosecution.

It has been known before that the Watergate conspirators had also been involved in collecting a "dirty file" on Teddy Kennedy, just in case he got the presidential nomination, but it was news that they had gone as far as faking State Department cables to damage the Kennedy name.

Haldeman and Ehrlichman have now succeeded in persuading President Nixon to postpone any drastic steps, including their own resignations. They do not only have an extraordinary hold over the President, they are also his own last ditch defence. Much of his own ability to clear himself of all complicity may depend on them.

To a large extent, the functioning of the Nixon administration depends on these two men, such has been the concentration of the decision-making process, such has been Mr. Nixon's habit of delegating power. Even in the field of foreign affairs, Dr. Kissinger depends to some extent on Haldeman in clearing certain decisions that affect his own operation and the State Department or the Pentagon.

Haldeman dislikes the star quality Kissinger has acquired, dislikes the liberal friends he consorts with, and at times has let it be known that Kissinger's relations with the President have become strained; but he also recognised the extent to which the President depends on Kissinger and, in the end, that remained the decisive factor even for him.

Kissinger's reputation remains totally untainted by what happened at the other end of his corridor, where Haldeman has his office, and so is that of Treasury Secretary George Shultz and that of other members of the cabinet, with the exception of Attorney-General Kleindienst, who is likely to go, and when the President decides on a drastic house cleaning. But they all feel crippled by the fact that the President is crippled.

There is a gloom in the White House such as I have not seen it in all the 23 years I have been in this city. The great crises of the past electrified the atmosphere, created great tension, but there was always an inner confidence in the ultimate ability of the President to act and to govern. I remember an interview with President Johnson during the Tet offensive in Vietnam when he looked ashen and could hardly speak; I remember the extreme but quiet tension during the Cuban missile crisis; the despair during the McCarthy days in the early fifties and the determination to act after the invasion of South Korea. But I do not remember sensing

a fear that the government may be rotten at the core.

It is therefore high time that the President restored the sanctity of his office, offered solid proof of his innocence and restored the credibility of his administration. He must also clean out the Augean stables and surround himself with men who have a broader vision, a greater sense of morality and a better grasp of the American political system and what is expected of the President. It will not be easy to find these men in this situation.

It may be a hopeful sign that Mr. Nixon has now turned to an outside lawyer, the 70-year-old John J. Wilson, and entrusted him with the task of determining whether his principal aides are implicated in the scandal.

Two key figures, Patrick Gray and Jeb Magruder, resigned on Friday, but it is difficult to imagine that Dean and Erlichman—who handed Gray the two Kennedy folders to burn—are not directly implicated.

Following Gray's forced resignation, President Nixon immediately appointed William Ruckelshaus as the new (acting) head of the FBI—and for more reasons than that he has been up to now head of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Nixon now seems more isolated than ever before. Even though he flew off yesterday to inspect flood conditions in Mississippi as if he had nothing more serious on his mind, he cannot ignore, however much he may want to, that he himself is in danger of drowning.

MILITARY RANKS ATTRACT FEW BLACKS

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there are those who purport to be "liberal spokesmen" who oppose the All-Volunteer Force on the grounds that the draft is in the best interests of the poor and the black. Nothing could be further from the truth than this paternalistic argument. In the past, the proportion of blacks among draftees has always been greater than the proportion of blacks among enlistees. In addition, the ability to escape military service through deferments and medical exemptions has consistently been more readily available to the educated and affluent.

Under the draft, young men and their families were forced to serve at poverty level wages, while the defense dollar went to hardware, machinery, and pay increases for the senior grades. Today, the lower ranking enlisted man is given a fair salary, which allows him to support his family with a certain measure of dignity.

The real problem is not the continuation of the Presidential power to draft—it is the persistent lack of equal opportunity in the Armed Forces. Although some improvements have been made in recent years, minority group recruitment and advancement still lags badly. These topics were highlighted in a recent article entitled "Military Ranks Attract Few Blacks," and I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Chicago Tribune, April 29, 1973]

MILITARY RANKS ATTRACT FEW BLACKS

(By Robert Enstad)

A few years back, the best opportunity available to a young black with a college de-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gree was an Army career. This situation has changed as the Army and other branches of the military fight a losing battle with industry to attract educated blacks and other minority-group members to their ranks.

The blunt fact is that the armed services, which statistically look lily white, especially in the officer ranks just can't attract the minority-group people they would like. And the fear that an all-volunteer Army which became a reality on Jan. 1, would become a haven for America's minorities is not coming true.

"The minority community of this nation isn't banging the door to get in," said Lt. Col. Donald Williford, a black in charge of the Army's minority-officer procurement program. "Our biggest problem is one of awareness, of letting the minorities know that the Army is no longer World War II or Korea, that the Army is educationally oriented."

The story is the same for the Air Force, the Marines, and the Navy, which also are trying desperately to increase minority-group representation in their enlisted and officer ranks.

According to CWO John L. Beverley, the Navy's minority-programs officer for Illinois, the Navy is still fighting its old image of an institution that didn't accept blacks, which was true until 1942.

"Many blacks will question us and ask where their advancement will be in the Navy," said Beverley. "Our biggest problem is trying to erase that old image of segregation and discrimination, of blacks who served in the Navy being mostly cooks and stewards."

Minority participation in the armed forces as of last June 30 was roughly the same as their percentage or the nation's population. The figures were 87.2 per cent Caucasian, 11.1 per cent black, and 1.7 per cent from other minority groups.

However, most minority-group members were enlisted men, and the percentage of black enlisted men in the Army was several percentage points above their percentage of the total population.

Only a tiny fraction of officers were black. The Army led with 3.9 per cent of its officers, followed by the Air Force, 1.7 per cent; the Marines, 1.5 per cent; and the Navy, .9 per cent.

The Army figure reflected only a .7-per cent increase in black officers since 1964, a period in which the Army and the other military branches established special recruiting efforts to attract blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, Orientals, and American Indians.

Why have these efforts had so little success?

According to Williford and Maj. Lazelle E. Free and Lt. Alfredo Brown, both of the Army's 5th Recruiting District human-relations office, the Army's failure is caused by:

The requirement of a college degree to get into the Army's officer program.

Anti-Army attitudes that grew out of the Viet Nam war.

Peer-group pressure not to join the military.

Lack of prestige among blacks in being an Army officer. Many blacks "never think of themselves as wearing anything more than stripes in the Army," Brown said.

New opportunity in industry for educated blacks.

Why is it so important that the Army have more black officers? Seventeen per cent of the Army's enlisted personnel is black, and these men cannot find enough black officers with whom to relate.

"When you try to spread the minority officers among different parts of the Army you don't have enough," said Williford. "The enlisted man can't see enough of them to say, 'Hey, he has done something. I want to be like him.'"

Ironically, the Army's own higher standards for enlisted men are making it more

difficult to enlist minority-group members in those ranks. Starting this year the Army is recruiting only a small percentage of men without high school degrees and is being more strict about accepting young persons with minor police records. This means that such persons, who often are from minority groups, can no longer find an escape from their troubles and joblessness in the Army.

Said Lt. Col. Frank S. Westling, chief of staff of the Army's 5th Recruiting District:

"We used to allow recruiters to make phone checks of an applicant's police record. Now he must have some written proof. Repeated trouble with the law means he could be trouble for us. We want to avoid those people."

Westling and Lt. Col. James Clites, chief of recruiting for the 5th Recruiting District, believe the Army still has discrimination problems it must overcome if it is to attract more blacks. But they also believe the Army has made considerable progress at integration, and that this message hasn't gotten across to the black community. There are nine black Army generals, they point out.

"It is terribly important to us that the black go back to his community after his Army service and have good things to say about us," said Westling.

The one bright spot for military recruiters is that, while they are not doing as well as they like, they are doing much better than they were 10 or even 5 years ago in attracting minority-group members.

"Over-all, we are doing very well, considering where we were," said Beverley, the Navy recruiter. "As time goes on we will do much better."

PERCENTAGES OF GROUPS IN ARMED SERVICES

The following table shows how much minority-group participation there is in the armed services. The figures are for last June 30, the latest figures available from the Department of Defense.

These figures have changed somewhat, especially since the military has been cutting down on its strength since the end of the Vietnam war.

The category of "others" includes Spanish-speaking Americans, Orientals, and American Indians.

[In percent]	
TOTAL IN ALL BRANCHES OF THE MILITARY—	
Caucasians	87.2
Blacks	11.1
Others	1.7
ARMY ENLISTED MEN TOTAL—686,695	
Caucasians	81.9
Blacks	17.0
Others	1.1
ARMY OFFICERS TOTAL—121,290	
Caucasians	95.7
Blacks	3.9
Others	.4
NAVY ENLISTED MEN TOTAL—510,669	
Caucasians	89.0
Blacks	6.4
Others	4.6
NAVY OFFICERS TOTAL—73,155	
Caucasians	98.7
Blacks	.9
Others	.4
AIR FORCES ENLISTED MEN TOTAL—599,774	
Caucasians	86.6
Blacks	12.6
Others	.8
AIR FORCES OFFICERS TOTAL—121,674	
Caucasians	97.7
Blacks	1.7
Others	.6
MARINE CORPS ENLISTED MEN TOTAL—178,395	
Caucasians	86.1
Blacks	12.6
Others	1.3

MARINE CORPS OFFICERS TOTAL—19,542	
Caucasians	98.0
Blacks	1.5
Others	.5

SCIENTIFIC MERIT AND BIO-MEDICAL RESEARCH

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on other occasions I have addressed the administration proposals to reduce funding for biomedical research, both in the form of total funds available for grants and by eliminating National Institutes of Health research training grants. Another proposal has been offered by the administration, that while less obvious than budgetary reductions, deserves most serious consideration.

It has been proposed that the current grant system employed by the National Institutes of Health be replaced with a contract system, thus eliminating the primary function of the NIH "Peer Review System" that presently controls the awarding of research grants. A number of university-based medical research institutions and researchers have challenged these proposals, claiming that their result would be to significantly increase funding for industrial research projects without due regard to scientific merit.

One such critic is Dr. Jerome Gross, a professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School and a biologist at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. I would like to share with my fellow Members of Congress the views of Dr. Gross, who spoke before the hearings I held on proposed cuts in Federal medical programs on May 5, 1973, in Newton, Mass.:

COMMENTS OF JEROME GROSS, M.D.

As a member of the professional biomedical community I wish to comment on what I see as an increasingly destructive trend in the philosophy and procedures for federal funding of research, particularly basic research in the biomedical sciences.

To introduce myself, I am Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School and Biologist at the Massachusetts General Hospital. My major area of interest deals with the biological and biochemical mechanisms of growth and development which are involved in crippling birth defects, structural deformities resulting from chronic diseases and failure to heal properly, and the mechanisms of aging.

Regarding the cut-back in funds for biomedical research, it has been easy to accept the too obvious explanation that this particular area of governmental support is being treated uniformly like all others undergoing fund reduction. This argument might be acceptable if it weren't for the fact that the trend began at least seven years ago during the Johnson administration. Some of us became aware of increasing pressures to encourage contracts, targeted practical research, to cost account the benefits of research and to answer the question, "why can't we administer our research along the lines of the Department of Defense?" There were at that time trial balloons raised at the NIH, questioning the desirability of the Peer Review

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

System and tentatively proposing the use of "in house" administrative evaluations of quality and desirability by NIH staff scientists and administrators. In 1966 this hospital was visited by 3 paid industrial consultants to the National Institutes of Health for the purpose of seeing how our research capabilities might be coordinated with those sectors of the aerospace industry which would relate to biomedical research and development. We were told of the advantages of contract type research, of how the NIH Peer Review System really functioned on the basis of cronyism and special "in" privilege; ergo, why don't we get smart and administer our research more in line with industrial procedures.

I suggest that with the rapid increase in research funds and potential for industrialization of health-related research there has been strongly increased pressure to obtain a much larger share of public research money and control for industry. Under the present NIH granting mechanism one wonders how research proposals from industry would have fared in the competition with universities on the basis of scientific merit. Under a contract system with ad hoc reviewing committees or "in house" administrative decisions, industry can be assured of a far larger share of the funds regardless of scientific merit—and a larger hand in the decision making.

In order to make this shift in fund mechanisms, the easiest procedure is to cut back research grant applications in order to force university investigators to accept contracts. In addition, opposition is most effectively eliminated by removing the key staff members at DHEW and the NIH who might fight the shift in policies through their long established relationships with congressional committees, executive agencies and the outside scientific public.

What further evidence is there for the existence of such a "game plan"? Published figures from the NIH show a progressively increasing shift toward research contracts of large size. The National Cancer Institute and the National Heart and Lung Institute, both of which have been fattened in their appropriations are increasingly going the large contract direction. The rest of the National Institutes of Health, still primarily operating through research grants, have been seriously cut in their appropriations, the net effect of which will mean reduction in the work of the study sections and the redirection of grantees toward contracts. In this manner the standing committee type peer review system is being automatically attenuated and the industrialization of the universities being effectuated.

The open contention that scientific merit and quality should not have top priority in the evaluation procedure is a built in philosophic feature of these trends away from a continuing national competition for research funds. Loss of faith in the ethic of quality will doom science to mediocrity, lead to high cost technological developments such as respirator tanks for the treatment of polio and the loss of low cost highly creative laboratories, such as that of John Enders who solved the problem of polio via basic laboratory studies supported by shoe string research grants.

If it is not possible to alter this trend away from competitive research grants and toward large administratively awarded contracts we should at least try to play an important role in attempting to establish a peer review mechanism for contracts based on quality and competition.

It is a well known secret that the Office of Management and Budget has recently prepared a memorandum for discreet distribution to certain NIH officials recommending abolition of the study section peer review system and the substitution of mail reviewers who are not associated with the particular field of the application, i.e. not knowl-

edgeable. It is also strongly rumored that NIH committees are studying alternate plans for reviewing mechanisms. It is of vital importance that the NIH and interested congressmen receive serious impute from the outside with regard to the relative merits of the present Peer Review System and useful modifications. There certainly has been relatively little open debate and discussion of this vital subject now in the backwash of budget cuts.

LOUIS GOLDBLATT MERITS RETAILER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1973, Louis Goldblatt, president and chief executive officer of Goldblatt Bros., Inc., received the National Brand Names Retailer of the Year Award at the Annual Awards Banquet of the Brand Names Foundation.

The coveted Retailer of the Year Award denotes marketing of the finest quality and widely diversified general merchandise, as well as leadership in advertising and promotion, business relations, continuity of finest standards, employee training programs, community interest, and participation in civic and cultural affairs.

It is an award justly deserved by Goldblatt Bros., Inc., for the high standards—in policy and practice—maintained over the years by that company having served the best interests of the consumer by giving him, along with courteous and efficient services, access to high quality merchandise at costs affordable by the average American.

Mr. Speaker, Lou Goldblatt began his career in his father's tiny neighborhood dry goods store in Chicago and this original \$500 investment has been developed into a chainstore organization of 46 full-line department stores, located in four Midwest States, employing more than 10,000 people.

Lou Goldblatt is a distinguished American, and a humble and compassionate man. He has participated in every worthwhile endeavor in our community in order to help those who are in need of help. He is a great humanitarian who has always contributed generously to the betterment of the people of our community. He is an outstanding philanthropist who has been a strong supporter of such meritorious causes as cancer research, the cerebral palsy campaign, heart disease research, and other charities involving hospitals, clinics, rehabilitation centers, and medical research. Above all, he has never lost the common touch.

Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our heartiest congratulations to him, to his wonderful wife, and to the entire Goldblatt family for this well-deserved recognition. They have our best wishes for many years of good health and continuing fruitful service to the people of our great country.

MINNEAPOLIS' URBAN AMERICAN INDIAN CENTER

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last week ground was broken in Minneapolis for the \$2.5 million Urban American Indian Center.

This new facility, the first of its kind in the country, will provide a uniquely Indian cultural and social setting in which urban Indian people can deal with their own needs on their own terms.

The following article in the Model City Paper provides additional information about the new Indian Center.

The article follows:

URBAN AMERICAN INDIAN CENTER GROUND-BREAK MAY 10

Ground will be broken May 10 for the Urban American Indian Center at Bloomington and Franklin Avenues, former site of the Adams Elementary School.

The 40,000-square-foot social service, cultural and recreation complex geared toward the needs of the urban Indian will be financed with a \$2.5-million grant from the federal government, City of Minneapolis and Model City.

Actual construction will begin early this summer with completion projected for spring of 1974. Construction bids should be let around June 1.

Keynote speaker for ceremonies beginning at 2 p.m. is Don Cook, chairman of the Indian Center board of directors.

Representatives of the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development of the city and Model City will make brief remarks. There will also be an opening statement by Erv Sargent, coordinator of the center.

Leon Cook, chairman of the National Council of American Indians, members of the National Tribal Chairmen's Association and chairman of tribes throughout the Midwest have been invited.

The Indian Center is the first federally-funded project of its kind in the nation.

The structure's emphasis, that of a "common community pavilion," according to Jerry Johnson of the Partners, chief architects for the project, will be conveyed through the use of huge 1-by-6 foot hemlock beams in the ceiling.

The angular shape of the structure "came naturally," he said, given the site and building's planned uses. A full-sized fieldhouse that will accommodate everything from basketball to indoor tennis and baseball is set back on the site. It will have bleacher seating for 600.

Directly in front of the fieldhouse along Franklin Avenue, an open-air amphitheater will be located. Over 600 spectators can sit along its terraced sides and the ceremonial plaza will be large enough for 150 participants.

The western portion of the center doglegs out from the fieldhouse to blend with storefronts along Franklin Avenue. This wing will contain social services offices, an auditorium, central court-museum, library, small clinics and a guest house for visiting teams or lecturers.

Housed in the rear of the wing is a day care center for up to 60 children. It opens onto a courtyard, playspace and wading pool.

The center will also include a kitchen, lockers and meeting rooms.

The architects and board of directors have tried to incorporate as much natural material into the design and structure as possible, Johnson said. Most of the interior will be

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 17, 1973

skylighted, natural-finish wood siding will cover the exterior and sidewalks and ramps leading to the building wind around carefully existing trees.

Denby Deegan Associates of Bismarck, N.D., have been hired to lend an Indian motif to walls, floors and furnishings. Plans are being made to apply large Indian art abstractions to the exterior walls. Quarry tile, perhaps from Moose Lake, will be laid in the plaza floors.

Symbolic play equipment for the day care court is being designed "so the children will ask questions and learn about their heritage through the things they play with," said Johnson.

A pole, symbolic of a vertical Indian art object to be commissioned later, now stands before the building's scale model.

With the acquisition this year through Model City urban renewal money of additional open space east of the center, plans are being made to vacate 16th Avenue between Franklin and 19th Street to create a community mall for Indian events and fairs.

Two basketball courts, a volleyball court, small sand-lots and a 470-foot powwow ring will be developed and on open land.

APATHY IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is an economic fact of life that events in our automobile industry send shock waves throughout our entire economy. The Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States proudly proclaims that 1 out of every 6 employed persons works in the manufacture, distribution, maintenance, and commercial use of motor vehicles; 1 out of every 5 of the Nation's 311,464 wholesale establishments sell automotive products; and 1 out of every 4 retail dollars is for automotive-related purchases. The impact of the Big Four is so pervasive that one analyst of the industry has quipped—

When Detroit sneezes, the nation catches a cold.

It is in view of these facts that I am distressed to see the automakers reacting so lethargically to the demands of the marketplace. The strength of our economy is founded on the vitality arising from the interaction of supply and demand forces. But the management of the Big Four appears content to devise their own standards. The recent developments regarding compliance with the Clean Air Act clearly illustrate this tendency. We have also seen Detroit's apathy in its continuing insistence on promoting high-priced, overpowered, inefficient automobiles.

The National Academy of Sciences recently reported on the automakers' poor attempts to meet the requirements of air pollution controls. The report concluded, in part:

It is unfortunate that the automobile industry did not seriously undertake such a program on its own volition until it was subjected to governmental pressure. A relatively modest investment, over the past dec-

ade, in developmental programs related to emissions control could have procluced this crisis that now prevails in the industry and the nation.

The vitality of the American automobile industry depends on a responsive management. I am very concerned that the apathy of the Big Four will ultimately cost the jobs of thousands of workers, as the consumer begins to look elsewhere for his automobile. The editors of the Washington Post apparently share my concern. I would like to submit to the RECORD a copy of their editorial which appeared in yesterday morning's editions:

AUTO MAKERS AND BUSINESS CATASTROPHES

The recent improvement in American exports does not entirely allay the rising doubts about the competitive performance of American industry. A large part of the improvement is owed to agricultural exports. The record of the American automobile industry is particularly troubling. Up until 1968, the United States had always exported more motor vehicles and parts than it imported. But then things turned around and last year the country bought \$3.5 billion worth of vehicles and parts more than it sold. That amount alone is more than half of the country's entire trade deficit for 1972.

The automobile industry's difficulties seem to go deeper than the conventional accounting of costs and demand. Successful competition is a constant process of rapid adaptation to new circumstances. The industry's struggles with the Clean Air Act offer an example—a small one, to be sure, but telling—of the way that it currently operates. The combined engineering skill of these huge companies has not produced an engine that can adequately meet the original 1975 standards of the act, which was passed three years ago.

The best that they could devise was an attachment known as a catalytic converter, which neither they nor anyone else trusted. The industry and its critics agreed that it offered the prospect of high cost, low efficiency, difficult maintenance and dubious effectiveness. General Motors protested that if it were forced to go into production with the catalytic converter, it would risk a "business catastrophe." The episode is something less than a monument to American technological genius.

There are four engines that appear to have met the original 1975 standards. Two are Japanese, and two are German. Not only are the Europeans and Japanese adapting far more rapidly to world automobile markets than the American manufacturers, but they are adapting faster to our own domestic market. The two German engines are diesels, one of which, incidentally, is made by GM's subsidiary. It should be noted that no diesel is likely to meet the act's restrictive 1976 standards. The Japanese Mazda, with its rotary engine, has met the 1975 standard with a thermal purifying system that somewhat diminishes performance but seems to offer more hope. Still more hopeful, Honda has developed a stratified charge system that not only meets the 1975 standards but seems very likely to meet the 1976 standards as well. In contrast, there is no American engine that even meets the original 1975 requirements without the catalytic converter that, to GM, threatens a business catastrophe. Americans have to begin wondering whether the business catastrophe here does not go considerably beyond the narrow issue of exhaust purification.

Many American industries continue to demonstrate brilliantly their ability to compete worldwide. Aircraft, computers and various other kinds of advanced machinery are doing very well abroad. But the automobile industry is a large enough piece of our national economy that its successes and failures have meaning for us all. Fortune Maga-

zine has just published its annual list of 500 largest American industrial companies, and three of the top five are automobile companies. (The other two are Exxon and General Electric.)

Part of the American manufacturers' trouble arises, evidently, from their habit of putting extremely heavy engines in their cars. Efficiency is supposed to be one attribute of a good machine, but the recent gasoline mileage figures published by the Environmental Protection Agency show that in most weight classes the foreign imports tend to get significantly better mileage than American cars. In response, it might be argued that foreign manufacturers are designing their cars for markets where gas costs twice as much as it does here. But the American companies are making cars for a market in which both the government and the oil companies are now anxiously exhorting drivers to keep their tire pressure up and their speed down to avoid another kind of business catastrophe, a gasoline shortage this summer. The gasoline mileage of the average American car has dropped steadily in recent years.

American automobile makers usually react with hostility to the suggestion that they are producing the wrong kind of car. They keep saying that they are meeting the American consumers' taste. Meanwhile, of course, the level of imports keeps rising. The automobile industry is larger than ever, richer than ever, and central to American prosperity. But there is some grounds to suspect that it is a little less quick and flexible than it used to be, in responding to new challenges.

LISTEN WORLD

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, every year the Bowie-Crofton Optimists' Club conducts an oratorical contest, a praiseworthy event aimed at enriching the lives

of young people by giving them valuable experience in public speaking. This year's winner was James Stascavage, a 12-year-old resident of Bowie, Md., and a student at St. Pius School there.

I would like to share Jim's speech with my colleagues because it illustrates so well the balance of optimism and concern that is felt by the young people into whose hands we shall deliver this country. I insert Jim Stascavage's speech, entitled "Listen World," in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

LISTEN WORLD!

(By James Stascavage)

"Ya pays yer money and ya takes yer choice!" So the barkers at the carnival would yell to the people that they were trying to con. Well—at my age I don't have the money to pay, or, at least today, the choice to take. But that doesn't mean that I don't have likes or dislikes.

For example, I don't like some of the false advertising we have on TV, in the newspapers and in the magazines today. In many cases, this is just propaganda that is waiting for the unsuspecting public. Ads that say that there are tremendous sales on household items oftentimes furnish the people with broken cheap goods that have exorbitant price tags. I'm not saying that all ads are wrong.

Many are honest and true, and aid the public in deciding which are the right buys. But still, who can tell whether or not they will be the victims of a bait-and-switch deal. That is, they show a beautiful piece of furniture on TV at a very low price—but!—When you go there the same piece of furniture is run-down and faulty. The salesman then shows you another piece—beautiful—but about three times more expensive! Hearing ads on TV and seeing them in the paper, who knows which is the truth and which one picks his pocket? These con-men exist even in the small rural towns and can get away with almost anything.

But I have other things besides complaints. I like the way you're taking notice of the pollution problems and helping to support

ecology. I don't understand why you put up with people who still pollute our natural resources. I would be glad if we could go back to the Reconstruction Era just after the Civil War, but I guess that no one can stop economic development, not even you, World.

Pollution starts when factories try to compete with each other in the manufacturing of goods. They need electricity and take a good percent of it from the water in hydroelectric plants. The electricity is put to use in companies and corporations. But in many cases the owners of companies don't know where their wastes are going. Why don't you tell them World!

Many of our streams and lakes are cluttered with debris because some men were too greedy to worry about pollution. Lake Erie is so full of muck that lake trout, pike and pickerel die, float to the top and cause an organic pollution. People who bought homes on Lake Erie twenty years ago thought it would be a great recreation area. Then the companies moved in and turned it into one great big mess.

But the pollution in the water doesn't come from factories on land alone. Huge freighters and steamers leave big clumps of oil and waste floating in the oceans and lakes. Oil wells that float in the seas also leave their mementos to our age of civilization.

Praise is also due to your concern of the welfare of your people. Many poverty stricken children and adults die each day. But organizations such as Hope and Care help to save some of these people.

Poverty results when people have no money or valuables and no jobs to produce an income. With no income, their credit rating is zero and so are their chances of owning their own land and home. But when poor families get together they form a community called a ghetto. Organizations help, but while they can't completely eliminate poverty, they do get rid of a good part of it. With the help of people around the world, poverty will be a word of the past.

With these and other complaints and praises I give you credit for doing a very good job. You have your failures and your weaknesses, but you get straight A's in trying to keep yourself together for generations to come.

SENATE—Monday, May 21, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast brought us to the beginning of a new week, remind us of our heritage as a "Nation under God." If we have strayed from Thy precepts, bring us back to the faith of our fathers, that with clean hands and pure hearts we may serve Thee aright. O Thou whose judgments are true and righteous altogether, keep this Nation and its people under Thy higher law lest we become a law unto ourselves and perish. Help us to worship Thee and Thee alone lest we make idols of ourselves or yield to false deities. May Thy spirit brood over us and move amongst us that in these days of destiny we may make Thy ways our ways. Not in our own but in Thy strength and wisdom help us to serve Thee.

We pray in Thy Holy Name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1973.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STAFFORD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 29, 1973, Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with

amendments, on May 18, 1973, the bill (H.R. 7447) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 93-160) thereon, which was printed.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1973, the following reports of committees were submitted:

On May 18, 1973:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.R. 5293. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the Peace Corps (Rept. No. 93-161); and

H.R. 5610. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-162).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 514. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data (Rept. No. 93-163).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1201. A bill to amend the act of Octo-