

tion of the Federal user charges flowing into the aviation trust fund; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

211. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to observing Veterans' Day on November 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

212. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the assignment of students to particular public schools on account of race, religion, color or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

213. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to provide for selection and terms of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the U.S. mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

215. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to nursing homes for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

216. Also, memorial of the Legislature of

the State of Oklahoma, relative to adequate hospital, domiciliary, and clinical medical services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

217. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to providing that industries may not move operations to escape environmental protection legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

218. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to recycling metals and other materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

219. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to repealing Federal taxes on certain forms of wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

220. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to casino dealers' tip income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 7987. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Morales and his wife, Joyce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 7988. A bill for the relief of Rosalina B. Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSPADDEN:

H.R. 7989. A bill for the relief of Jim A. Egan and Violet A. Egan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7990. A bill for the relief of Denise Newell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7991. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Walker and Edna C. Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

217. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county legislature, Suffolk County, N.Y., relative to restoration of the operating budget of the Brookhaven National Laboratories Associated University, Inc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

218. Also, petition of Edward R. Garcia, Warren, Mich., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO BEN MARGINES

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend Mr. Ben Margines for his many years of outstanding service and leadership in religious, community, and political affairs in Los Angeles.

Ben Margines was born in Poland, emigrated to British occupied Palestine in 1934—where he served in the underground—and then emigrated from Israel to the United States, with his wife and son, in January 1961. He became a citizen of the United States in 1965.

Mr. Margines has been deeply involved in senior citizen activities, including the Senior Citizens Leadership Training program of the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation. He was commended by California Attorney General Evelle Younger for his participation in consumer protection programs for senior citizens and is currently serving as Treasurer of the Attorney General's Senior Citizen Consumer Committee. He is a member of the National Senior Citizens Club of Los Angeles County, Special Vice President for Senior Citizen Affairs of the West Hollywood Community Coordinating Council, has been active in the Wilshire Community Coordinating Council's senior citizen program, and is working with the Los Angeles Police Department in community crime prevention meetings for senior citizens.

Mr. Margines has provided significant leadership in the Jewish community. He has been a leader in the American Jewish Congress, is a past board member of the American Congress of Former Polish Jews, and is a member of the executive committee of the Jewish National Fund.

He has had a long-standing interest in opera, has performed for Israeli troops, and is a member of the Troopers and of the Opera Reading Club of Hollywood.

As a deputy Registrar of Voters in Los Angeles County, Mr. Margines has registered thousands of voters over the last 8 years—4,250 voters were registered by him in 1972 alone. His consuming interest in his adopted country has also manifested itself in assistance provided to immigrants in obtaining citizenship. As voluntary secretary of the Fairfax Adult School for citizenship classes, he has participated in, and been an honored guest at, the biennial "Salute to New Americans" for new citizens in the city and county of Los Angeles over the last 8 years and can be justly proud of his personal contribution to the realization of this goal for many.

There have been a number of political candidates both locally and nationally whose campaigns have benefited from the contributed talents of Ben Margines. His interest and his activities in this field have been directed to candidates in both major political parties. This typifies his dedication to the all-important goal of electing to public offices those individuals he feels will best represent all citizens of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Margines is a humanitarian of the highest order and I consider it a privilege to call him my friend.

SECURITIES LEGISLATION

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, this session of Congress may see the introduction

of more securities legislation than at any time since the 1930's. Committees of both Houses of Congress have recently finished detailed reports offering a long list of legislative recommendations on the most important economic and regulatory problems facing the industry. In fact, consideration of this legislation is already underway.

I anticipate that every investor and every securities firm, no matter how large or small, will be touched in some way by the changes brought about by this legislation. Accordingly, I want to take this opportunity to note the efforts of one segment of the brokerage community—the independent broker-dealers—to bring their views on this important legislation to the attention of the Congress. They are just as concerned about and as knowledgeable on the effects of this legislation on the individual investor as are the industry's giants.

Perhaps the role of these firms in this Nation's delicate capital formation process is not as well known as it should be. The independent broker-dealers are firms engaged in the securities business, who, by virtue of their size, fall into the category of small businessmen. They face all the problems of any small businessman and a number of problems that others do not face as well.

Recently, a group of these small firms presented their views on some of the difficulties of the day-to-day business for a small brokerage firm to a joint meeting of the Senate and House Select Committees on Small Business. In addition, Mr. Raymond W. Cocchi has also written to Chairman BIBLE of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business detailing some of the many problems faced by small broker-dealers, and I want to include his letter in the RECORD. Mr. Cocchi has important things to say about the future of securities regulation and its effect on the small businessman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that Mr. Cocchi's letter to Senator Bible be printed in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 4, 1973.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of December 18, 1972, I am pleased to transmit our reaction regarding the SEC's December 27, 1971 presentation mentioned in the Securities Subsection of the 22nd Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate.

As you know, my letter of June 9, 1971 brought to your attention our increasing concern that small businessmen in the securities industry are being overlooked and forgotten in the various proceedings going on in other committees of Congress and before the Securities and Exchange Commission. It pointed out statements made by the chairman of our nation's largest brokerage firm, calling for a speed-up of the process of survival of those most fit. It pointed out our nation's strong tradition of fostering small business as evidenced by the Small Business Administration, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the McGuire Fair Trade Act, the Small Business Investment Company Act, and numerous other Congressional safeguards established for small business. It pointed out that three-fourths of the NASD's 4,470 member firms fall in the category of small business. We asked your Committee to undertake hearings in these areas to develop a record which might be the basis for either regulatory or legislative provisions which would protect the more than 3,000 small businessmen in the securities industry.

Our delay responding bears explanation. The explanation could best be put by quoting SEC Chairman Casey in his February, 1972 transmittal to the Congress of the SEC's "Study of Unsafe and Unsound Practices". He appropriately stated:

"The problem faced by those responsible can perhaps best be appreciated by going to Tolstoy's War and Peace. Of Kutuzov, the Russian commander facing Napoleon before Moscow, Tolstoy wrote:

"The commander-in-chief is always in the midst of a series of shifting events and so he never can at any moment consider the whole import of an event that is occurring. Moment by moment the event is imperceptibly shaping itself, and at every moment of this continuous, uninterrupted shaping of events the commander-in-chief is in the midst of a most complex play of intrigues, worries, contingencies, authorities, projects, counsels, threats and deceptions, and is continually obliged to reply to innumerable questions addressed to him, which constantly conflict with one another.

"... (A) commander-in-chief, especially at a difficult moment, has always before him not one proposal but dozens simultaneously. And all these proposals, based on strategies and tactics, contradict one another. A commander-in-chief's business, it would seem, is simply to choose one of these projects. But even that he cannot do. Events and time do not wait.

"An order (to retreat) must be given to (the adjutant) at once, that instant. And the order to retreat carries us past the turn to the Kaluga road. And after the adjutant comes the commissary-general asking where the stores are to be taken and the chief of the hospitals asks where the wounded are to go, and a courier from Petersburg brings a letter from the sovereign which does not admit of the possibility of abandoning Moscow, and the commander-in-chief's rival, the man who is undermining him (and there are al-

ways not merely one but several such), presents a new project diametrically opposed to that of turning to the Kaluga road, and the commander-in-chief himself needs sleep and refreshment to maintain his energy, and a respectable general who has been overlooked in the distribution of rewards comes to complain, and the inhabitants in the district pray to be defended, and an officer sent to inspect the locality comes in and gives a report quite contrary to what was said by the officer previously sent . . ."

In the SEC's December 27, 1971 presentation Mr. Loomis points out the events leading to an industry crisis which eventually led to the creation by the Congress of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation. It is at this point that a fundamental difference of opinion develops between small securities firms and The Securities Exchange Commission. The SEC has told us time and again that they are only carrying out the mandate for reform called for by the Congress upon the passage of the Securities Investor Protection Act. It is our view that the SEC has over-reacted and an "over-kill" situation has occurred.

Small businessmen in the securities industry have been inundated with new, highly restrictive, complicated, and nearly incomprehensible rules and regulations. New requirements calling for daily, weekly, and monthly complicated mathematical computations, coupled with monthly, quarterly and annual newly-developed forms, have placed an unimaginable strain on small businessmen. New interpretations of long-standing industry rules and regulations, coupled with many administrative and legislative proposals now pending, will cause the demise of more small businesses.

Worse, yet, thousands, maybe even millions, of our nation's thirty million investors have become "orphaned" due to the fewer number of securities firms now in existence. Most of the firms remaining no longer can profitably serve small public investors.

At times the regulators seem to suffer to some extent from a bad case of tunnel vision—all they can see is so-called "investor protection" in terms of their own regulatory responsibilities but fall adequately to take into account the very serious situation of depriving small public investors access to the market place.

Historically, independent broker/dealers have engaged in the distribution of securities to individual small investors. Many provide regional and local securities facilities by maintaining primary or branch office locations in areas throughout the country where there are not branch offices of large broad-based New York City firms. Many participate in underwritings managed by other firms; many retail listed securities; many retail unlisted securities; many retail mutual fund shares; many maintain markets in active and inactive local securities; and many raise capital for new or small businesses.

To keep pace with rising overhead costs and the threat of lower commission rates many of our members are turning to new sources of income, most of which, however, tend to exclude individual investors from participating. They have developed expertise in originating underwritings. New and unseasoned issues, however, are not normally considered suitable for the small, unsophisticated and less affluent individual investor. They have developed professional skills in the distribution of tax shelter programs. These programs, too, are often considered unsuitable for the lower tax bracketed individual investor. Out of frustration, some have sought the unregulated havens of private placements, exempt transactions, unregulated commodities and options, and many other financial areas where the potential buyer by necessity must be highly sophisticated and affluent.

In a free enterprise society, independent broker/dealers are no different from anyone else. They tend to spend the precious hours, days, weeks and months of their earning lifetimes doing those things which are more productive and bring the highest return pound for pound for the effort expended. The small investor, however, is suffering.

Mr. Loomis pointed out the need for a strengthened basic capital structure of the brokerage industry and referred to the then pending proposed amendment to Rule 15c3-1 which, if adopted, would meaningfully increase the capital requirements of broker/dealers.

That Rule was adopted and put into effect many months ago, with a resultant capital increase of 400% required of general securities firms. Coupled with the requirements of Rule 17a-11, for practical purposes, it effectively brought the increase to 500%.

On December 5, 1972, in Release #9891, the SEC set forth a 32-page "Notice of Proposal to Amend Rule 15c3-1", which proposes to substantially revise the net capital requirements of securities firms.

This proposal comes at a time when the securities industry is attempting to interpret Rule 15c3-3, considered to be the most far-reaching and highly-complicated requirement ever to hit the securities industry, which takes effect on January 15, 1973.

Referring back to Chairman Casey's remarks in the SEC's "Study of Unsafe and Unsound Practices", he said.

"In developing and evaluating protective measures, we have been mindful that we are dealing with a moving situation. Some forms of protection useful now may become unnecessary as others are developed. For example, the Net Capital Rule (15c3-1) is and has from the beginning been primary protection against financial irresponsibility of brokers. When the proposed rules for segregating customers' cash balances and establishing reserves for unsegregated securities have been fully implemented (15c3-3) and have proven their ability to protect customers' funds, the net capital rule may become less important."

In other words, if the SEC has already meaningfully increased net capital requirements and has already adopted measures for the protection of customers' cash and securities, why then should there be a major overhaul of net capital requirements at this time without allowing reasonable time to determine whether there is a need for a further strengthening of the Net Capital Rule or whether there is a need for any Net Capital Rule at all.

Mr. Loomis further pointed out the Commission's non-objections to the Exchange's new rate proposal conditioned on the Exchange providing for a 40% discount from non-member rates for brokers who are non-members of the Exchange and have heretofore not had economic access to it. We are grateful to the Commission for its thoughtfulness in taking into account the interests of non-Exchange members.

I wish to point out, however, that on April 27, 1968 under SEC, Justice Department, and Congressional pressure the New York Stock Exchange Board of Governors reversed its policy and decided to:

1. recommend to its members the abolition of "customer directed give-ups"—until that date they had strongly argued for the continuance of such practices.
2. institute volume discounts and commission rates for large institutional type orders.

3. provide limited economic access to the Exchange for non-member broker/dealers.

Item one, referred to above, by itself would deprive non-member broker/dealers of substantial income. Item two would result in little or no impact on smaller non-Exchange members. Item three, however, coupled with Item one would tend to lessen to a great ex-

tent the loss of income non-Exchange members would suffer.

Under continuing pressure by the above-mentioned agencies:

1. "customer directed give-ups" became unlawful on December 5, 1968.
2. volume discounts were instituted on December 5, 1968.
3. non-member access, apparently of much lesser significance to the SEC, Justice Department, and the Congress, was allowed to be "studied" by the Exchange and was not instituted until March, 1972—nearly three and one-half years later!

These statements, in response to the SEC's December 27, 1971 presentation, are made in a spirit of cooperation and are not intended to be overly critical of the SEC. We feel it our responsibility, however, to make known just as candidly and straightforward a fashion as possible, some of the frustrations and problems of small securities firms as we see them.

We were encouraged when the "Securities Study Group of the Federal Bar Association Small Business Committee" in its recently-completed study entitled, "Fundamental Problems of Small Initial Securities Offerings", concluded in part:

"... the Committee requests that the Securities and Exchange Commission carefully consider the role regional investment firms play in financing small businesses. As indicated earlier, national banking firms are most reluctant to concern themselves with this sector or our economy. Therefore, any action which weakens the regional firms' network impairs the ability of small business to raise capital."

We were further encouraged when William McChesney Martin, in his highly publicized report to the New York Stock Exchange Board of Governors, saw fit to conclude:

"The role of the small brokerage firm, should not be overlooked. It has contributed to the health and strength of the economy, by raising capital to finance new ventures, and by serving the needs of small investors scattered across the nation. In short, by broadening economic opportunity. In the course of the many changes, which will inevitably take place in the securities industry, care should be taken not to cause the elimination of efficient, small firms."

Mr. Loomis, himself, states in his letter: "We realize that these small independent business entities make a vital contribution to our national economy and, in so far as possible, we seek to assist and encourage them".

Whatever the real intent of those who regulate our industry, it seems at times that they are determined to drive all but the large out of the securities business.

The head of an IBDA San Francisco investment firm, who until recently held a high position in the National Association of Securities Dealers, stated in a recent speech:

"Nobody can deny that the securities industry requires regulation to insure solvency, honesty and fair treatment of the investing public. Additionally, a primary purpose of regulation is to strengthen the industry's economic function. The critical dilemma is how to keep the hand that helps and protects from strangling us in the process."

The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce House of Representatives will hold hearings in the 93rd Congress on its "Legislative Recommendations of Proposed Securities Act Amendments of 1973". These hearings could do much to solve some of the above-mentioned problems we are experiencing, such as establishing Uniform Reporting Requirements. Other aspects of the Proposal, however, call for greater industry financial and operational responsibilities—more than those already adopted by the SEC to date.

On February 12, 1973 the SEC will com-

mence public hearings on its recently-completed study of the "potential economic impact of the repeal of Section 22(d) of the Investment Company Act of 1940". Our members are deeply disturbed with certain statements made by SEC Chairman Casey in his letter transmitting the study to Senator John Sparkman, Chairman of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, a copy of which is attached. Of particular concern, on pages four and five of his letter he states:

"The impact of the cost-saving that investors would realize from the repeal of Section 22(d) would fall almost entirely on the independent broker/dealers who made three-fourths of all load fund sales in 1970 and who during that year derived gross revenues of \$150 million from this source."

He describes a group of broker dealer firms whose business consists almost entirely of selling mutual fund shares and who represent about 13% of the broker dealer community. He goes on to say, in reference to this group:

"It should be noted that the mutual fund industry is far more important to these firms than they are to it".

With all respect due to Chairman Casey, I leave the track and must say that this statement seems to be inconsistent with the broad national policy established by our federal government to protect small business. It would seem to me that the SEC has no authority, within the broad policy goal of Congress, to simply write off a portion of the small business segment of the securities industry.

We are desperately in need of your help and I hope this response to the SEC presentation and some of the current matters raised in this letter will be of help. I am looking forward to arranging the oral presentation by our small business liaison committee and have, as of this date, taken steps in that regard in accordance with the thoughtful suggestion contained in your December 18, 1972 letter.

Your interest and concern is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND W. COCCHI,
President, IBDA.

THE PROBE MUST GO ON

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and thoughtful journalists in this country, Harry Hamm, editor of the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register, has summarized the case for full disclosure of the Watergate scandal and related events more succinctly and more clearly than any other editorial that has come to my attention. This article, which is quoted below, merits the attention of my congressional colleagues, regardless of their political persuasions.

THE PROBE MUST GO ON!

Now come those who would have the press suddenly cease and desist in its reporting and commentary on Watergate. It has been suggested that the office of the Presidency will be harmed if the sordid revelations aren't soon spiked. President Nixon himself has said it is time to go back to business as usual.

Surely the President knows that this is not possible until the whole truth is known. This is no minor political scandal involving a lowly public official caught with his hand in the till. Even now it is clear that Water-

gate represents a profound abuse of presidential power. That is what should concern the American people.

A congressional inquiry into the Watergate matter will open this week and hopefully with the full cooperation of the White House. If there is any hedging under the lame excuse of "executive privilege" President Nixon's claim of no personal involvement will be further damaged and possibly beyond repair.

Let us reject here and now the notion that the institution of the presidency is under attack in the Watergate case. It is the conduct of the presidency that is in question. Regardless of whether President Nixon had any personal ties with Watergate or in efforts to cover up, it was the President who personally built the apparatus around him which now stands accused of gross misconduct and evil deeds.

There is mounting evidence that the closest associates and political advisers of President Nixon did plan the bugging of the Watergate offices of the Democrat Party as well as other illicit acts of political espionage.

Add to this the indictment now of two former members of the Administration's Cabinet, including the man who headed the President's re-election campaign until two weeks after the Watergate break-in, and the campaign's chief fund raiser. They were charged with conspiring to arrange a secret \$200,000 contribution to the election effort. And tied to this same dealing is the President's brother and President's personal attorney, accused of pressuring shady businessmen and organized pressure groups for large sums of money, preferably in cash.

Startled we are when it is learned that the President ordered John Ehrlichman to conduct a secret White House investigation of Daniel Ellsberg—independent of the Justice Department.

And then it is disclosed that the secret investigation carried out by two Watergate felons resulted in the burglary of the files of Mr. Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

But that is not all! We are told that John Ehrlichman last month summoned the judge in the Ellsberg case to the Western White House to tell him he was being considered for a high position. During the visit it is said the judge talked to President Nixon. As for the job offer, we are told it was the directorship of the FBI, one of the most coveted posts in our country.

How can anyone condone such conduct? How can anyone argue that the American people have no right to know of these shocking events?

We agree there must be no "whitewash" at the White House.

Only the whole truth will suffice, aired in public to all the people, not in statements made behind closed doors to grand juries or special investigators, where we cannot hear for ourselves what the facts are. Failure to come forward now will only further erode the people's confidence in the office of the Presidency.

And let it be a sober reminder to all that this game of politics is no game at all. It is the central thread in the achievements and failures of man. And how we weave that thread might well determine whether we'll survive as a free nation dedicated to individual liberty and devoted to the pursuit of happiness for all people and not only for a "palace guard" of political strongarm experts.

RETIREMENT OF JIM FARLEY

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a friend of the Senate and of many mem-

bers of this body, Mr. James A. Farley, recently retired as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. and was appointed honorary chairman in which capacity he will continue his distinguished service to the company.

Jim Farley, onetime national chairman of the Democratic Party, Postmaster General, and adviser to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has devoted his life and talents to outstanding public service, and I congratulate him on his retirement and I wish him every future success and happiness in his new position.

There appeared in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution of Sunday, May 13, a very fine editorial saluting Jim Farley, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objections, the editorial was ordered to be printed as follows:

MR. FARLEY RETIRES

James A. Farley is one of the distinguished figures of recent American history.

He was a mentor of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He had as much or more to do with making Mr. Roosevelt president as Mr. Roosevelt himself.

President Roosevelt discarded Mr. Farley when he ran for his third term. It was an act of ingratitude which Mr. Farley took like the gentleman he is.

What Mr. Roosevelt lost, American business gained. Mr. Farley went with Coca-Cola Export when Coca-Cola was as rare abroad as are dukes and duchesses here. The success of Coke's export program is too successful to need retelling.

Now Mr. Farley has retired as chairman of the Export Corporation and become its honorary chairman, an appropriate title for a man whose career has been marked by honor.

His has been a fine career in public life and private business and one which has won him the friendship and respect of much of the world.

AGAINST THE VITAMIN BILL—NEW YORK TIMES TAKEN TO TASK FOR EDITORIALIZING IN NEWS COLUMNS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a certified social worker and psychotherapist in New York City speaks for itself:

New York, N.Y.,
May 14, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: I read today in the New York Times a highly slanted article by Richard Lyons covering legislation to block the final FDA order which pertains to vitamins, minerals and other supplements.

Mr. Lyons attempts to portray supporters of your bill as faddists and crackpots. He fails to inform his readers that many experts in nutrition have been critical of the FDA order. He also fails to inform his readers that the FDA order would ban completely a number of harmless food supplements other than vitamins and minerals.

I am a practicing psychotherapist specializing in problems of drug abuse and addiction. I am currently working for a private agency whose clientele consists exclusively of people who have problems with drugs.

More than half of our patients are heroin addicts.

About two years ago I decided to interest my patients in nutrition. Some of them resisted my efforts, others gave it a try. Roughly 60% of my patients changed their way of eating. In addition to abandoning "junk foods" the majority of my patients learned how to balance their diets. They also learned how to intelligently take vitamins, minerals and other supplements. In a few instances remarkable positive results were achieved in a very short period of time.

When people stop using heroin or barbiturates or amphetamines after long time usage, they often suffer from depression and/or anxiety, have insomnia and generally do not feel capable of coping with life tasks such as working at a job. They are capable however of changing their eating habits when it is stressed to them that this is an important priority. After a relatively short period of time they feel better and look better. It is an important ego boost for them when they realize that they are responsible for the improvement in their well-being.

Without going into lengthy details, I would like to state categorically that if the FDA order is permitted to stand, this kind of rehabilitation will be impossible in the future. I have a number of patients who are too poor to seek a doctor for prescriptions for vitamins, minerals and other supplements. Other patients have difficulty swallowing pills and could not take many pills of low potency. (I consider some of the maximum RDA's proposed by the FDA to be of low potency*). Those on welfare would have difficulty filling Medicaid prescriptions since many drug stores in New York City refuse to accept Medicaid prescriptions for vitamins.

I hope that your efforts in passing H.R. 643 will meet with success.

Cordially,

DAVID WOLYNSKI.

P.S. Do you mind if I send a copy of this letter to other Members of Congress?

FROEHLKE'S DEPARTURE FROM OFFICE AS SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is with sincere regret that I speak on the occasion of Mr. Robert Froehle's departure from office as Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Froehle has seen the Army move through some difficult times. He expertly supervised the departure from Vietnam. He was responsible for returning from Vietnam millions of dollars worth of equipment needed by our Armed Forces at home and elsewhere in the world. He also vigorously and successfully supported programs which recruited and promoted outstanding military and civilian personnel that form the hard-hitting management team running the Army today.

In addition, he developed clearer lines of policy and fiscal control over the Department's intelligence resources, which had the added benefit of improving communications among all Defense Depart-

*I refer particularly to vitamin C.

ment intelligence agencies. Success with programs—programs which saved the taxpayers money, which rationalized procedures, and conserved manpower resources—are only a part of Bob Froehle's success as Secretary of the Army.

Mr. President, he did more than put imaginative programs into operation in the department he headed. There is no doubt that he also breathed a new spirit into it as well. Because of that spirit of concern for people and their job satisfaction at every level of the Army—particularly the unit level—the Army of today has a renewed pride and sense of mission. Very importantly, it has gained greater respect from the American people.

Mr. Froehle will have this Nation's respect for his great service to America and to the Army during these trying times of need. This Nation needs more Robert Froehles. As long as we are able to place such men in positions of responsibility in our Defense Department, this Nation will be safe and democracy will endure.

Mr. President, upon the departure of Secretary Froehle, he delivered some heart-warming remarks at a farewell ceremony at Fort Myer, Va., on May 10, 1973, which reflect the deep and human feelings of a great leader. I ask unanimous consent for his speech to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ROBERT F. FROEHLKE

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

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

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

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

It is also customary for him who departs to express in a few well polished phrases what he thinks, "in all humility," he has accomplished and how much, nevertheless, still remains to be done by his successors. I do not believe it behooves a man—even with that nice saving qualifier "in all humility"—to speak of his own achievements. History and our peers will judge what each of us has really accomplished. Let not the individual himself try to assume the role of arbiter. He is too close to himself to be objective. How painful for his listeners to hear

him embarrassingly strive to hold the "appropriate" medium line between self-congratulating pride and self-doubting modesty. And yet, I am sufficiently human to take great satisfaction in what I perceive the Army has accomplished during my tenure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

While I pray that the call to arms will

never actually come. I also pray, trust and believe that, should it come, this Army of ours will be quietly ready in body and spirit.

Nancy and I leave you with perhaps a tear in our eye, but definitely sincere and hearty smiles on our faces. We refuse to think that we are leaving good friends. Rather, we thank the good Lord that we have had this opportunity during this completed chapter of our lives to make many new friends.

THE PLIGHT OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to work with the Delaware Committee on Soviet Jewry in connection with the plight of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. While engaged in this effort, a letter came to my attention that had been smuggled out of the Soviet Union. Since it outlines in significant and woeful detail the problems associated with being a member of a minority group within the U.S.S.R., I insert it in the RECORD so that it will be brought to the attention of my colleagues:

Moscow, U.S.S.R.,

April 14, 1973.

My DEAR SHEILA AND IRA: We're very glad for your concern. We are very touched and grateful for everything you did for us. American Jews are the right people. American Jews are our only hope and pride. And we understood it very well when we met you.

Human imagination is limited. When one is refused an exit visa one does not return to one's former life but to an existence so strange that it is very difficult to visualize from outside. The circumstances which condition the way of life the peculiar ghetto of "refusants" are created not so much by the official authorities as by ordinary people and begin long before the application for visa. It begins with one's family (sic) and continues with one's colleagues, one's neighbours, the house-manager, the yard-keeper, shop assistants and passers-by. All the petty spites and envies which had long slumbered in the souls of these ordinary representatives of mankind don't have to be concealed any more. They get to be things to be proud of, being directed against one who has sold himself to foreign imperialists.

Such eminently desirable things as one's neighbour's job, his apartment, his scientific ideas are suddenly felt to be within one's grasp when the neighbour applies for a visa. And the desire for them which had always been felt as somehow unheroic acquires now a special political coloring and is not sanctified as part of the fight against the awful meane of Zionism. A clerk ousting his colleague by intrigue, or a hoodlum assaulting a Jew in the street—become brave fighters in the ideological war against a person who, after all, has not done any wrong by official standards. (sic) He is just reuniting with his relatives—officially, there is no other kind of emigration.

For all that the applicant can be sure that not one of his persecutors really believes what they tell him about the terrors at the capitalist hell. Being people with a well-developed appetite for material goods, they really envy him as one who may get a chance to enjoy the legendary opulence of foreign parts. It is this feeling together with their hidden annoyance at their own faint-

heartedness (in front of any authority, in front of any sort of official or unofficial superiors, tremulous obedience all their wishes, expressed, hinted or guessed—it is envy they feel), that serves to make their indignation at the right of people overstepping all the sacred boundaries that serves to make their indignation so intense.

Let us take a look at the holy of holies of the Soviet Society, the so called collective. This word designates any group of people gathered (usually involuntarily together) and passing together for any purpose for some part of their time. Common flat with one toilet for several families is a collective as is an office or a hockey team. From a kinder-garten to the Politbureau—the country consists of collectives.

One of the deadly sins often imputed to this person that is "setting himself above the collective" while a collective usually has no autonomy and no definite sphere of competence, it is held to be responsible for the behavior of its members. When a person commits the atrocious act of applying for a visa the collective does not have to wait for directives from above. As often as not after expressing its indignation, it suggests some form of reprisals and then asks for permission to carry them out. In such cases there is always something to gain as well as to fear. The renegade's room, his job, the work he had done—all these are to be divided. So, the reaction of the collective is a loud concert of mixed fear, envy and greed all posing as patriotic zeal. The unusually decent people distinguish themselves by being silent. If they are Jewish or half-Jewish, this is really bold of them since the question "who's the next" has been formed already in everyone's mind.

In Spring, 1972, a book on tissue transplantation was accepted for publication. It was the result of several years' work Dr. Edward Shifrin, a surgeon, 31 years old. Out of the 5 chapters of the book 4 have been written by Shifrin and the remaining one by his collaborator. Two other and high ranking names had to be included for the book to be published, and so it had four names on its title-page. The agreement on the publication of the book was signed on March 10, 1972. On April the 4, Shifrin applied for a visa. On April the 20th the two nominal and high-ranking co-authors told the publishing house that having obtained new data which is to change some fundamental concepts of the book they want to cancel the agreement. And canceled it was, although such data in such a field the venerable authors could hardly obtain in a month, even if they had had the time to read the book. As a matter of fact, they had not. What had Shifrin's colleagues to say on that? The collective of scientists of the Transplantation Institute was unanimously outraged by the shameless behaviour of Edward Shifrin who had "forgot what motherland means". Now when the book appears there will be one name less on the title-page.

One more example. The name of script-writer Veniamin Gorokhov has been erased from captions of his film when his desire to leave the country became known. (Just in case the producer's name was also erased. He had never shown any intention to leave, but his name was Galanter and sounded suspicious). Needless to say that the collective of the Union of Cinema Workers unanimously denounced Gorokhov and suggested his expulsion from the Union. What do they hope to gain? Well, cinema workers are besides in the "ideology front" and special zeal is a great asset to their careers. Gorokhov is an able man, his work had received some prizes abroad, and that is rather like setting himself the collective.

By these cases I have tried to exemplify the moral climate to which one has to return when refused a visa. (I don't mention about their difficulties). This may explain to you, dear Ira and Sheila, why the refusants, who

are people of very different backgrounds, tastes and views hold so close together. It may also explain why a person thinks not twice but many times before applying. But in some cases, it may explain why he applies at all.

Dear Ira and Sheila, you may use my letter in every possible way. This letter is written without censorship. You can send over every correspondence for me using this channel. My address will be written on the envelope you receive. This is a very safe and tested channel. I have finished my monograph (a big book) "Two-phase flows in chemical engineering". I am going to publish it abroad. It is my only hope to gain money in my very straitened circumstances. My pension is the very way to send myself and my family to the grave. Nevertheless I understand things very well and look danger in the face. In my status there is nothing to lose. American Jews always made "noise" about Russian Jews. It is very, very important for us! My writings will support this situation. Thanks to the fact that Americans struggle for us I can write you this letter. The authorities have now prepared a "nice" place in prison for me but they couldn't realize their "Good intention"—the international Jewish movement is a rock against it, every anti-Semite enterprise will smash to smithereens.

Once more, I am much obliged for your concern, dear Ira and Sheila!

With love

YOUR DAVID AZBEL.

WHAT ABOUT THE MIA'S

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, now that the initial jubilation over the return of our prisoners of war from Vietnam has subsided, I feel compelled to comment that for the families of over 1,300 who served in the war in Vietnam there is yet no jubilation, no peace of mind, and no answer to their questions of "Where are our loved ones?"

I speak, of course, of the families of those who were officially listed as missing in action. My concern for these brave Americans was heightened by a recent letter from one of my constituents. I believe her letter can jar us all back to the reality of war and the job that remains unfinished.

I call on my colleagues and all Americans to remember the missing in action, and I caution those who worked so hard for the release of the POW's not to be satisfied with the job they have done until all MIA's are also accounted for—because for the families of these men, the war goes on and there is not yet complete "peace with honor."

I submit the letter for the RECORD:

CHESTERTON, IND.

DEAR SIR: I have but one urgent request to make of you at this time. Please do not forget our over-3,000 men still "missing-in-action." The knowledge of what has happened to these men should top every other priority. Are they dead? Is there a glimmer of a chance that even a few have survived? Where are they? I urge you to speak out on their behalf and for the sake of their waiting families. Please do not let the Watergate

affair—tragic as it is—overshadow these Americans lost in behalf of their country.

Help them please. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JUDITH M. RAY.

REVISED SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I presented remarks to the Senate Committee on Finance, which has been holding hearings on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's recently revised Social Services Regulations. I include this statement to be inserted in the RECORD.

NEW SOCIAL SERVICE REGULATIONS SHOULD BE REJECTED

(Statement by Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express my concern over an opposition to the final social service regulations which govern the social service programs under the Social Security Act.

The new regulations were first proposed on February 16, 1973. The people immediately voiced their disapproval of the proposed changes. HEW received over 208,000 letters of protest and Congressional offices—my own included—were visited by hundreds of people who were to be tragically affected by the new rules.

As a result, legislation was introduced in both houses of Congress to prevent the implementation of the new regulations. After it became obvious that these regulations were not only unacceptable but a misrepresentation of the legislative mandate for social services set forth in the Social Security Act, the Administration went back to the drawing board. The result appeared on May 1, 1973 with the issuance of the final draft of the social service regulations.

The revised regulations do contain modifications which reflect some awareness of the objections to the original proposal, but in most instances they still create more problems than they solve.

In some vital areas, however, no relief from the misguided meat-axe of those who are butchering our social service programs is proposed at all. A case in point is the Community Legal Services program. It is estimated that over 40,000 Pennsylvanians were assisted in various actions this past year through the efforts of 107 young attorneys working in this project. Community Legal Service's vital importance is more fully appreciated when it is kept in mind that it has been the means for many of the disadvantaged in American society to be shown that there is something in the system for them. We have let the poor, the elderly, and the minorities know that justice can be a reality and not merely a pious sounding abstraction. To eliminate this new hope would be tragic.

I am inserting at this point in my statement, Mr. Chairman, a letter I have received from an old friend who is the current Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association. He forcefully describes the community wide benefit accruing from the work of the Community Legal Services program in my native city. I commend Mr. Bongiovanni's comments to the members of the Committee and echo his call that this fine program be maintained:

PHILADELPHIA BAR ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 14, 1973.

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOSH: The new social service regulations promulgated by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare really emasculate our Community Legal Services, Inc. by severely limiting permissible legal services to "service in solving legal problems of eligible individuals to the extent necessary to obtain or retain employment." We need help to have these regulations changed immediately.

As you and I are well aware, we are fighting for survival in the cities and the survival of the cities is threatened by many of the disadvantaged who feel, sometimes with justification, that our institutions do not provide any means to redress their grievances. As a result of a good deal of missionary work, we are beginning to persuade some of these people that our institutions do provide the means to redress their grievances and we do this by indeed providing the means. The means are C.L.S. which is only possible due to the generous financial support of the federal and state government and, more importantly, the selfless dedication of so many of our younger lawyers who have been working in this program, not only with zeal but with real skill. The new regulations bring down an iron curtain on the whole thing.

This comes at a time when the main source of funding for legal services through the Office of Economic Opportunity is gravely threatened with extinction. The uncertainty surrounding the future of legal services and the administrative hassles which the Office of Legal Services in O.E.O. are thrusting on programs in the field, caused the effective continuation of C.L.S. in Philadelphia to be in immediate jeopardy.

We need your help now.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH N. BONGIOVANNI, JR.

In the case of eligibility for day-care center services, the people who need this type of help, perhaps more than any other group will be deprived of its services.

In my district, in Northeast Philadelphia, there are a large number of families in which both parents work. Many of these families have young children who must be cared for during the day, but the parents cannot afford to send them to private day-care centers or to nursery schools.

Up to now, these parents have placed their children in Federally funded day-care centers. This situation is perfectly proper, both for the parents and the government. Both parents hold jobs and they pay taxes. They do not act as a drain on the community, they contribute to it. In return, the government plays its proper role by supplying them with a necessary service.

However, the new regulations will force many of these people, perhaps thousands in Philadelphia alone, to take their children out of the day-care centers. The result will be that one parent will have to stop working and the family's income will be lowered by a drastic amount.

The regulations limit free day care to the children of families with an income which is no higher than 150 percent of the state's assistance payment standard. They also provide for a sliding schedule of fees up to 233 1/4 percent of that standard. In Pennsylvania these rules will limit free day-care service to families with an annual income of no more than \$5,634 and the sliding fee basis for a family of four with an income of up to \$8,764 a year.

According to Pennsylvania State Department of Welfare, the average cost of maintaining a child in many day-care centers in Philadelphia exceeds \$2,000 a year.

This income restriction, as bad as it is,

has even been carried to a further extreme. The new regulations include not only income, but income resources. In other words whatever is in the family's bank account must be added to the gross income along with the value of savings bonds. Even the value of a piece of inherited jewelry or the wife's engagement ring must be included in the total of a family's income. (If the Administration was as diligent in collecting taxes from the giant corporations which seem to be living on welfare, it would not even have to try to foist these incredible rules on people which need its help.)

As you can see, a family of four with a combined annual income of \$8,764 would be ruined if it had to pay for even half of the cost of maintaining one or two children in a day-care center.

This situation is even worse for the parents of mentally retarded children who have been receiving help at Federally funded centers. While the new regulations will permit them to keep their children in the centers under the old guidelines until the end of the year, they will then have to meet the new income regulations or take the youngsters out of the programs. New applicants will have to meet the new guidelines right away.

I am sure there is no need to describe what this policy will do to families in the middle and low income brackets.

In some cases these people will be induced to go on welfare in order to get the necessary care for their children.

(It has always been my understanding that it is the Administration's policy to encourage people to work whenever possible, not to force them to give up jobs.)

There are several other aspects of the final regulations which need our immediate attention. The first has to do with recipient participation in the social service system. The old regulations called for recipient participation in the State Advisory Committee or Day Care. The recipients or their representatives were to compose at least one third of the Advisory Committee membership. The new regulations eliminate the requirement of recipient participation. In addition, there are no provisions for parent participation in the choice of day-care services for the child or determination of the adequacy of such services.

This seems to be contrary to what the Administration believed in 1972. In President Nixon's State of the Union Address he said, "Today it often seems that our service programs are unresponsive to the recipients' needs." If in theory the Administration believes this, how can elimination of recipient participation be justified within that framework? How can we not act to rectify this situation?

Another provision of the regulations which needs to be examined is the eligibility definitions of past and potential recipients. A past recipient under the final regulations is an applicant for or recipient of financial assistance within the previous three months. There was a two year permissible span under the old regulations. The final regulations concerning potential recipients would cut the time period within which an individual may become eligible for welfare from five years to six months. The regulations would also eliminate group eligibility which allows services to be provided to those in low income neighborhoods. These provisions not only discriminate against working people but cumulatively defeat the purpose of social services. We do not want to force people on welfare; we want to encourage people to work. They cannot do this alone; they need supportive services to help them get on their feet and stay there.

We cannot allow the Administration to continue this assault on the living standards and goals of working people. We cannot allow the Administration to talk about getting people off the welfare roles and putting them to work while it forces them to do just the opposite.

Very early in President's Nixon's first term, the then Attorney General John Mitchell told the press, "Don't listen to what we say. Watch what we do."

Well, now that we see what the Administration is doing, we must realize that we are facing a crisis. Services now provided to the people from other sources such as the Office of Economic Opportunity and Model Cities are also on the verge of elimination at a time when they are needed more than ever before.

I am urging this committee and all of Congress to play a constructive role in guaranteeing the American people the services they need to live happy and productive lives.

We have the resources to see this through. What we need is a united, dedicated effort on the part of Congress and the American people to ensure this goal.

I thank you for allowing me to testify here today.

ABORTION AND THE COURT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the myths prevalent in the country today is that only Catholics are concerned about abortion and all of its evil implications. This illusion did not arise by chance, but is the result of a conscious strategy and constant propaganda by the small number of persons who set out to impose their misguided views on abortion on America, and singled out the Catholic Church for vitriolic attacks as a plan to divide and conquer. Appealing to prejudice against the Catholic Church, the constant barrage of propaganda has, according to a recent article in the Washington Monthly, played a significant role in influencing members of the Supreme Court in their recent abortion decision.

Not only does this proabortion tactic demean Catholics by implying that they do not have a right to participate in public issues, but it degrades Protestant and Jewish citizens who deeply respect human life and resent the allegations that they are not concerned with the evils of abortion. One important Protestant magazine which adamantly disputes the proabortionists' distorted view of Protestant opposition to abortion is Christianity Today. The recent Supreme Court abortion decision was described by the editor-publisher Mr. Harold Lindell as follows:

It gives further evidence of our departure from Hebrew-Christian tradition and the almost complete secularization of national life.

I urge my colleagues to read the following editorial appearing in the February 16, 1973, issue of Christianity Today, volume XVII, No. 10, pages 32-33:

ABORTION AND THE COURT

Writing to Christians in Rome about the spiritual condition of the pagan world, Paul diagnosed it in this way: "Although they know God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their senseless minds were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools. . . . Since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a base mind and to improper conduct" (Rom. 1:21, 22, 28). Not only the thinking but often the laws of men, and even the deci-

sions of religious councils, can conflict with the laws of God. That is why Peter and John, called before the Sanhedrin, declared that they must obey God rather than men (Acts 4:19).

In a sweeping decision January 22, the United States Supreme Court overthrew the abortion statutes of Texas, indeed, of all the states that protect the right of an unborn infant to life before, at the earliest, the seventh month of pregnancy. The Court explicitly allows states to create some safeguards for unborn infants regarded as "viable," but in view of the present decision, it appears doubtful that unborn infants now enjoy any protection prior to the instant of birth anywhere in the United States. Until new state laws acceptable to the Courts are passed—at best a long-drawn out process—it would appear impossible to punish abortions performed at any stage.

This decision runs counter not merely to the moral teachings of Christianity through the ages but also to the moral sense of the American people, as expressed in the now vacated abortion laws of almost all states, including 1972 laws in Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania, and recently clearly reaffirmed by statewide referendums in two states (Michigan and North Dakota). We would not normally expect the Court to consider the teachings of Christianity and paganism before rendering a decision on the constitutionality of a law, but in this case it has chosen to do so, and the results are enlightening: it has clearly decided for paganism, and against Christianity, and this in disregard even of democratic sentiment, which in this case appears to follow Christian tradition and to reject permissive abortion legislation.

The Court notes that "ancient religion" did not bar abortion (*Roe et al. v. Wade*, No. 70-18 [1973], VI, 1); by "ancient religion," it clearly means paganism, since Judaism and Christianity *did* bar abortion. It rejects the "apparent rigidity" of the Hippocratic Oath ("I will give no deadly medicine to anyone if asked, nor suggest any such counsel; and in like manner I will not give to a woman a pessary to produce abortion") on the grounds that it did not really represent the consensus of pagan thinking, though pagan in origin, but owed its universal acceptance to popularity resulting from "the emerging teachings of Christianity" (*ibid.*, VI, 2). To these, the High Court unambiguously prefers "ancient religion," that is, the common paganism of the pre-Christian Roman Empire. Against the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church that the "life begins at conception" (curious language on the part of the Court, for no one denies that the fetus is human, or that it is alive: the Court apparently means *personal* life), the Court presents "new embryological data that purport to indicate that conception is a 'process' over time, rather than an event, and . . . new medical techniques such as menstrual extractions, the 'morning-after' pill, implantation of embryos, artificial insemination, and artificial wombs" (*ibid.*, IX, B). It is hard to understand how the contention that conception is a "process" of at most a few days' duration is relevant to the possible rights of the fetus at three or six months, and even harder to comprehend the logic that holds that "new medical techniques" for destroying or preserving the embryo "pose problems" for the view that it was alive before being subjected to those techniques.

Pleading "the established medical fact" that "until the end of the first trimester, mortality in abortion [of course the reference is to *maternal* mortality—fetal mortality is 100 per cent] is less than that in normal child-birth [nine maternal deaths per 100,000 abortions vs. twenty-five per 100,000 live births, a differential of 0.016 per cent, of course not counting the 100,000 fetal mortalities]" (*ibid.*, X), the Court decreed that a state may not regulate abortion at all dur-

ing the first three months, and during the second, only to protect the health of the mother. After "viability," defined as "about six months," when the fetus "presumably has the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb," then, "if the State is interested in protecting fetal life . . . it may go so far [emphasis added: since abortion is 100 per cent fatal to the fetus, it is hard to see the value of "protection" that goes less far] as to proscribe abortion during that period, except when it is necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother" (*ibid.*). Since health is explicitly defined to include "mental health," a very flexible concept, this concession to the protection of the fetus from seven to nine months will, in practice, mean little.

The Court based its abortion decision on the right of privacy, and that without empirical or logical justification. "This right of privacy . . . is broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy," Justice Blackmun wrote in delivering the opinion of the Court. But the right of privacy is not absolute, and, much more important, no abortion decision can ever be by any stretch of the imagination a purely private matter. The fetus, if not a full-fledged human being, is at least a being owing his existence as much to father as to mother, and is therefore an individual distinct from both. Curiously, fathers are scarcely mentioned in the fifty-one-page majority opinion! The decision would appear to contradict itself when it insists that the "private" abortion decision must be made in conjunction with a physician and/or in line with some kind of medical judgment.

In his concurring opinion, Chief Justice Burger fatuously comments, "I do not read the Court's holding today as having the sweeping consequences attributed to it by the dissenting justices [White and Rehnquist]." The New York state tally stood in 1971 at a ratio of 927 abortions for 1,000 live births; now that abortion has become allowable nationwide, the ratio will presumably change, but the experience of nations with easy abortion suggests that it may very well remain as high as one abortion for every two live births, or even higher. What would the Chief Justice consider sweeping? Mandatory abortion for all those falling into a certain class? Infanticide? Mass extermination of undesirables? Make no mistake: the logic of the high court could be used with like—in some cases with greater—force to justify infanticide for unwanted or undesirable infants; the expression, "capability of meaningful life" could cover a multitude of evils and will, unless this development is stopped now.

In his dissent, Justice White sums up the situation and the Court's action:

"The common claim before us is that for any one of such reasons he cites convenience, family planning, economics, dislike of children, the embarrassment of illegitimacy, and others], or for no reason at all, and without asserting or claiming any threat to life or health, any woman is entitled to an abortion at her request if she is able to find a medical doctor willing to undertake the procedure. The Court for the most part sustains this position: during the period prior to the time the fetus becomes viable, the Constitution of the United States values the convenience, whim or caprice of the putative mother more than the life or potential life of the fetus. . . ."

In arriving at this position, the majority of the Supreme Court has explicitly rejected Christian moral teaching and approved the attitude of what it calls "ancient religion" and the standards of pagan Greek and Roman law, which, as the Court notes in self-justification, afforded little protection to the unborn" (*ibid.*, VI, 1). It is not necessary to read between the lines for the spiritual sig-

nificance of this decision, for the Court has made it crystal clear.

In view of this, Justice Rehnquist's dissenting observation that the Court is engaging in "judicial legislation" may seem almost insignificant. Nevertheless, we must ask what remains of the democratic process and the principle of local initiative when not only long-standing older laws but the most recent state laws and even the will of the people expressed in state-wide referendums are swept from the board in a single Court ruling, when the people and their representatives are prohibited forever—or at least until the Constitution is amended—from implementing a higher regard for the life of the unborn than that exhibited by seven supreme judges.

Having previously seen fit to ban the formal, admittedly superficial, and possibly hypocritical acknowledgment of God that used to take place in public-school prayers and Bible readings, the Court has now repudiated the Old Testament's standards on capital punishment as cruel and without utility, and has rejected the almost universal consensus of Christian moral teachers through the centuries on abortion. Its latest decision reveals a callous utilitarianism about children in the womb that harmonizes little with the extreme delicacy of its conscience regarding the imposition of capital punishment.

Christians can be grateful that the court has not yet made the "right" to abortion an obligation. It is still possible for us to consult the will of God in this matter rather than the laws of the state. The present decision makes it abundantly clear that we are obliged to seek his will and not to be guided only by public law. We should recognize the accumulating evidence that public policy is beginning to display what Paul called "a base mind and improper conduct," and for similar reasons. Will the time come when this nation "under God" is distinguishable from those that are aggressively atheistic only by our currently greater material affluence? Christians should accustom themselves to the thought that the American state no longer supports, in any meaningful sense, the laws of God, and prepare themselves spiritually for the prospect that it may one day formally repudiate them and turn against those who seek to live by them.

VINCENT J. BURKE: A REPORTER'S REPORTER

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Washington press corps lost a talented colleague and a good friend with the death May 14 of Los Angeles Times newsman, Vincent J. Burke.

Mr. Burke, a senior member of the Los Angeles Times Washington bureau and the former head of its Moscow bureau, was a "reporter's reporter." He possessed that elusive news sense which meant that he could ferret out what was really important and what most interested the reading public. And, to the credit of his profession, his dispatches were written with clarity as well as depth.

A native of Chicago, Vince Burke attained a BA in history from the University of Chicago; and, after a brief stint with United Press, joined the Army

Air Corps in World War II as a public relations officer.

After the Army, United Press sent Mr. Burke to Washington to cover the Agriculture and State Departments and later the House of Representatives where he gained recognition as an expert in tax legislation. The Los Angeles Times, knowing of his fine reputation as a tax authority, one of the most complex of legislative issues, lured him to its Washington bureau in 1963; and, during the last 10 years, he further distinguished himself as the most informed newsman in Washington on urban affairs and social welfare legislation.

In fact, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare often called Vincent Burke for information on this subject; and, at the time of his death, he and Vee, his devoted wife of 31 years, were working on a book about proposals for a guaranteed income for the aged.

Vincent Burke's unquenchable curiosity and diligence have been passed down to his children, three of whom are holding college scholarships while the fourth, Barbara, begins a newspaper career of her own. My deepest sympathies go out to these fine children and to Vince's exceptional wife, Vee, in their great loss.

Perhaps one of the best summations of what Vincent J. Burke meant to his friends and his profession was written by his Los Angeles Times colleague Tom Foley who said:

Vince was not flashy. But a native intellectual curiosity made him a digging reporter who not only covered a subject but smothered it.

OEO OVERHEAD TOO HIGH

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to me that while much publicity has been given to the restructuring of OEO and much opposition has come from OEO employees, very little has been said by the poor.

Since the restructuring of OEO will eliminate many bureaucratic jobs, one can understand that the employees are fighting for their jobs. During all their rhetoric, however, all they talk about is their jobs. Rarely are the programs ever mentioned. Is this perhaps because the programs are not too terribly successful?

When one really thinks about OEO and studies the amount of good OEO has done for the amount of tax dollars spent, one realizes that many of the programs cannot be defended.

The conclusion, therefore, is that employees who have brought legal action against OEO to protect their jobs are simply using poverty to maintain job security.

I include the following editorial from the New Bedford, Mass., Standard Times in the RECORD:

"OVERHEAD" IN OEO

The acting director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Howard J. Phillips, says

most OEO spending is for administrative and personnel expenses.

Defending the Nixon administration's plan for cutting and reassigning OEO operations, Phillips estimates that among the nearly 900 Community Action Programs under OEO an average 85 per cent of the allotted funds is expended in salaries and overhead.

Assuming that as director Phillips knows whereof he speaks, it is not surprising that, so far, the most militant opposition to the administration's plans has come from within the OEO bureaucracy.

Court challenges are being filed in U.S. District Courts in Washington, Chicago, and the plaintiffs turn out to be, in the first instance, the union representing headquarters employees of OEO, and in the second, the National Council of OEO Locals, which represents the union's field units.

These suits do not allege deprivation of those whom the antipoverty programs are supposed to benefit. The litigation alleges that OEO employees are being hurt, that they are being "coerced" and "terrorized" into giving up their jobs. OEO employees are complaining their desks and typewriters are being removed and that they are being reassigned, involuntarily, to other agencies.

While one may sympathize with those uprooted by the administration's consolidation and economy project, there is, also, cause for wondering in this upheaval whether the griping does not suggest that the administration's diagnosis is correct—much of the antipoverty effort has lost its direction and has become a self-perpetuating bureaucracy.

Next year's budget allocates almost twice as much for human resources as when Mr. Nixon came to the White House. It calls for spending \$268 billion over-all, which is hardly chicken feed, and the proportions between spending for defense and human resources have been reversed in the four years. It was one-half for defense in 1969, one-third for human resources. Now it is the opposite.

Significant, too, is the fact that of the 4,250 full-time permanent positions in the Executive Office of the President, 1,935 are assigned to the OEO staff, nearly as much as for the other 17 departments in the office, including the White House. The administration's plan calls for abolishing-transferring every OEO position.

Little wonder, it would seem, that such a small percent of Community Action Program spending actually reaches the objectives. If the administration's plan can improve the odds, it should be welcomed.

AUBURN PRISON OFFERS COLLEGE COURSES FOR INMATES

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the May 1, 1973, edition of the Auburn, N.Y. Citizen-Advertiser.

The article details a program of seven college-level courses taught by volunteer professors and students from Cornell University to inmates at the Auburn correctional facility. Prison Superintendent Robert Henderson says he believes Auburn is the only prison in New York State offering such a program.

The courses were the idea of Richard Mitchell, a doctoral candidate in educational administration in Cornell. I would like to commend Mr. Mitchell and

Superintendent Henderson for this fine program and their attempts to rehabilitate the inmates at Auburn.

In the wake of the uprising at Attica prison in September of 1971 and the resulting cries for prison reform, Superintendent Henderson and Mr. Mitchell and the students and professors working the program, should be recognized and congratulated for not just talking about prison reform, but for doing something positive about it.

I include the newspaper article about the program:

TWENTY-FIVE CORNELL VOLUNTEERS TEACH SEVEN COURSES TO 200 INMATES

Auburn Correctional Facility, site of the first electrocution in the world in 1890, has a more positive distinction that is not noted on a small historical marker set just outside the locked main gate: The prison now offers college-level courses to selected inmates in an experimental, volunteer program.

Auburn prison Superintendent Robert Henderson believes his prison is the only facility in New York offering seven college-level courses. He said he is proud of the distinction, which is dependent upon volunteer professors and students from Cornell University and Auburn Community College.

The Cornell volunteers, some 25 this semester, teach freshman English, economics, biology, sociology, history, mathematics and philosophy of education four nights a week to about 200 inmates of the Auburn facility, an all-male, maximum security prison.

The college-level prison program is the brainchild of Richard Mitchell, a doctoral candidate in educational administration at Cornell, who saw a "glaring need" for educational opportunity in the prison a year ago while working on a manual for correctional officers.

Mitchell took his idea to Henderson and "worked out a program in about a week." He found five undergraduate students willing to go up to Auburn, about one hour's drive from Cornell, to teach three subjects: economics, mathematics and history.

Although Henderson was "enthusiastic," Mitchell found himself at the beginning of "an uphill battle" with the state and state prison bureaucracy to provide for adequate instruction. Mitchell cited, in particular, delays in receipt of books and materials ordered from the State for inmates and problems with regulations placing a limit on overtime for correctional officers, consequently limiting the length of class periods.

"The college-level program deals with only about 15 per cent of the prison population," Mitchell said. "Approximately 85 per cent of the inmates read at a fifth grade level. The biggest problem is illiteracy. But if an inmate has achieved a diploma or high school equivalency within the prison, he has no educational program after that. Our goal was to introduce a high calibre, effectively run educational program to upgrade the entire educational system."

Approximately 600 of Auburn's 1,500 inmates are enrolled in a kindergarten through 12th grade prison school taught by State Civil Service teachers in day or evening classes. Inmates receive 25 cents a day for being students at the primary or secondary level. The highest-paying prison jobs, said Henderson, pay about 80 cents an hour for skilled cabinet makers working five and a half hours a day, five days a week.

College-level students receive no monetary remuneration, he said.

But the most important long-term remuneration for the inmates, in Mitchell's mind, is that student inmates may receive a State University of New York transcript through Auburn Community College in four subjects as of January, 1973. Inmates enrolled in subjects not taught by Cornell volunteers in

conjunction with Auburn Community College faculty may take a standardized College Level Examination Program (CLEP) test developed by the Educational Testing Service.

"A person leaving prison has few options," Mitchell said. "But as a student in a State University college-level course, a former inmate doesn't have to go through an admissions process to enter the State system and hopefully he would be able to move directly into an educational program upon release from prison."

Mitchell thinks correctional facilities must establish programs to increase the inmates "economic and social options" upon release. "Education is not the panacea but it does provide one more alternative for these guys and that's what we're concerned with doing," he said.

"Education has a low priority in the economy of the State right now," Mitchell said. "Wardens often cannot initiate educational programs because of lack of funds." Henderson concurred, noting the prison's college-level program was dependent upon volunteer teachers from Cornell and Auburn.

"What we need," said Mitchell, "is an institution to make even a minimal commitment to coordinate existing prison programs." He cited, as existing programs, a group of Cornell law students working on a "literacy based on law" educational reading program with Auburn prisoners. Other law students provide legal counsel to the inmates.

"I get students calling me all the time wanting to volunteer for field work in nearby prisons such as Auburn and the Elmira Correctional Facility and Reception Center," he said, "but I can't help them coordinate their efforts. The wardens at both institutions are ready to accept aid if we can organize a clearing house to coordinate volunteers in education, architecture, libraries, law and other fields who have expertise to bring to bear on these nineteenth century bastilles."

The State currently supplies only transportation for the volunteers between Cornell and Auburn, as well as books and supplies for instruction.

What motivates a teaching volunteer? Mitchell characterizes them, as "academically serious and socially committed. They have their heads together and they are teaching because they see a legitimate need. Prison reform is also a very sexy issue right now."

John Dennis, a January graduate from Cornell now teaching economics, became interested in prisons while considering resisting the draft.

Norris (Hap) Clark volunteered to teach English after attending a Black Graduate Student Association meeting at Cornell and learning inmates were predominantly black and Puerto Rican.

Both Clark and Dennis feel teaching at Auburn is meaningful. Said Dennis: "Personally, I feel a prison is the most meaningful place to teach. I prefer teaching in places that need development rather than go where the dollar is."

"The inmates resent 'do-gooders' or 'bleeding-heart liberals,'" he added. "I found the inmates acutely perceptive, very 'people conscious,' and disillusioned with the possibility of getting any breaks while in prison. I learned not to promise things I couldn't deliver."

Thomas Vawter, a doctoral candidate in ecology and evolutionary biology, teaches a one-year freshman biology course with another Cornell graduate student and a member of the Auburn Community College faculty. He tries to relate biology to human rather than academic models, using, for example, sickle-cell anemia to illustrate problems of genetics.

As a teacher, he finds inmates "generally more aware of what's happening in the world

than Cornell freshmen" and much more diverse in terms of preparation and personal background. "If given a chance," he said, "some inmates would compare favorably with Cornell's brightest undergraduates."

The Cornell teaching volunteers frequently found working within the numerous regulations and policies governing prison life difficult. Problems cited included discontinuity caused by a heavy turn-over within the class due to continual influx and departure of inmates from the prison, absenteeism due to illness or to "keep-lock," referring to a period of time during which an inmate is not released from his cell because of prison infractions, the failure of books and other materials ordered from the State to arrive on time and difficulties in finding time to give inmates individual help before or after class.

"Some inmates still don't have textbooks," said Vawter of his biology students in their second semester. "Although interest is high, these problems over and over tend to erode interest and to discourage the inmates."

Other major teaching problems center in making the curriculum relevant to the inmates, some 70 per cent of whom are black or Puerto Rican, while simultaneously conveying the principles of a traditional academic discipline.

Clark, teaching freshman English with Chestyn Everett, assistant professor of black theater arts, modified the College Proficiency Examination syllabus to include more work by black authors and poets. Class discussion of Ralph Ellison's "Invisible Man," for example, was substituted for Emily Bronte's "Wuthering Heights," which remained required reading.

"We found," said Clark, "that most of the inmates preferred materials by blacks or on blacks. This makes it twice as difficult to generate interest in other literature, although we had good discussions on 'The Great Gatsby,' on Orwell's essays and some of James Joyce's short stories."

"Getting off the material is easy and can create ill-feeling between the inmates who want to 'rap' and those who want to cover the material," said Vawter. Most teachers resolve the problem by asking the inmates to hold unrelated questions to open discussion at the end of class.

"These guys get little intellectual stimulation and so they jump into it with both feet . . . they are not used to pigeon-holing or categorizing their knowledge and consequently may jump from biology to sociology," he said.

The inmates' reasons for taking college-level courses vary considerably.

Clark said that "aspirations of continuing their education for credit, wanting to get out of the confines of their cell for a few hours, or wanting to learn how to criticize and appreciate literature" motivated his freshmen English students.

Inmates in economics, Dennis felt, wanted "to gain a practical understanding of interest rates and banking and insurance procedures. They also wanted to analyze Third World economic development, the role of U.S. corporate investment in those nations and the causes of unemployment in the ghetto."

The possibility of early parole may also be a factor for some inmates. Others have specific career goals: A young black inmate, imprisoned for homicide nearly 10 years ago when he was 16 years old, would like to teach music if paroled, sometime after 1977. He completed high school while in prison and is now enrolled in a philosophy of education course taught by Richard N. Boyd, an associate professor of philosophy at Cornell.

Several inmates studying biology work in the prison hospital and indicated an interest in becoming nurses, Vawter said, while others were concerned about biology's ap-

plication to problems of the ghetto in areas such as nutrition and eugenics.

The actual class lasts somewhat over an hour out of a two-hour period. Correctional officers escort the inmates from their five-tier cell blocks to the school building. The process, by cell-block, is reversed at the end of class. If not released for night school, most inmates remain locked in their cells from 5:15 p.m. to 7:20 a.m. the following morning.

When Mitchell completes his doctoral dissertation, the college-level program utilizing Cornell volunteers will probably discontinue. Henderson makes it clear that the program depends upon volunteers and that, as of the present time, New York has limited its support to covering transportation costs of volunteers and in agreeing to supply books and materials.

None of the current Cornell volunteers are trained in administration or prison education and for this reason Vawter felt none would assume Mitchell's role as volunteer administrator.

"Unless we get institutional backing to keep this thing going, it's going to die at the end of the semester," Mitchell said.

BUFFALO CHAPLAIN SEEKS END OF CURRENT PRISON SYSTEM

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Roman Catholic chaplain for the Erie County, N.Y., Penitentiary, has spoken from the heart on the conditions facing those serving prison sentences.

The occasion was the 43d annual communion breakfast of the Buffalo Police Department with some 400 Buffalo policemen and guests in attendance.

The speaker was Rev. Walter L. Tomiak and the dignitaries included: Most Rev. Edward D. Head, new bishop of the Buffalo diocese, Mayor Stanley M. Makowski, Erie County Sheriff Michael A. Amico, Police Commissioner Thomas R. Blair and the latter's predecessor, Frank N. Felicetta.

Father Tomiak called for an end to the penitentiary as it now exists. He pleaded for help in ministering to those who need and want help.

He said his own expertise is inadequate to deal with the many individual problems; that experts in the field should be made available, such as a psychologist, a psychiatrist, a psychoanalyst, or a therapist.

The priest said that effective work is being done with alcoholics and drug addicts, but added:

When it comes to other areas of deviant behavior, nothing is being done.

Mr. Speaker, Father Tomiak's remarks were both timely and impressive. They deserve wide attention and consideration. He deals sympathetically and realistically with a serious situation. I include his text as part of my remarks:

ADDRESS BY REV. WALTER L. TOMIAK AT BUFFALO POLICE DEPARTMENT'S COMMUNION BREAKFAST, BUFFALO, N.Y., MAY 13, 1973

As I walked through the corridor of the penitentiary, I was alerted by some of my "clients" that they saw the newspapers an-

nouncing my acceptance in speaking before the notables in the community's law enforcement body. One of them shouted out, "Tell it like it is, Father". This is what I intend to do.

There must be a reassessment and re-evaluation of the whole penal system. The penitentiary, as it is now, is a phenomenon of the past and has to be ended. No one enters the penitentiary as a penitent to do penance. If anything, this human personality has a problem.

These unique individuals need help, but, instead are thrown into this dimension of incarceration and forgotten by the whole of society. I consider these social rejects. Regardless of the deviation and perversion, they are human beings and should be treated as such, especially when they ask for help.

I concede that hard-core criminals will have to be contained in such an environment, but, in God's name, I don't understand how we can put anybody into a penitentiary. When a homosexual addresses me, I realize that I have a human being beset with a problem. When a psychotic approaches me for help, I have to explain to him what my role is.

First, it is made clear that I am a priest and a chaplain. Here I can service him in matters spiritual. Next, my role as counselor may be effective in moral matters. However, I cannot help him in deep psychological troubles for I am not a psychologist, a psychiatrist, a psychoanalyst, or a therapist.

NOT MY PROVINCE

That is not my province and my expertise is not in that field. There is always that possibility of triggering off a series of traumatic events over which there is no control. In all truth, we are dealing with a "sick" man. My skills and techniques are woefully inadequate.

Even so, I sit on my butt and listen—listen—listen. Occasionally I interrupt the almost one-sided dialogue with a reminder of just what my role is. Just who do I turn to? They say we have psychologists working in penitentiaries. There may be, but I haven't seen one. I can't understand how we permit such a thing to happen in our society.

To all intent and purpose, society is doing something for the alcoholics. Programs for the "alkies" and half-way houses indicate that steps are being taken in that direction. The traffic of alcoholics is not as pronounced as it was years ago. Then there is the thrust made into the problem of drug addiction. Addiction centers serve a vital and desperate need, but, when it comes to other areas of deviant behavior, nothing is being done.

When I see a youngster come in who can't keep his cotton pickin' hands off a car and then is exposed to X number of days to the perversion in the penitentiary, I can't appreciate what is going on outside. How does such a youngster return to society after such an exposure and such an ordeal?

MUST BE A CHANGE

I implore the legislators to look hard and realistically on some of the laws that need updating. Perhaps in the light of research and past experience, new laws should be enacted to keep pace with the change in society.

There must be a change—there must be a reformation with emphasis on rehabilitation. To those involved in the field of correction; think in terms of "satellite" schools or even campuses. Set your sights on the team approach.

Can you visualize a battery of services offered by professionals representing the best that academia can offer? Truly this is a learning process. The best of education should be available. This concept is exciting and the potential unlimited. I am aware that there are sporadic experimentations, but they

are more of the exception rather than the rule.

Our correctional officers are in a bind. They are asked to perform a dual role. On the one hand, they are expected to deal with the penal and punitive aspects of imprisonment. On the other, they are expected to be clinically, therapeutically and rehabilitatively oriented; this they are not yet able to do.

This is where there is need of team approaches with involvement on the part of agencies particularly geared to meet the needs of those incarcerated. There is need for social services, for rehabilitation, for therapies, for medicine, for LOVE. Staff conferences involving administration and all disciplines representing education, rehabilitation, the therapeutic, the spiritual and reflective.

The day when I, as a chaplain, can sit down at such a meeting and take part in meaningful analyses of the problems of the past, the needs of the present, and possible successes in the future; that will be the day ushering in fresh air of hope.

ALL HUMAN BEINGS

We are confronted with changes all around us. Even the Church is affected. The day when I, as celebrant of the Mass, turned away from the wall and faced my congregation, with arms outstretched, I, for the first time saw my "social rejects".

As I looked beyond them I realized that all this before me was an extension of a community, a city, a county, a society. When I blessed them I realized that these were unique persons, human beings, men and women, teenagers, with various degrees of sensitivity, creativity, despite the deviant patterns.

I'm positive that the Bishop as he faces his people experiences an even more panoramic perspective. I would like to see the day when our Bishop will come into our penitentiary, and see the people there. I would like to see the day when pastors and associates will visit our dimension even though it is beyond parochial boundaries.

I would like to see the day when nuns particularly will visit the distaff side of social rejection and look at the problem from a woman's point of view. I would like to see the day when volunteers will be able to make a meaningful thrust in this area of misery and ostracism.

I am not only thinking of the people who are dying physically in this dimension, but, also of those who are languishing morally, mentally, and spiritually. I feel that I must be articulate and vocal. I am a priest and I love these people—these people are images and likenesses of Almighty God.

Thank you for flushing me out, I am delighted to be able to speak out about this crucial problem to at least one segment of the population.

FIVE NORTH MASSAPEQUA FIREMEN HONORED

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 19 five young men from the North Massapequa Fire District were honored for an act of heroism and I would like to read the Merit Award as it was presented to them:

MERIT AWARD

To all concerned: Be it known, that on the night of May 19, 1972 while passing a burning residence located at 1170 Hicksville Road in

the District of N. Massapequa, firemen Vincent Kehoe, Gerard Kelly, Joseph McGroarty, John Ferro, and Gary Pysock turned in the alarm and forcibly entered the building, awakening the occupants, and leading them to safety, thereby saving their lives.

The board of fire commissioners, of the N. Massapequa Fire District, presents you with this merit award, in recognition of your outstanding service given to this community, above and beyond the call of duty.

Presented this 19th day of May 1973 by the N. MASSAPEQUA BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS.

THREAT TO A FREE SOCIETY

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1968, I was 1 of 17 House Members who voted against the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. What started out as a highly meritorious bill to give Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies to deal with the alarming increase in crime became an abomination, and it represents one of the most serious attacks in our Nation's history against individual privacy.

Title III of this act allows the President to use such measures as he deems necessary to protect national security, and this has resulted in the extensive use of wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping. At the time of House passage of this act, I warned, on the House floor—

What we are asked to do today by title III is to authorize a wholesale invasion of privacy of citizens across the country.

Much to my anguish, the Nixon administration has used wiretapping, under the guise of protecting national security, to such an extent that freedom of speech and the full and open exchange of ideas are now being intimidated. The recent activities carried on by the White House in the name of national security illustrate the effect on society of the repressive, negative, and harmful aspects of licensing wholesale eavesdropping by the State.

Justice Brandeis said that each individual's right to privacy was "the most comprehensive of rights, and the right most valued by civilized men." A system of wire and electronic surveillance strikes at the very heart of a democratic society by creating suspicion and distrust, and limits the freedom to discuss and exchange ideas.

Mr. Speaker, in this respect, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on May 18, 1973:

WEB OF SUSPICION

White House acknowledgment that the President ordered wiretaps on thirteen National Security Council aides and four newsmen—reportedly at the personal instigation of Henry A. Kissinger in some cases—offers further dismaying evidence of the degree to which individual liberties and the integrity of the executive branch itself have been compromised under the climate of self-righteousness, secrecy and suspicion in which the Nixon Administration has operated.

The Justice Department asserts that the

taps were permissible under the Constitution and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which declares that nothing in the act "shall limit the constitutional power of the President to take such measures as he deems necessary to protect the Nation against actual or potential attack or other hostile acts of a foreign power, to obtain foreign intelligence information deemed essential to the security of the United States or to protect national security information against foreign intelligence activities."

Legal authorities differ over the powers ascribed to the President in the act, especially when invoked against American citizens. Last June the Supreme Court ruled illegal the Federal Government's use of wiretapping and electronic surveillance to monitor domestic radicals without first obtaining judicial warrants. The Court declared that "Fourth Amendment freedoms cannot properly be guaranteed if domestic surveillance may be conducted solely within the discretion of the executive branch."

Even if the Fourth Amendment safeguards do not apply to the Government aides and newsmen involved—which is difficult to believe—no evidence has been presented so far that would indicate that the leaks which prompted surveillance constituted a serious threat to national security. The wiretaps were first ordered in response to a report by William Beecher in this newspaper that American B-52 bombers had raided Communist supply dumps and base camps inside Cambodia, without protest from the Cambodian Government.

That was hardly news to the Communists, or to the Cambodians. It was information to which the American people were entitled, even if it may have caused some embarrassment in Phnom Penh—not enough, incidentally, to prevent the Cambodian Government from resuming relations with Washington the following month.

As has so often proved the case with this and previous Administrations, the secrecy that the White House sought to impose through highly dubious means seems to have been aimed more at preserving its own interests than the national interest. As one White House source has put it, "There wasn't one member of the staff who was disloyal to the country. But they were disloyal to Kissinger, and they were giving him problems."

There are certainly times when officials who cannot go along with official policy should quit or be fired. No organization can countenance the systematic disclosure of its confidences. But neither can it afford to become so obsessed with secrecy that it breaks faith with its own people, resorting to internal espionage in the absence of the most compelling danger to the national security.

The Administration has apparently become ensnared in the web of its own suspicions.

EDA EXTENSION TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION (H.R. 2246)

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, an amendment to the Senate amendment of H.R. 2246 is to be considered under suspension of the rules on Tuesday, May 22. This bill extends the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for an additional year through fiscal year 1974.

To help Members better understand the bill and the amendment that will be

considered under suspension tomorrow, I am submitting for the RECORD a section-by-section comparison of the bill as passed by the House and the Senate, as well as a table that compares funding authorizations. The table shows funding as authorized under current law; as passed by the House; as passed by the Senate; as actually appropriated for fiscal year 1973; and as contained in the proposed compromise amendment.

The House considered and passed H.R. 2246 on March 15 by a vote of 278-108. That bill authorized a total of \$1,222.5 million for programs under the act, such as public facility grants and supplemental grants, business development loans,

technical assistance, and the title V Regional Commission programs.

On May 8, the Senate took up the House bill, amended and passed it by a vote of 81-16, substantially reducing the total amount authorized by the bill to \$362.5 million. Two other amendments, not contained in the House bill, require studies and reports to Congress by the administration.

The purpose of bringing this bill under suspension is to compromise the differences in funding authorized by the House bill and the Senate amendment. The House amendment being offered to the Senate amendment will reduce the authorizations in the bill to \$495 million—

a more than 60 percent reduction from the original House bill.

It is imperative that we pass H.R. 2246 to continue these proven successful programs that assist areas in economic distress. National unemployment continues at the 4.5 million level. Areas affected by the flooding of the Mississippi need economic assistance, and communities affected by the recent closing of military installations need economic rehabilitation.

We can best assure that our much needed economic development efforts continue without interruption by passing this measure immediately.

The comparison and chart follow:

COMPARISON OF H.R. 2246 AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE ON MARCH 15, 1973 WITH THE AMENDED BILL PASSED BY THE SENATE ON MAY 8, 1973

HOUSE Section of bill	SENATE Section of bill
1. Amends Title I (Public Facility Grants and Supplemental Grants) by amending Sec. 105 of Act to authorize \$800 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.	1. Same, except authorizes \$200 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.
2. Amends Title II (Public Facility Loans and Financial Assistance for Business Development) by amending Sec. 201(c) to authorize \$170 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.	2. Same, except authorizes \$50 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.
3. Amends Title III (Technical Assistance, Research, and Information) No provision.	3.
Amends Sec. 302 to authorize \$50 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.	(a) Amends Section 301(b) to permit the Secretary to pay up to 100% of administrative expenses of an Indian tribe. (b) Same, except authorizes \$25 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.
4. Amends Title IV (Area and District Eligibility by amending Sec. 403(g) to authorize \$50 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.	4. Same, except authorizes \$12.5 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.
5. Amends Title V (Regional Action Planning Commissions) by amending Sec. 509(d) to authorize \$152.5 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.	5. Same, except authorizes \$75 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to carry out title.
6. Amends Sec. 2 of the Act of July 6, 1970 (PL 90-304) to reinstate a moratorium on re-designation of "redevelopment areas" to June 30, 1974. No provision.	6. Same.
No provision.	7. Requires a report to Congress within 30 days after enactment from the "Interagency Economic Adjustment Committee" listing details of utilizing unused defense property and other efforts to assist each community with plans for its economic development.
Total funds authorized, \$1,222.5 million.	8. Requires the President to instruct the Secretary of Commerce and OMB to examine past and current Federal efforts to secure balanced national economic development and to submit proposal to Congress within six months for restructuring Federal economic programs into coordinated plan for assistance. Total funds authorized, \$362.5 million.

H.R. 2246 TO EXTEND THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1974

[In millions of dollars]

	Current authorization in act	Bill as passed by House	Bill as passed by Senate	Proposed amendment to compromise authorizations	Actual 1973 appropriation
Title I: Public Facility Grants	800.0	800.0	200.0	260	166.5
Title II: Business Development	170.0	170.0	50.0	55	53.5
Title III: Technical Assistance	50.0	50.0	25.0	35	31.5
Title IV: Growth Centers	50.0	50.0	12.5	50	50.0
Title V: Regional Commissions	152.5	152.5	75.0	95	41.7
Total	1,222.5	1,222.5	362.5	495	343.2

HON. JACK BRINKLEY REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the information of our colleagues my June newsletter which will soon be mailed to the constituents of Georgia's Third Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent.

The newsletter reads as follows:

U.S. CONGRESSMAN JACK BRINKLEY REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

SUPPORT—BUT DISAGREEMENT

The President of the United States deserves the support and understanding of the American people during these trying times. I have absolute, unqualified confidence in the good character and personal integrity of President Nixon. With respect to Watergate, I pledge to the people of the Third Congressional District of Georgia to stand with the President without qualification or reservation.

THE BUDGET—A MATTER OF PRIORITIES

Labels can be so misleading. The President's full employment budget is a deficit budget. And his vetoes are not necessarily

a matter of spending but a matter of priorities. Examples of misplaced priorities are the Vocational Rehabilitation Act veto and the Water-Sewer Bill veto.

The presumption of a tax increase if we do not support the President right down the line, is illogical. The real issue is which programs should be funded.

Some people in the Administration still have the Marshall Plan mentality on priorities. There's no justification for spending \$2,740,000,000.00 annually for a 221,000 troop level in Germany. That grossly expensive policy is a policy of the past and is a clear example of outdated strategy.

The President has said that we must be strong militarily and we must be strong economically. I wholeheartedly agree, and be-

lieve that we can better achieve both with qualitative emplacement overseas rather than quantitative.

**AID TO NORTH VIETNAM—FOREIGN
AID REQUEST LATER?**

Excerpts from a message to Congress on May 2, 1973, by the President on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973:

"... My present request does not include any assistance for North Vietnam. It is my hope that all parties will soon adhere fully to the Paris agreements. If and when that occurs, I believe that American assistance for reconstruction and development of both South and North Vietnam would represent a sound investment in confirming the peace.

"Representatives of the United States have recently been holding discussions with representatives of the Government of North Vietnam to assess economic conditions there and to consider possible forms of United States economic assistance. This assessment has now been suspended, pending clarification of North Vietnam's intentions regarding implementation of the cease-fire. Once Hanoi abandons its military efforts and the assessment is complete, the question of aid to North Vietnam will receive my personal review and will be a subject for Congressional approval."

No, Mr. President. Not even later when emotions have subsided and memory has dimmed the cruelty and torture and deprivation inflicted upon our men.

Alternatively, why not consider giving attention to the Gold Star Wives Charter NOW? Or, lend Administration support to the bill which would authorize Federal indemnity to our firemen and law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty.

THE VETOS—ANOTHER VIEW

Excerpts taken from the remarks of U.S. Rep. W. R. Poage of Texas, the Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, made on the floor of the House of Representatives on April 10, 1973, during debate on a proposal to override the President's veto of the rural water and sewer grant program:

"Mr. POAGE. . . the President begins by saying that he asks one simple question: 'Would this program justify an increase in taxes in order to pay for it?'"

"Now this sounds like a noble yardstick, but . . . did the President use this same yardstick when he officially promised several billion of our tax dollars presumably to build water and sewer and other systems in North Vietnam? Did he use this yardstick when he asked and received tax money to purchase 17 new helicopters at a cost of \$37 million to replace an existing fleet of 18-month-old copters for his White House staff?"

"And let us look at the budget he sent us in January. He asked for \$169 million for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries. Will that not require tax money?"

"This same budget asks for \$153 million for the arts and humanities—an increase of about 80 percent. I have no criticism of either sport fishing or of the arts. I believe that they both contribute to the quality of American life. But I want to suggest that a Federal dollar used for sport fishing or for the arts has exactly the same effect on the need for taxes as a dollar spent on rural sewer systems. The President simply claims the right to determine priorities. This has nothing to do with the total of expenditures."

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT—APRIL 6,
1973

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States, The White
House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In today's *Washington Post* there was mention of a potential twenty-five percent pay raise recommendation for certain governmental officials, including Members of Congress. I wish to reg-

ister my opposition to this as our situation is so widely misunderstood already. For those of us who are not wealthy, as a matter of fact, consideration might be given by the Pay Board to a reduction in salary and in lieu thereof providing a housing allowance which would cover the often exorbitant cost of lodging in the capital area.

Respectfully,

JACK BRINKLEY,
Member of Congress.

A HISTORY LESSON

Once upon a time, there were two great powers who were always opposing each other. One was sophisticated, advanced, educated, shrewd in business, and very wealthy. Its opponents were crude, pragmatic, and very warlike. The wise men in the enlightened, sophisticated country came up with the brilliant idea that if they destroyed their arms and armories, declared themselves for peace, and renounced war, no one would want to bother them. If they proved that they were no threat, then those across the sea would feel safe, would no longer have fear, and everyone could settle down to trading. Without military expenditures, things could be done. Prosperity would boom without the load of military spending. So they did it.

But, unhappily, those on the other side didn't play the game right. They decided that, now that they had the chance, they might as well make sure that the enlightened country wouldn't change their minds, and then they wouldn't have to worry at all.

So Rome destroyed Carthage.

**HON. GEORGE BROWN REPORTS
1972 INCOME, CURRENT NET
WORTH**

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my practice for the past several years, I am reporting herewith my income for last year and current net worth for the benefit of any who may be interested.

For 1972 my total income was approximately \$2,500.

My net worth is approximately \$33,000 and consists of my equity in a Washington area home and furnishings—\$15,000—an equity interest in several lots in California's 29th Congressional District, which I represented for 8 years—another \$15,000—and a loan of dubious collectibility to my campaign committee—\$18,000. I also own one share of General Motors stock, worth less than \$100, but which makes me feel like a capitalist. I owe about \$15,000 on notes, aside from the mortgages on my house and lots. My equity in retirement systems is not included in the above. My equity in a 1973 Pontiac is about zero.

My wife had no income last year and owns no separate property.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the only financial disclosure required of Members of the House of Representatives is the form which we submit to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, a form which provides for only a very limited disclosure. A reporter for

Gannett News Service, after examining this form and noting that it showed no income in the categories referred to in the form, asked me how I managed to support myself last year. I allowed this reporter, John Simonds, to examine copies of my income tax forms for the past few years so that he could determine this for himself, and I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the article which he wrote based on his examination of these documents, his discussions with members of my staff, and whatever other research he engaged in.

The article, as printed in the San Bernardino Sun-Telegram on May 13, follows:

**REPRESENTATIVE BROWN'S EARNINGS PLACE
HIM BELOW "POVERTY LINE"**

(By John E. Simonds)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. George E. Brown, Jr., D-Colton, has made public a 1972 federal income tax return that shows his earnings last year placed him below what is usually considered the poverty level.

Brown, who returned to the House this year following a two-year hiatus resulting from his unsuccessful 1970 try for the U.S. Senate, reported that his income was \$2,521 last year, a figure so low he did not have to pay any taxes.

The joint return that Brown and his wife, Rowena, filed listed his wages at \$166 with \$1,750 coming from "consulting fees" and \$604 from interest. A part of that interest was \$500 paid to him by Rep. Glenn Anderson, D-Calif., who bought Brown's home on Capitol Hill two years ago and is paying off part of the mortgage to Brown.

John Longville, Brown's press aide, said the Congressman sold some property in East Los Angeles for \$15,000, which did not result in a profit, and cashed in some other holdings to make ends meet last year. The form 1040 did not show these liquidations since they did not net Brown a profit. The Browns have four children.

Brown volunteered to make his income tax form public in response to a question about the outside income form he and other House members were required to submit by April 30 to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Brown's form listed no sources of income, investments or speaker's fees during 1972, raising a question about how he supported himself last year.

Brown has been an advocate of full public disclosure of members' personal and political finances and has urged other colleagues to open their books to the public.

Rep. Jerry L. Pettis, R-Calif., submitted a form to the ethics committee that included little information about his outside earnings. He listed a speaking fee from the American Medical Association, but did not say how much it was. The rules only require a listing of such "honoraria" that total \$300 or more, but the amount itself does not have to be listed.

Rep. Victor V. Veysey, R-Calif., listed stock holdings in the Japan Fund, Security Pacific National Bank, Dun & Bradstreet, Ingersoll Rand, Irving Trust Co. of New York, Chemical Fund, Atlantic Refining Co., American Express and National General Corp. Veysey also listed his proprietorship in the Victor V. Veysey Ranch. He said he collected an honorarium from the California Beet Growers, but did not say how much.

Longville said the congressman had about \$100,000 when he came to Congress and only \$50,000 when he left after losing out in the 1970 Senate primary. Until winning election last year from his new district, Brown was driving a 1965 Impala that frequently broke down during his campaign.

OVERVIEW OF PETROLEUM
SUPPLY SITUATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has been holding hearings at which witnesses have been testifying on the growing fuel demands and the effects of the shortage on farmers.

Too few people realize the serious consequences that might arise in our food production chain if adequate supplies of fuel are not available.

To bring this problem to the attention of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD the testimony of Stephen A. Wakefield, Assistant Secretary of the Interior and member of the Oil Policy Committee:

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN A. WAKEFIELD BEFORE
THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, MAY
17, 1973

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the current energy supply situation in the United States and its impact upon the agricultural sector of the economy.

I would like to confine my prepared remarks to a brief overview of the current situation regarding petroleum, natural gas and LPG, the significance of this situation to agriculture, and some of the actions we have taken to alleviate the situation.

OVERVIEW OF PETROLEUM SUPPLY SITUATION

Petroleum demand in the United States has grown rapidly over the past several years. At the same time refining capacity in this country has been expanded relatively slowly, such that we are now faced with the situation that domestic refining capacity is not adequate to meet domestic demands. The reasons for this condition are complex, and I will not try to address them in detail here. The focus of our discussion here today is more concerned with the evaluation of the impact of the current situation and attention to the means by which we might avoid serious consequences.

In this environment, product supplies will be very tight. Our projections show that for 1973 a shortage of perhaps one to two percent of demand in gasoline supplies is a probable occurrence this summer. Of course, these projections are based on a number of assumptions, including refinery operating rates, crude availability, import volumes, and other factors. We think our projections are based on the most probable operations in the industry over the next year. We have, however, tested our estimates for possible deviations from our assumptions, and if several unlikely but possible contingencies should occur, we may face shortages as high as four or five percent of demand this summer. I might add, also, that there is at least some probability that shortages might be avoided altogether, if we are lucky.

As you are aware, the petroleum markets in the U.S. are not monolithic. There are distribution problems within the industry, due both to physical factors, such as the location of pipelines and water access, and to economic factors, relating to the size and degree of integration of companies from well-head to market and other factors. In this system, we cannot expect that a one to two percent shortage of product will appear simultaneously and evenly spread across all geographic locations and product markets. There will be areas of the country which will perhaps escape the consequences of a short-

age altogether, and other areas in which the shortage might be acute. It is precisely this problem that the allocation program, which Mr. Ligon will touch on later, seeks to reduce.

Because of the relatively limited flexibility of supply and the significant role of small, independent companies in the area, the Midwest United States is the area of principal concern for this summer, this area of the country which will most likely be faced with the more significant problems of product supply. Our mutual concern, Mr. Chairman, is magnified due to the concentration of agricultural interests in the Midwest area, and the potential consequences for the Nation if supplies should be critically short in this region.

NATURAL GAS AND LPG

Both natural gas and LPG supplies are expected to be extremely tight this year. Natural gas shortages have been experienced over the past few years, and are in large part responsible for the marked increase in distillate fuel oil consumption. For both these products, the critical period for potential shortages will probably be in the winter during the period of peak seasonal demand. As I previously stated, the overall situation regarding heating fuels next winter will be highly dependent upon our experience this summer, and the ability of the industry to build adequate stocks of distillate fuels in preparation for the winter. Currently, stocks of distillates are above normal for this period of the year, and if current refinery performance is sustained over the summer (including a high level of imports), we anticipate that the potential for winter supply problems will be materially reduced.

Natural gas and LPG both have an impact on agricultural interests which is slightly different from the normal use of these products for heating. I will discuss the agricultural factors of the supply situation in a few minutes.

IMPACT OF CURRENT SUPPLY SITUATION
ON AGRICULTURE

Agricultural demand for gasoline and diesel fuel this summer are of prime concern. Based on projections made by the Department of Agriculture, we estimate that in the Midwest area (PAD District II) agricultural gasoline demands will be about 225 MB/D, or about nine percent of the total Midwest demand, during the period April through September. This, of course, represents the peak season for both agricultural and total consumption of gasoline. During the same period, April through September, agricultural diesel fuel requirements are projected to be about 86 MB/D, or some fourteen percent of total distillates demand in PAD II. The consumption of diesel (or distillates) by the agricultural sector, however, is contra-seasonal to the demand pattern for total distillates in the Midwest, in that agricultural diesel consumption peaks in summer, rather than winter.

Our projections for the Midwest, although much less precise than projections for the total U.S., indicate that gasoline supplies overall will be extremely tight but adequate during the second quarter. This, again, assumes high levels of refinery operation, crude availability and imports for all areas of the country, including PAD II. In the third quarter, however, we anticipate that shortages may appear, even at maximum levels of refinery operation.

I might add at this point that our projections for gasoline are highly dependent on the import levels of both gasoline and distillates. Distillate imports, particularly, through the first four months of 1973 have averaged about 400 MB/D, well above last year's levels. This performance is due in large part to the absence of quantitative import restrictions on distillates throughout this year. As the new import regulations take

effect, in which both gasoline and distillates are allowed to be imported in unlimited quantity, we would expect that gasoline imports will show a similar upward trend. If the current performance as regards imports of distillates can be sustained, the industry will be able to devote more capacity to the production of gasoline during the second quarter, relieving this supply problem somewhat without damaging our distillate supply position for heating next winter.

As a general summary of the Midwest/agricultural situation, we see the prospect of gasoline shortages as a real possibility, probably in the third quarter of the year, and in terms of total demand, of a relatively small magnitude. Diesel fuel supplies for agricultural consumption would not appear to be a problem, particularly because of the current good stock situation in distillates and the contra-seasonal nature of the agricultural demand pattern.

The Federal Power Commission, because of the serious gas shortage being experienced by gas pipelines serving the interstate market, has established nine categories respecting the use of gas. The second category, after meeting the requirements of residential, small commercial consumers, is the large commercial requirements and firm industrial requirements for plant protection, feedstock and process needs. Feedstock gas is defined by the FPC as "gas used for its chemical properties of natural gas as a raw material in creating an end product."

Natural gas is used as a feedstock in the manufacture of ammonia, destined primarily for fertilizers. This consumption amounts to about 500 billion cubic feet annually or about 2.2 percent of our total annual consumption of natural gas.

Based on this definition, it appears that the use of natural gas for the manufacture of ammonia is one of the top categories in the allocation of available supplies of gas.

Propane, 70 percent of which comes from the production of natural gas, is used for crop drying. In 1971, it is estimated that some five million barrels or about two percent of our total consumption of propane was used for this purpose.

This year's supply of fertilizer is not likely to be adversely affected by the natural gas supply situation, as the total consumption of natural gas in the summer is low and summer shortages for this category of use are not likely. Propane requirements for crop drying, on the other hand, dovetail into the peak demand season for heating fuels. In a normal winter situation, crop drying should be complete before cold weather occurs, which implies that propane for crop drying may be adequate. If, however, we experience a cold early winter similar to our experience of late 1972, we may expect some problems. Again, much depends on the overall availability of heating fuels, including distillates, and based on current stock levels and operations we have some encouragement that problems similar to last year's can be avoided.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO AVOID SERIOUS
CONSEQUENCES OF A SHORTAGE?

We have already taken several steps intended to alleviate or eliminate the prospects of shortage this summer and next winter. As I mentioned, the recent import program changes will encourage higher product imports, and additionally, the implementation of license fees for crude imports above 1973 quota levels will provide a measure of value to the import "tickets" now held by independent refiners and, consequently, some leverage for obtaining crude supplies. We have also granted the Oil Import Appeals Board virtually unlimited quantities of license fee-free quota for independents faced with unusual hardship. We have further taken steps to distribute Federally-owned

crude oil preferentially to small refiners in an effort to ease crude supply problems.

The U.S.G.S. estimates current quantities of royalty oil accruing from all Federal lands amounts to about 225,000 B/D (Elk Hills NPR #1 not included), of this total amount, approximately 64,000 B/D are onshore and the remaining 160,000 B/D are offshore. Of the offshore total, 48,300 B/D are on Section 6 leases and are not available for distribution. Ten thousand B/D are produced off the California OCS and are fully committed leaving about 100,000 B/D available from the Gulf of Mexico OCS. Since January 29, 1973, some 30,000 B/D have been granted to applicants. Thirty-five applications have been made for a total of 172,243 B/D. This amount minus what has been granted totals 142,000 B/D or twice the amount remaining of the available supply.

By regulation (30 CFR part 225A), the Secretary of the Interior has decided to give preference in royalty oil disposal to small refiners as determined under the rules of the Small Business Administration, except when special circumstances warrant other actions. In line with these regulations sales contracts have been made with Good Hope Industries, La Jet, Inc., Indiana Farm Bureau Coop. Assoc., Inc., Howell Corporation and Rock Island Refining Corp., and approval has been granted to Gladioux Refinery Co. and Alabama Refining Company, Inc. These data are current through May 11, 1973, based on the latest report by the U.S. Geological Survey.

Our current efforts are directed into two areas: fuel conservation and product allocation. As for fuel conservation, I cannot emphasize enough the impact that fuel and energy conservation practices could have on the current situation. Even a moderate attempt by a percentage of the consumers to conserve fuels could reduce demands by an amount sufficient to erase the entire projected shortage. In the Department of the Interior, we have just established an Office of Energy Conservation which is now actively coordinating the efforts of several Government agencies in rapidly developing a program of Government, industry and public conservation which could be implemented very shortly. If successful, this program could have major impact this summer. Such a program will be a necessity in the years ahead, if we are to avoid repeated shortages until we can develop domestic resources, under the President's energy policies, sufficient to offset our rapidly growing demands.

A major part of our current effort is also devoted to administration of a product allocation program, the authority for which was granted by the Eagleton amendment to the Economic Stabilization Act. I would like to defer discussion of the allocation program to Mr. Ligon, appearing before you as a representative of the Oil Policy Committee.

A GREEN THUMB MAKES DOLLARS AS WELL AS SENSE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who might be referred to as garden freaks—in the jargon of young people—have been given a new legitimacy. The high cost of food at the supermarket, has given rise to thought on the great values found inside a 25-cent package of seed.

The details of this revelation are in the May 17, 1973, issue of the Christian

Science Monitor which includes an informative article on the delights of horticulture without a garden plot. In these days of unfolding coverups, it is encouraging to see something that does not involve a plot.

So that my colleagues and their constituents may reap the benefits of a green thumb, I am enclosing a copy of the article to be inserted in the RECORD:

WILL 25 CENTS BUY YOU A SUMMER OF CARROTS?

(By Phyllis Hanes)

With food prices high and still climbing, one of the best investments a family can make is a 25-cent package of vegetable seeds. One packet of carrot seeds will grow enough to feed a family of four all summer long. And although there are other reasons for gardening, such as freshness, flavor, and freedom from pesticides, the strongest incentive right now is the price of food.

During the '40's vegetable plots were called Victory Gardens, and then in the '60's everyone was into organic gardening. Now we have the Economy or Inflation Plot. But whatever you call it, the small family vegetable patch is sprouting up all over, especially in urban areas.

Families with plenty of land have no problems, but these are rare. Those with no space, however, are resorting to the old American custom of make-do.

ANY PLACE WILL DO

There are gardens on the garage roof, under the breezeway, around the swings and hanging from the eaves as well as in pots and window boxes.

The idea that vegetables must be planted in tidy rows is no longer essential. Precise, geometric beds are a thing of the past. It's even possible to grow vegetables without a garden, according to some of the new experts. There are books and brochures and radio programs to tell you how.

The main thing that is different is that there's no need to have the vegetable garden as one unit, anymore. Fine, if you have a sizable spot. But if not, narrow strips and patches of ground can be put to use easily.

"A vegetable garden doesn't have to be a square patch or a round circle in order to produce," says Jerry Baker, one of the new breed of garden teachers. "Mix the vegetables in with the flowers—they'll love it."

"Plants are like people. They're marvelous mixers," he said one day this spring, when he dropped into the office to chat.

"Tuck your radishes in under the evergreen shrubs. I do," he said. "A few bush beans or beets will enjoy growing in a row along the driveway. And carrots look great with their green fernery as a border for zinnias or bachelor buttons."

AFFECTION EMPHASIZED

Mr. Baker has both radio and television shows on gardening. He's recently formed a research organization called the American Gardening Institute, and he's written a series of books called the "Make Friends Series" (Simon & Shuster, \$1.95). They are concerned with making friendships with roses, and with your vegetable garden, lawn, annuals, fruit trees, evergreens, and garden covers.

Plants need affection as much as they need attention, according to Mr. Baker's theory. He has a rule of thumb that guarantees a green thumb which says a gardener must have "pride, persistence, and patience."

Another believer in planting food in every available nook and cranny is television actor Glenn Ford who grows fruits and berries around his swimming pool and has his front lawn covered with strawberry plants.

Space is the big problem for most city dwellers and "minigardens" have been the subject of countless books and articles.

Perhaps the most popular one is a free brochure put out by the U.S. Department of Agriculture called "Minigardens for Vegetables, Home and Garden Bulletin No. 163." It's available by writing to the Department of Agriculture, Office of Information, Washington, D.C. 20250.

Other books and magazine articles tell how to feed a family of four all summer on gardens of a certain size. They also show diagrams and directions for making boxes, planting tubs, old wooden barrels, and other containers, in which midget vegetables can be grown.

MIDGET SEEDS AVAILABLE

Most all seed catalogs showed a generous number of seeds for midget vegetables this year. Available are midget watermelons to better fit your refrigerator, midget corn on the cob, dwarf modern cabbage, Tiny Tim tomatoes, Tom Thumb lettuce, and midget cucumbers, to name a few.

Another way to reap big harvests from small space is to plant climbing vegetables such as cucumber, squash, and melons, so they'll grow vertically instead of horizontally.

They will climb up a fence or trellis, homemade step-ladder or maypole, using considerably less space than if they grew along the ground in the usual manner.

They also will climb just as happily up the side of your garage, over your breezeway or on an old rose trellis or arbor, if these are the only areas you can find for the purpose.

A large seed company, Northrup King, has figured out that one 25-cent package of cucumber seeds will supply you with at least 50 cucumbers. This means a saving of \$4.75, figuring that you might buy them in the supermarket at 10 cents each.

Cucumbers also can be grown in a barrel to save space, that is, if you can find enough soil to fill it.

You'll need more than the edge of a walkway, however, if you want to grow sweet corn—a vegetable that many gardeners believe justifies any amount of juggling or lawn grabbing for the pleasure of eating it freshly cut.

A single row won't pollinate well, so room is needed to make it worthwhile. There are several midget types, however, and many gardeners think it's well worth the cost of one pack, to have just a couple of good batches of corn straight from the garden.

MANY GADGETS ON SALE

Of course there's no limit to what a new gardener can spend if he gets "hooked" on some of the new gadgets and gimmicks. Expensive tools and tractors will soon eat up the big savings from that 25-cent package of seeds.

There are new and fancy gimmicks galore from Gro-lamps for tender seeds, to compressed pellets that expand in water, peat pots that can be planted along with the seedling, seed tapes that make sure you sow the seeds evenly spaced, and little sticks, each impregnated with a seed, that need only be struck into the good earth.

There also are soil substitutes and synthetic soils that are clean, easy to use, and are free of weeds and harmful organisms. A big advantage of these soils too, is that they are lightweight; easy to use in tubs or boxes that might need to be moved to follow limited sunlight.

Plans and designs for some new gardens look more like a wood-working course than a back-to-nature project. But never mind, they produce.

Some books show how to build seed beds raised to chair height so that weeding can be managed without any bending. Others have directions for wooden, tiered planters for easy putting or pollinating. These are helpful in a more practical way if the gardener's backyard is full of tree roots or rocky soil,

but has plenty of sun. He can import soil and plant in the tiered arrangement.

BOXES GO VEGETARIAN

Movable pots, wooden, and plastic window boxes and containers are not new to city terrace gardens, patios, and penthouse planters, but many formerly used for flowers now are extensively vegetarian.

Swapping seeds is another aspect of the new economy garden game. Although old-timers have always known how to give a slip or two of their favorite hydrangeas or a few iris to neighbors and relatives, seed swapping has a practical intent.

It's the result of a year's experience for some gardeners who found out at their first harvesttime that not only did they have more tomatoes ripe at the same time than they could use. But all their friends and neighbors also had plenty of the ripe fruit.

Small families and a loner can't possibly consume an 18-foot row of lettuce if plants mature all at one time, either.

The answer is to sow fewer seeds and swap the leftover ruby lettuce, for instance, for a half pack of zucchini squash or turnip.

The secret among horticulturists, is successive sowing, which assures a continuous supply of a vegetable, while it is in its prime.

Some small gardens I've seen are used for a mass planting of just one favorite vegetable—or one that grows easily in that particular soil. The seed, such as carrot seed, is sown broadcast over prepared ground, then sprinkled with peat moss or vermiculite, and watered.

UNUSUAL VARIETIES SOUGHT

The seeds start sprouting just like grass. what happens when weeds come is another problem, but the method is successful with some. A garden of nothing but lettuce or salad vegetables, is another favorite, and some people are happy with just a patch of herbs.

Gourmet gardeners, who often have some garden experience, are ready to try new and exotic varieties, and are an offshoot of the organic group. They're interested not only in absolute, untainted freshness, but also in unusual varieties such as shallots, flageolet beans, lovenge, or snow peas, that they can't find in local stores.

This is risky planting for the amateur, but it's exciting. Nothing gives the grower a greater feeling of independence than learning he's under no obligation to take the word of a neighbor who insists that Big Boy tomatoes or Golden Bantam corn are the best.

The fun of gardening for the gourmet is in being able to recognize the subtle differences in varieties of the same vegetable and in discovering them for himself.

Then there are the tomato lovers, who, even though space is limited always try a few new varieties each year, checking the early spring seed books and comparing the length of the long-maturing Beefsteaks (96 days), and Ponderosas (95 days), with the quicker growing Earliana (66 days), and the Fireball tomato (60 days).

Another gourmet gardener might show you his plot with 20 or more varieties of beans—from Montezuma red beans, the same bean grown by Indians when Cortez discovered Mexico, found in toms 3,000 years old—to soy beans, fava beans, limas, and Kentucky Wonders.

ALL SORTS OF CARROTS

A gardener also might be comparing the Chantenay and Danvers carrots from the supermarket with his home-grown French ones called "touchon" or the tiny Dutch carrots called "sucram" which means sweet.

United States seed companies have rapidly become more diversified in the numbers of varieties of seeds they carry. A few years ago the big concern was with mass market sell-

ing. You got your seeds from hardware and grocery store seed racks.

Today it's different. Although I sent to France and England this year for catalogs with special items such as the flageolet bean, mini marrows and Oriental vegetables, I discovered later they were available from several U.S. companies.

Nichols Garden Nursery, Albany, Ore.; Harry Saier of Dimondale, Mich.; Burpee's and a few others make a point of importing European and Oriental varieties that will grow here.

Once you start getting the handsome brochures from companies such as Thompson & Morgan in England and Georges Delbard in France, you'll find yourself eyeing every vacant lot you pass with an eye to expanding your garden plot one way or another next year.

Last year there was another boom in community gardens which is still increasing today. In Appleton, Wis., a priest rented seven acres from a farmer and got people together to buy seeds in bulk and rent plots for only \$5 a year.

STUDENTS COOPERATE

And students at Pennsylvania State University paid \$3.25 for the summer for 20 by 30 foot plots on which to grow vegetables in an effort to "return to the soil" and save money.

Boston's Fenway Community Gardens, started during World War II as Victory Gardens, are going full steam today with about 500, 15 by 30 plots, some with gardeners at the same plot for 20 years.

Although four or five hours a week is adequate to maintain a garden the size of the Fenway plots, most of these gardeners spend twice as much time puttering and perfecting their plants.

But no garden groups or even the new experts will object to exploding the myth of the green-thumb magic.

Gardening means physical work, with a peasant's tools. And there are some people who have an aversion to this kind of labor. Gardening, even to save money, is not for them.

But for people with enthusiasm for getting close to the land, it's pleasant, relaxing, and it will help you enjoy very good savings on the food budget this summer and fall.

SAVE THE PUFFISH

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Ash Meadows area in the State of California and Nevada has been the home of the several species of pupfish for 20,000 years. During this time, the pupfish have adapted from the coldwater, postglacial lakes which covered the Western United States following the last Ice Age to a totally different and inhospitable environment, which is typified by Devils Hole—where the water is high in mineral content, low in oxygen, and 92 degrees in temperature.

Yet the pumping of water by a local ranching operation has caused the water level in Devils Hole to drop to a dangerously low level. The desert pupfish may not survive another year unless steps are taken to preserve their unique habitat.

Saving the remaining species and subspecies of this endangered fish, along

with the protection of their habitat, is of importance not only for the maintenance of nature's diversity, but because of their tremendous value for studies of genetic evolution. Already man's needless indifference has permitted the extinction of several subspecies; and the two which live in the Ash Meadows area are on the brink of extinction.

In addition to the unique desert pupfish found in the Ash Meadows area, botanical research conducted by Dr. Janice C. Beatley of the Laboratory of Nuclear Medicine and Radiation Biology of the University of California at Los Angeles, assistant professor of botany; James L. Reveal, of the University of Maryland; and others, have revealed unique species of plants growing in the Ash Meadows area—plants that are found in no other place in the world.

Some of these plants were restricted by evolution to this single area; most of them are entirely different from plants in surrounding areas of Nevada and California. Also some rare species of snails have been located in the Ash Meadows area.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I today introduce a bill to establish the Pupfish National Wildlife Refuge. This bill would not rescue the desert pupfish from extinction, but those unique species of plants and snails would also be preserved. As Professor Reveal states:

We are fighting time. No advanced technology will ever replace an extinct species.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pupfish National Wildlife Refuge of the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve and protect several species of desert pupfish, and to interpret their evolution in areas of their natural environment, for the benefit and education of the people of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to establish the Pupfish National Wildlife Refuge (hereinafter referred to as the "Refuge") in the States of California and Nevada. The boundaries of the Refuge shall be as generally depicted on the map entitled "Pupfish National Wildlife Refuge" and dated May 1972, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the Department of the Interior.

Sec. 2 The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to acquire lands, waters, and interests therein, within the boundary of the Refuge, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. Lands, waters, and interests therein owned by the State of California or Nevada, or any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only with the consent of such owner. Lands acquired by the Secretary within the boundaries of the Refuge may be withdrawn from all forms of entry for administration as part of the Refuge. When the Secretary determines that lands, waters, or interests therein have been acquired sufficient to constitute an efficiently administrable unit for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Refuge by publication of notice to that effect in the Federal Register. Pending such establishment and thereafter, the Secretary shall administer the lands, waters, or interests therein

within the boundaries of the Refuge as a unit of the National Wildlife System. In accordance with the provisions of this Act, the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee), and the Endangered Species Act of 1969 (16 U.S.C. 668aa, 668cc-6), except that the monetary limitation in the Endangered Species Act of 1969, relating to appropriations for land access from the Land and Water Conservation Fund shall not apply to acquisitions of land under this Act.

SEC. 3. Effective upon establishment of the Refuge, the Devils Hole portion of the Death Valley National Monument which was added to the Death Valley National Monument by proclamation numbered 2961 of January 17, 1952, is abolished as such, and the lands, waters, and interests therein are made a part of the Refuge established under this Act. Any funds available for the Devils Hole portion of the Death Valley National Monument shall be available for the purposes of the Refuge.

"FREE PRESS"—PEKING STYLE

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon made his historic journey to Communist China last year he cautioned that detente between Washington and Peking would be a delicate matter for a long time to come because our respective political systems are so diametrically opposed.

However, in the euphoria that accompanied that event and in the great volume of reportage that has come out of Red China ever since, there is a tendency to forget or just ignore the most fundamental difference between our respective societies: Ours is free and theirs is not.

In recent months, we have been told over and over that Mao Tse-tung's regime has made great strides in seeking to overcome China's historic legacy of disease, hunger, plagues, and floods. Only rarely is it made clear that the accomplishments claimed by Peking and hailed by so many of our newsmen are at the total expense of all individual freedom and that whatever has been achieved on the China mainland since the Communists grabbed power in 1949, results from one of the most ruthless tyrannies in the history of mankind.

Just how frail the threads of detente are when dealing with Communist dictatorships is pointed up in microcosm by an experience the New York Times management has just reported. The Times has sent more reporters to Red China than any other journal in the United States. It has been eminently fair in its editorials regarding Red China over the years. It has long sought to open a full-time bureau in Peking.

But, it seems, the Times has made an egregious error in the eyes of Peking's masters. It has accepted and printed advertising both from the free Republic of China in Taiwan and from Americans of Chinese origin who are hostile to the Chinese Communists.

Peking's emissaries have advised the Times it must cease and desist from allowing its advertising pages to be used by

those who are critical of Communist China. Not only do Mao's representatives seek to stifle a newspapers' obligation to press freedom. They also threaten reprisal. When the Times rejected the Peking demand, the Chinese Communists made it indelibly clear that they would not permit a Times bureau in Peking until and unless the Times abandoned its free press concept and refused to publish any more political advertising which offended the sensibilities of the so-called People's Republic on the China mainland.

Of course, we have already seen a prime example of how Red China seeks to curtail press freedom. Shortly after they were admitted to the United Nations the Peking Government forced—blackmailed is a more appropriate word—Secretary General U Thant and his successor Kurt Waldheim to exclude two highly respected reporters from the Republic of China from further accreditation as U.N. correspondents.

I am happy to say that the Times opposed that abuse of press freedom by the Red Chinese in the U.N. as vigorously as they are now opposing Peking's latest totalitarian efforts to crush the Times' freedom to publish any and all opinion. Incidentally, the Times points out that it had accepted the advertising of North Korea and other Communist countries but his made no impression on the Communist Chinese.

Much as Peking publicly insists it does not interfere with the internal affairs of other countries, the fact of the matter is they cannot resist doing so. What could be better evidence of this than trying to destroy the American principles of press freedom and freedom of expression?

For the benefit of those of my colleagues who may have missed seeing the Times account of this sordid affair, I insert it at his point in the RECORD:

[An editorial from the New York Times, May 17, 1973]

THE CHINESE PROTEST

Over the years there have been recurrent objections from widely diverse groups, and individuals to particular advertisements appearing in this newspaper. Yesterday the Government of the Chinese People's Republic protested—not for the first time—against the appearance in The Times of political advertisements placed by anti-Communist Chinese residents in this country and in Taiwan.

As long ago as Dec. 28, 1961, an editorial in The Times stated our basic position on freedom of advertising: "The Times believes that in furtherance of the objectives of the First Amendment of the Constitution, it should keep its advertising columns open to all points of view. . . . The political and other opinion of the New York Times—that is, our editorial policies—are expressed daily and exclusively in the editorial columns of this page. . . . Our policy with respect to political advertising is to keep our columns open to those who wish to express a particular point of view, no matter how widely divergent it may be from our own."

This position has been reiterated a number of times since then and remains unchanged. Thus almost four years ago, on Aug. 29, 1969, we stated:

"We at The New York Times have always felt an obligation to keep our advertising columns open to all comers, refusing ads only on the grounds of fraud or deception, vul-

garity or obscenity and incitement to law-breaking or to racial or religious hatred."

It goes without saying that we will maintain this policy in the future as in the past.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES: EDUCATIONAL SMORGASBORDS WITH A LOCAL FLAVOR

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, education at all levels has always been a concern of mine even long before I came to the Congress. As we move into our last quarter of the 20th century, it is not hard to see that our rapidly changing society has much different education needs than the society of the first half of this century.

Vocational education and training programs as well as adult education programs have encouraged many people to stay in the "system" gaining valuable skills which enable them to find work at a much higher level of income than would have normally been open to them, and at the same time contribute much to their community.

Community colleges in the past were often looked upon as a 2-year institution where you could go for your first 2 years of college. How this has changed. Community colleges are now offering one of the most valuable educational experiences available. Through skillful counseling, these schools in 2 years attempt to guide and direct students to their final goals, whether it be on to a 4-year institution, to a vocational technical school for final training in a skill such as medical technology. These community colleges are also reaching out to encompass older members of the community and offering cultural and artistic benefit as well as the expected academic routine.

At this point I would like to share with you an article by Kenneth G. Gehret, the education editor of the Christian Science Monitor. I believe it has much to say about the future of these institutions:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 14, 1973]

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

(By Kenneth G. Gehret)

"We're like a smorgasbord. We say, 'Come in, sample our dishes. Take what you want as often as you want.'"

John S. Owens, vice-chancellor of the Coast Community College District, Costa Mesa, Calif., was describing the role of community colleges in general and of the two campuses in his district in particular.

"It isn't that way in the four-year colleges," he continued. "There a waiter gives you a menu. You must choose from the list of dishes, and at the bottom is the notation, 'no substitutes.'"

Mr. Owens probably realized that his metaphor was overdrawn. Options are not so broad as depicted in the burgeoning two-year institutions nor so narrow in the four-year ones.

Still, there can be no doubt that community colleges and "regular colleges" (state or private) are worlds apart. True, most community colleges include among their offerings academic programs that prepare stu-

dents for transfer into the junior year of four-year colleges, en route to the bachelor's degree.

But the community college is much more. It is indeed a phenomenon all its own. It is not a copy of the lower division of the four-year college. The "community" in its title suggests its place and mission much better than did the earlier designation of "junior college," though some publicly supported two-year colleges still bear the name. Its roots are in the community, its students come from the local area, its sense of purpose is strongly community oriented.

And its attitude is democratic, rather than elitist.

AN OPEN-ADMISSION POLICY

Typically, the community college boasts an open-admissions policy. All high-school graduates in its district are welcome; grades make no difference. (Where applicants outnumber available places, students with the poorest records may not be accepted.) In fact, some community colleges admit drop-outs, preparing them to take high-school equivalency exams.

Charges are nominal, with costs covered largely by public funds.

For all the publicity given black admissions at four-year colleges and universities, the fact remains that it is the two-year institutions that are offering the largest number of blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and other minorities ready access to higher education. Community colleges are minorities' prime educational route to upward social and economic mobility.

To say this is not to disparage the efforts of other institutions of higher learning. Many of them are doing an excellent job within their resources. And since community colleges can award only the associate of arts degree, other colleges and universities (public or private) have the responsibility for providing advanced training for minority-group members desiring it.

Community colleges are essentially student centered. They meet community residents at least half way. This is often true in terms of hours; afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes are common. And courses are added according to individual interest and community need.

If a local plant shuts down, the college usually is in a strong position to retrain laid-off workers in line with the job market. Similarly, expanding production or service industries often depend on the college to provide employees who have entry-level skills.

Workers who want to move ahead on the job or prepare for a different kind of work frequently enroll in evening courses.

Community-college officials often speak of "meeting the needs of people where they are." This extends beyond the job ladder or progress toward a degree. It includes satisfying cultural and artistic tastes, and acquiring or developing skills for personal enjoyment.

LIFETIME OF LEARNING

These needs vary according to age level and type of community. The comprehensive community college is prepared to deal with the recent high-school graduate, the employed or unemployed worker, and the senior citizen. It also may take courses directly to inmates in prison and to mothers on welfare.

This is hardly a description of the lower half of a four-year college. It is, rather, a picture of a community institution of dynamic vitality and tremendous potential. Its concern is increasingly with the needs of the local area.

The community college stands in the very center of the emerging concept of a lifetime of learning, in which people drop in and drop out of studies as their needs and interests change and their horizons expand.

The thrust evident in the community-college movement is part realization, part potential. Development of the institution in

this form dates only from the early 1960's. Learning how to respond to individual needs and community concerns takes time. There are formidable obstacles in the way.

"The community colleges have a tremendously complicated educational task," said Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer Jr., president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, in an interview. "This is because of the great variety of students attracted and the commitment of the institutions to meet them where they are."

A diversity of students means a diversity of expectations. Adjusting courses and services to different needs is obviously a major challenge to the institutions, Dr. Gleazer points out.

Often, too, the individual expectations are unrealistic. The student may be pursuing the wrong goal. He may be heading for a career in business management when aptitude tests indicate a more suitable goal would be in electronics.

Counseling in the community college is essential in such individual instances as well as in those largely of a group nature. Minorities tend to shun technology training in favor of the academic track. The pull toward the BA degree is strong with them. Vocational education has a stigma from high-school days when voc-ed was considered "punitive." Those who could not make it in the academic track were shunted into manual training.

Yet for many, technologies (with the option of going on later from, say, medical lab technician to physician) are the realizable goal more students should pursue in the two-year college.

"We should be boosting budgets on counseling," Dr. Gleazer emphasizes. "If budgets tighten up, these kinds of services might go by the board, or at least be cut down. The colleges should recognize that counselors are different from faculty and that they should operate as a team of specialists, concentrating together on the 'patient.'"

Students often do not seek out counselors, Dr. Gleazer acknowledges, perhaps because they are few in number relative to the total student body. The team approach might make counseling more appealing, the executive director of AACJC believes.

"OPEN DOOR" DEBATED

The open-door policy of most community colleges has been the subject of debate in education circles. "How can you keep standards high if students who are inadequately prepared make up a large portion of each class?" critics ask.

Here is where the argument of democracy in education confronts the elitist contention.

"A student who has been deprived of an adequate education because of general school conditions or difficulty with the English languages does not necessarily lack the intelligence and ability to handle college-level work," open-access proponents assert.

"With skilled counseling and tutoring, many will make it through the community college. Others won't. But how can we know one group from the other until we give them a chance? And can society afford to neglect the ones who can make it?"

The entering class in one community college included 92 percent of students whose high-school grades were under 70 percent and who had severe problems in reading or other basic skills. Most of these students were blacks or Spanish-speaking. Special assistance helped pull many through. (See article on Hostos Community College in this section.)

Still, it is true that a large number of first-year students drop out. Orange Coast College (predominantly native white Americans) puts the figure at 38 percent. But what does the figure mean? Did that many fail?

REASONS DIFFER

The answer clearly is no. Many did not intend to go beyond one year, at least not im-

mediately. Some had the current need satisfied and went to work. Or felt compelled to take a job for financial reasons. Others transferred to another institution. No doubt a number would come back when it suited their purpose.

Quite likely, the fact that the typical student at Orange Coast is 26 years of age (often with a family) has a bearing on how long he stays at a stretch.

What happens to academic standards under these circumstances?

They are going up, Dr. Gleazer affirms: "Community colleges are increasingly attractive to students who might otherwise have gone to the university. This attests to the higher levels of academic achievement there."

Building on progress to date, Dr. Gleazer would have community colleges accept an even bigger role in the community. He sees a need "to identify the educational component in welfare, correctional institutions, etc. Then let the community colleges tackle it."

His expectation is that, through helping to correct these social problems, the colleges will not only assist the people directly involved, but save the community considerable money as well.

MORE CHANNELS SOUGHT

Yet he knows that the colleges "can't go it alone. We need to find ways to relate as effectively as we can to other institutions and agencies for the total job to be done."

Dr. Gleazer views the two-year college as in a strong position to perform another community function, that of serving as an occupational counseling and placement service. This should not be restricted to enrolled students, he points out. He means it as a service available to anyone. The colleges are already doing as much for students, hence broadening out to other adults seems feasible to the educator-executive.

Community colleges are fulfilling another essential function for enrolled youth, Dr. Gleazer is convinced:

"Students coming out of high school are often undecided about a career. They are not pressed to make a decision in the community colleges. The colleges serve the need for 'passage,' movement out of the educational system to adulthood."

There are, however, at least two major questions to be resolved before most community colleges can plot their course most effectively, according to the college-association executive: settling matters of funding and deciding the division of authority between community and state.

The two questions overlap.

Until recently, the pattern in most states has been local autonomy on most matters, with funding divided between the district and the state. In California, for example, local taxes levied specifically for the community college are supplemented by money from the state based on daily average attendance.

Dr. Gleazer and other observers see a trend toward greater state financing partly as a result of the so-called Serrano decision.

This 1971 ruling by the California Supreme Court declared that the inequalities in public-school education between a wealthy district and a much poorer one were discriminatory. Because of this decision, many states across the U.S. have been studying the possibilities of the state's assuming a larger share of public-school funding to reduce the inequalities that exist from district to district. Now the U.S. Supreme Court has cut across this trend with a ruling that implies property taxes are constitutionally acceptable as a way to finance schools.

Although the Serrano case did not deal directly with community colleges, the assumption is that the same principle, if it still is viable, would apply. Washington is one state that already underwrites the full cost of its two-year colleges.

WHO'S ACCOUNTABLE?

Another reason for increased state involvement is "accountability."

Dr. Gleazer puts it this way: "How can you justify duplication [of programs within the area]? Someone must identify educational needs and see that they're met. This policy direction is more and more being established at the state level."

Bucking this trend is the desire of communities for a large measure of control over decisions affecting the institution. This is developing into an area of conflict between communities and the state.

"I'm pretty well committed to some kind of local involvement though patterns will differ," the education executive says.

Dr. Gleazer spent last year visiting two-year colleges in 20 states and analyzing developments to date. The resulting book, "Project Focus," was recently released by McGraw-Hill.

Against this background, Dr. Gleazer is convinced that, whatever problems face the community colleges, they will continue their robust growth and develop into one of the most remarkable features of the education scene during the final decades of the 20th century.

FAMILY HEALTH VERSUS FAMILY PLANNING

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the March 31, 1973, issue of the prestigious British medical journal, *Lancet*, carried an important article by two faculty members at the Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine entitled "Family Health Versus Family Planning."

Written by Drs. Lawrence J. Casazza and Cicely D. Williams, the article asserts that family planning programs and nutrition supplement programs have seen little success in areas where total family health needs are not met in their simplest terms. The authors conclude: "A comprehensive approach is necessary."

Their findings are similar to those made recently by a staff survey team of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Their report, U.S. Aid to Population Family Planning in Asia, recommended that the United States should broaden its approach to the worldwide population problem by linking family planning, health and nutrition in a coordinated program of assistance.

The committee staff report also suggested that title X of the Foreign Assistance Act be revised to permit a coordinated program of family planning, health and nutrition through U.S. aid.

It is my hope that these suggestions will be seriously considered during congressional consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act. Because the *Lancet* bears directly on this issue, I urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

FAMILY HEALTH VERSUS FAMILY PLANNING

(By Lawrence J. Casazza and Cicely D. Williams)

Summary

The Ministries of Health for countries throughout the world are struggling for effective programmes to alleviate the mount-

ing population crush with its staggering health needs. The family-planning efforts as well as nutrition supplementation programmes have seen little success in areas where total family health needs are not met in their simplest terms. A comprehensive approach is required.

INTRODUCTION

The whole purpose of medical care is to ensure that people have enough professional supervision to supply sound health advice, to identify those at risk, and to provide treatment, curative and preventive, according to need.

For the masses living in developing countries and low-income neighbourhoods in developed countries the medical services fall regrettably short of fulfilling this purpose. Indeed, the World Health Organisation's declaration of the right of everyone to health sounds hollow when one surveys the gap between medical needs and services in most rapidly urbanising centres of South America, South-East Asia, and Africa.

Most people reading this belong to the privileged or to the relatively privileged sections of society. In them, most of the preventable or treatable diseases have been prevented or treated. They know full well after some deliberate reflection that this health, happiness, and comfort depend on the physical, mental, and social conditions of their homes more than on the proximity of a hospital with a cobalt unit or an organ-transplant expert or a family-planning clinic.

Medical care, for masses or individuals, depends first on the establishment of law and order. War refugees endure physical and mental anguish despite any advances in medical care the present technology can offer. On the other hand, totalitarian countries have succeeded in establishing some of the simplest and most effective programmes for health improvement. The Peoples' Republic of China has, indeed, revolutionised health care for the peasant population. This statement is made in a non-partisan light and only points out the prerequisite of a stable Government to get on with the job of providing health services.

Among the underprivileged, medical care is lamentably episodic. They may have access to emergency medical care, but follow-up is often inadequate and readmissions are frequent. They may also have some supervision in health centres, especially for routine immunisations and supplementary feeding. But in the world as a whole there is a large proportion of the most vulnerable who have no access to medical care either preventive, curative, or supervisory. Furthermore, this same segment is reproducing at a rate almost double that of the more privileged.

HEALTH PLANNING

With this broad statement of the problem, it follows that doctors and Government officials are pressed to formulate programmes to alleviate the situation. To make a start, planners set out to review the available health statistics only to find that they are absent or unreliable in most of the developing areas. Even in the "overdeveloped" countries the situation is not clear. Wegman summarised the situation when he stated that little more in the way of analysis can be done, beyond a study by colour, of U.S. infant-mortality statistics. Such a comparison is of little benefit to health planners, since the causes of these differentials between "white" and "all others" are not identified.¹

In almost every country in the world a high birth-rate is associated with a low standard of child health care (see table). It is reasonable then to see why planners seize upon population control as a panacea. Yet mere reduction in population size does not automatically improve conditions. The

Footnotes at end of article.

Netherlands is one of the most densely populated areas in the world, but is neither unhealthy, uneducated, nor dependent. Conversely, Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia with their sparse populations are remarkably backward. Family-planning education and services are undeniably a component of a health programme, but overemphasis of this one component at the expense of the nutritional and maternal and child-health needs of the family cannot produce higher standards of living, education, or responsibility.

SELECTED RATES BY COUNTRY FOR CRUDE BIRTH RATES, INFANT MORTALITY, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL DEATHS UNDER 5 YEARS

Country	Birth rate ¹	Infant mortality rate ¹	Deaths		Percent <5 year
			<5 year ²	Total ²	
Algeria.....	40.9	86.3	67,420	116,375	57.9
Egypt.....	34.9	119.0	266,215	449,375	59.2
Guatemala.....	39.0	88.4	38,655	74,830	51.7
Israel.....	26.8	22.9	2,025	16,527	12.3
Hong Kong.....	19.0	18.5	3,265	18,677	17.5
Canada.....	17.0	18.8	10,723	149,863	7.2
United States.....	17.3	19.2	100,605	1,863,149	5.4
Sweden.....	14.1	11.7	1,849	78,440	2.4

¹ United Nations Population and Vital Statistics Report series A, vol. XXIV, No. 3, 1971. Refer to 1970 or 1971 except for Algeria (1968 for birth rate and 1965 for infant mortality) and Egypt (1969 for infant mortality).

² United Nations Demographic Yearbook, 19th issue, 1967.

In rural Indian villages, women who lost children when their families were small showed a higher subsequent birth-rate.² For a balanced health programme consumer co-operation is needed. Untold millions of dollars have been spent on "crash programmes" and "mass impact" eradication projects which ignore the significance of domestic trivia in the maintenance of health and well-being. An example is a successful antitetanus vaccination scheme for mothers in Haiti where neonatal tetanus was practically eradicated, but where many infants slowly died of malnutrition and infection over the next two years of life.³

The same criticism can be levelled at the specialty of "tropical medicine", which emphasises traditionally communicable disease and parasitology. It has contributed to reducing mortality-rates in developing countries. But little attention is devoted to diseases of children in the tropics, where 50% of the deaths occur in children under 15 years and over 45% under the age of 5.⁴ How difficult it is to persuade those fostered in the European and North American tradition to accept and practise an essentially reasonable, simplified concept of maternal and child health services.⁵

FAMILY PLANNING

Gopalan and Nadamuni Naidu⁶ have called for the integration of nutrition programmes with family-planning services in order to decrease pregnancy wastage and infant and child mortality. However, Chen,⁷ in response to this suggestion, wrote that while such a concept "seems to make good common sense, . . . there is a real lack of scientific data" to support it. Similarly, Wolfers⁸ cited Singapore as an example of a successful family-planning programme reducing the birth rate from 50 per 1000 in 1950 to 21 per 1000 in 1970 without mentioning the existence of nutrition, paediatric, and obstetric services. From before the Japanese occupation in 1942 these services were supervising and treating over 70% of the mothers and children in the island, with the other 30% nearly all attending private doctors. Birth and death registrations have been practically complete since 1934. After 1945, these services were quickly re-established to provide comprehensive, continuing care in homes, health centres, and hospitals. Under

these conditions it was not difficult to get family-planning services accepted. Most clients were those referred by the health nurses of the Singapore Health Department.⁹ A similar development emerged in Hong Kong.¹⁰ In addition, a reduction in birth-rate can be seen for Malta and Italy accompanying a reduction in child mortality in the absence of any campaign for family planning.¹¹

On the other hand, in Seoul, South Korea, where family planning has been offered as a solitary aim, it is reported that three to five abandoned babies are picked up daily.¹² If women and children lack elementary medical care, repeated offers of an intrauterine device do nothing to encourage cooperation or parental responsibility.

ROLE OF NUTRITION PROGRAMMES

Just a few years ago most of us would have been shocked to learn that two-thirds of the world's children are significantly undernourished.¹³ Continued breakdown of traditional breast-feeding practices by urbanising, working mothers together with blunting of the anticipated increased food production during the past two years of the "green revolution" give little hope for downward adjustment of this estimate.¹⁴ Yet one of the scientific triumphs of the 20th century is the progress and development of our knowledge of nutrition. The task now is to transmit this knowledge in a meaningful message to those identified as poorly nourished to ensure utilisation of all available foods rather than dependence on supplementary programmes.

Massive food distribution may be a life-saving measure in catastrophic situations, but results from long-term programmes are disappointing. The food earmarked for the malnourished children frequently is sold because it is foreign to the usual diet or poorly distributed in the family, so that the index child receives only a token share. The frustration secondary to failure has led some to a blind faith in the results to be expected from family-planning projects. How surprised they are when the target population is offended and refuses to participate. The Demographic Conference in Accra in December, 1971, repeatedly stressed that family planning should be viewed in terms of the health and welfare of the individual and the family.¹⁵

The relationship between the nutritional status and resistance to infection has been recognised for centuries. It is no coincidence that Famine and Pestilence ride two of the four horses in the Apocalypse. Research on the immune response has demonstrated that the nutritional variable is significant in maintaining the integrity of this dynamically developing mechanism in newborn animals and humans.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ For the first time the synergistic effect of infection and malnutrition can be explained in part by breakdown in the host's defense mechanisms. Thus we see the imperative for effective nutrition programmes in any attempt to improve child health and intercept the cycle of disease, malnutrition, morbidity and death.

The nutrition programmes first and foremost should be diagnostic, therapeutic, and educational, not give-away. To start with, the local attitudes about nutrition must be known, and, where cases of malnutrition and failure to thrive are identified, the causes of this must be learned. Although economic restrictions on the family are a major factor in most cases, the encouragement of breast-feeding, improved hygienic preparation of foods, and avoidance of irritating, highly spiced adult food in infants' and children's diets would go far to improve the nutritional status. It is the responsibility of the medical community to bring new educational approaches to this area that has seen much rhetoric but little progress.

CONCLUSION

All too often, plans to meet the health needs of millions of people living in poverty are made by the more privileged members of society who by virtue of their role as planners are far removed from field conditions. Decisions are made for allocation of funds to programmes that fragment the health needs of the family. It becomes the burden of the already stressed family to "integrate" these services. This is asking too much of almost any family regardless of financial status. Health and contentment depend on the physical, mental, and social conditions of the home. Comprehensive services alone can begin to identify the special problems and risks in the homes and to meet the priorities of the families. Supplementary feeding programmes for children disregarding the other family members, obstetric services that only provide for hospital deliveries without follow-up of the high-risk infants, and well-baby programmes serving only infants or preschool children without continued school health programmes, are as near-sighted as family-planning programmes seeking acceptors without considering the total family health needs. For those health planners looking for scientific data before advocating this comprehensive policy on a national level need only look to their own families for proof.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Wegman, M. E. *Pediatrics*, 1972, 50, 956.
- ² Rhode, J. E. *Lancet*, 1972, ii, 705.
- ³ Driskill, L. Personal communication, 1972.
- ⁴ Health Conditions in the Americas, Pan American Health Organization Report, Washington, D.C., 1969.
- ⁵ Williams, C. D. *Lancet*, 1964, i, 345.
- ⁶ Gopalan, C., Nadamuni Naidu, A. *ibid.* 1972, ii, 1077.
- ⁷ Chen, L. C. *ibid.* 1973, i, 47.
- ⁸ Wolfers, D. *Am. F. publ. Hlth*, 1970, 60, 2354.
- ⁹ Singapore FPA Report, 1964.
- ¹⁰ Annual Report of Medical and Health Department of Hong Kong, 1971.
- ¹¹ Williams, C. D. *Trans. R. Soc. trop. Med. Hyg.* 1966, 60, 23.
- ¹² Harris, R. Personal communication, 1972.
- ¹³ Graham, G. G. *Am. F. clin. Nutr.* 1972, 25, 1184.
- ¹⁴ FAO 1972 Report, Rome.
- ¹⁵ *I.P.P.F. News*, no. 215, February, 1972.
- ¹⁶ Lopez, V., Davis, S. D., Smith, N. *Pediat. Res.* 1972, 6, 779.
- ¹⁷ Grace, H. J., Armstrong, D. S. *Afr. med. F.* 1972, 46, 402.
- ¹⁸ Smythe, P. M., Schonland, M., Brereton-Stiles, G. G., Coovadia, H. M., Grace, H. J., Loening, W. E. K., Mafoyane, A., Parent, M. A., Vos, G. H. *Lancet*, 1971, ii, 939.

TVA SHOULD MAINTAIN LOW-COST POWER YARDSTICK

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, which I am honored to serve as chairman, conducted extensive hearings into recent power rate increases by Tennessee Valley Authority.

In this connection the Elk Valley Times and Observer of Fayetteville, Tenn., recently published an excellent editorial concerning these hearings, and pointing out the importance of TVA

maintaining its traditional role as a low-cost power yardstick.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the editorial in the RECORD:

RESTORE "YARDSTICK" ROLE

Complaints by Rep. Joe L. Evins about Tennessee Valley Authority's steep rate increases in the past few years have been widely aired throughout the valley and the nation. Altogether, they constitute some serious questions about TVA's practices and their effect on the valley.

Perhaps one remark made by the Fourth District congressman sums up a major problem, the TVA's power "yardstick."

"You are fast closing the gap," Rep. Evins said after TVA Chairman Aubrey J. Wagner said TVA customers are still paying about 40 percent less than the national average.

The gap indeed is being closed in many ways, according to Rep. Evins. Industry spokesmen testified before the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee that their costs for power from the TVA are now on a par or even higher than those of other industrial customers elsewhere in the nation, even though residential rates may be lower. The subcommittee staff, Rep. Evins said, calculates that all of TVA's rate hikes since July 1967 represent an effective increase of 70 percent over that period of time.

In a statement last Thursday, Revere Copper and Brass Co. blamed what it called uncertainty of TVA's long-term power rate structure for holding up expansion of its north Alabama plant to a full employment capacity of 2,500. And this comes from an industry which TVA has frequently cited as a No. 1 example of the industrial potential of its service area.

Another serious gap between promise and performance was turned up in the hearings. House investigators said TVA told power distributors' representatives last year that a \$3 million deficit was imminent for July through September, first three months of the 1972-73 fiscal year. On the basis of this information, the distributors agreed that a revenue hike was needed. What they weren't told later, the House probers said, was that TVA actually wound up with a \$7.9 million profit for that three-month period. In what must be one of the most understated comments of the year, the report said: "We do not know what reaction of the distributors would have been if they had been advised that TVA's actual costs were less than had been estimated."

Rep. Evins summed up some of other serious matters. He told of an \$83 million depreciation on power operations, which he said exceeds the depreciation percentage of the Consolidated Edison Co. in New York, the nation's largest power company, and which raises a question as to whether the charge for that purpose is more than it should be. He also has told of operating costs for TVA steam plants that apparently are out of line with those of private utilities and of similar discrepancies in the area of salaries. He said more than 200 TVA employees are making more than \$25,000 a year, and that this number exceeds the total of the nation's largest utility. To be fair to TVA, however, it should be pointed out that many of its top echelon personnel are engaged in activities which are in many fields other than power.

The congressman also pointed out that TVA does not hold adversary hearings before implementing a rate-increase, nor does it file its proposals with the Federal Power Commission.

Other power agencies are required to hold such hearings, Rep. Evins said, adding: "Why should TVA not have adversary proceedings with respect to proposed rate increases in the public interest?"

As TVA officials pointed out at the hearings, the authority is not immune from the general picture of rising costs of fuels, interest and environmental protection measures. It says further that its costs per kilowatt hour in such areas as operating expenses, transmission and distribution, depreciation, and production and marketing remain measurably lower than those for all private utilities. Yet it has not responded directly to many of the criticisms aired by Rep. Evins, such as the one that TVA's rates have gone up 70 percent while those of the private utilities have risen 12 percent for the same period when all were experiencing similar hikes in costs.

The biggest gap, it seems, is a growing one between TVA's early performance which adhered to the promise inherent in the agency's creation, and its recent record. It started as a pioneering agency filled with enthusiasm and innovation. It appears at times that TVA nowadays has aged into a more normal bureaucracy, one that has to be prodded to initiate action, although there remains large vestiges of the historical role and functions which brought the authority international prestige.

From an agency that was to give the nation accurate data on the cost of power production through its "yardstick" function, TVA has become—if revelations before the Evins subcommittee have any accuracy at all—an agency that almost has given up its job as a demonstration power producer, and is now a power producing and marketing agency that takes the position that it is at the mercy of factors in the marketplace and, from figures presented by Rep. Evins, having less success than private utilities in coping with these problems.

With Rep. Evins, we reiterate our support for TVA's record, not only in transforming the life of the Tennessee Valley through providing cheap electric power, but also through its contributions in the fields of agriculture, reforestation, Townlift programs, flood control, industrial development recreation and new communities.

But we also share Rep. Evins' concern that escalating power rate increases could quite easily undermine the balanced work of industrial development and conservation of the Tennessee Valley and could damage the economy of this area.

In its 40th anniversary year, we think it appropriate that TVA—its directors, top staff members and employees—take these criticisms seriously from its neighbors in the region it serves and work to retain the confidence of the people and its role as an innovative, yardstick agency that continues to show the way in power production and all the allied facets of regional development.

FUEL CRISES

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, while thousands of homes, schools, and factories were running short on fuel oil last winter, the giant U.S. oil companies exported more than 200,000 barrels of fuel oil during the months of December and January. In February another 133,000 barrels of gasoline were shipped abroad.

This action by the oil companies is an unbelievable disservice to the American people. No gasoline or fuel oil should be exported while the United States faces such a serious shortage.

During this period we were in the mid-

dle of the fuel oil crisis and by February the major oil firms knew that gasoline supplies would be tight—yet they went ahead and shipped out products overseas.

The largest shipments of both fuel oil and gasoline went to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I have begun today drawing up legislation that will restrict free export of all petroleum products. In addition, I have asked the Federal Trade Commission and Treasury Under Secretary William Simons to investigate this new and very suspicious oil deal.

This oil deal clearly merits investigation to determine whether the oil companies acted in the public interest by exporting such large quantities of fuel and gasoline. While clearly these exports could not have solved the entire shortage, it is very curious that the major oil companies were exporting products while at the same time screaming about shortages.

I am calling upon the major oil companies today to voluntarily halt all exports of gasoline and fuel oil. But eventually Congress should pass legislation to restrict overseas petroleum shipments.

A HERO IS HOME

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania have given a hero's welcome home to Capt. Mark Ruhling, who spent nearly 4½ years as a prisoner of war in North Vietnam.

Captain Ruhling, a resident of Bethel Park, was shot down over North Vietnam on November 23, 1968, while flying his 84th combat mission for the U.S. Air Force. For the first year of his imprisonment his fate was not known. Hanoi refused to acknowledge his capture and Captain Ruhling was carried as "Missing in Action" on the U.S. casualty reports.

It was not until November 26, 1969, that Hanoi released a list of POW's and ended the agony of uncertainty which tortured his wife, Patricia, and their two sons, Christopher and Brian. At last they knew their husband and father was alive. Subsequently, Mrs. Ruhling became nationally known as an active leader in the campaign to make America remember her prisoners of war. All of us, I know, recall the ID bracelets, each bearing the name of a POW. Thousands of Americans wore them and were linked in a common cause.

On March 14, 1973, Captain Ruhling was released by North Vietnam and came home to a joyous welcome. Since then, he has been guest of honor at many testimonials held by his friends, neighbors and countrymen, anxious to express their admiration, appreciation, and respect to the man who sacrificed and endured so much in their behalf.

I was privileged to attend such a testimonial recently. It was arranged by the officers and members of two veterans'

organizations in Captain Ruhling's community—the Bethel Park American Legion Post 70 and Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 4532. I was greatly impressed by the tribute paid Captain Ruhling by Robert Coughlin, western vice commander of the American Legion; Judge Albert Folk of the Court of Common Pleas; Pennsylvania Senator WAYNE EWING; Bethel Park Councilman Donald Harrison, and Mayor Peter Page; Commander James Couch of Legion Post 70; and Commander George Naymick and Adjutant Harold Connell of VFW Post 4532.

Mr. Speaker, as Captain Ruhling's representative in the Congress of the United States I considered it a great honor to formally extend to him the thanks of a grateful Nation and to wish him the very best in years to come. No man deserves it more.

NEED FOR A NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. W. Dallas Herring, chairman of the North Carolina State Board of Education, recently made a speech to a Community College Conference in Raleigh, N.C., which I consider of such import and significance with regard to the Federal Government's involvement in education, that it should be shared with all of our colleagues and our Nation. I, therefore, include excerpts from the speech and will provide a copy of Dr. Herring's full statement for anyone who requests the same:

CITIZEN INPUT NEEDED: AMERICAN EDUCATION DRIFTS ALONG WITHOUT A NATIONAL POLICY.

(By Dr. W. Dallas Herring)

(NOTE.—These remarks are excerpted from a May 15 speech by Herring to a Community College Conference in Raleigh. Herring is chairman of the State Board of Education.)

There simply is no consistent national policy in education. We do not have such a policy, because we do not have the means in our government for achieving it. What we have instead is a very large contingent of professional educators in the U.S. Office of Education, whose administrative superiors come and go almost as regularly as the political winds shift.

The agency is a part of the president's administration, which sometimes undertakes a kind of policy-making activity, but it seems obvious that the president himself, whoever he may be, cannot devote the time and thought that is necessary to the development of a comprehensive and consistent national policy in education. He has too many other pressing duties. He can hardly do more than hit the high places in educational policy as time and circumstance permit.

The Congress also has a long history of concern with policy in education. Some of it we may commend and some of it obviously has not been articulated with sound and consistent policy goals. It is too much to expect that the Congress would be able to originate, adopt and enforce such a policy in education. It has too many other duties which necessarily distract attention and otherwise interfere with the function.

I do not quite understand why there should

be such a glaring oversight in the way our government is organized, unless it is because those who planned its organization believe that education would always remain a local concern. It is still a local concern, but it has long since become a matter of urgent state concern also, especially in North Carolina, which was the first state to establish and fund a statewide system of public schools and which more recently has taken the logical second step in creating a unified system of community college education.

In every state the means for citizen involvement in the development of educational policy making exist as a matter of law. Education has been the beneficiary of that arrangement and no one has suggested that it is not here to stay, because it has proved itself to be an effective instrument.

But education is also a matter of urgent national concern. It is too essential to the nation's well being in these critical times to be ignored by our national government. Given the way our economy is organized and the way in which tax policy has developed in the country, involvement of the federal government in education seems inescapable. It is very much involved without adequate means for developing a consistent national policy in education has proved to be a dangerous condition for education.

It may become a national disaster, if something is done about it. Those citizens who are interested in the safety of the country have, I think, every right to be concerned. They do not have the means for doing much about it and that, too, should concern them. It should be the first item on the agenda.

It would take more time and space than I have to catalog the critical evidence we have of this failure in the structure of our national government. Moreover, I do not wish to detract from the main point I am trying to make to you by going into a detailed account of the inequities, the inconsistencies and the glaring oversights of our present national educational policy.

It is frail and piecemeal at best. It is a tragic complexity of intensive concern, on the one hand, with educational minutiae and extensive indifference, on the other hand, to the quality of education, as well as its availability to millions of students all over the country. At its worst, it is made up of indecision and delay.

I do not blame anyone in particular for this condition. I think we are all to blame, because we have not learned from our experience with education in the states and localities that what has worked well there can work also in Washington.

It may not detract too much from this central idea to list a few conditions which ought not to exist and which certainly can be corrected if and when we create the means for developing a consistent national policy in education:

1. All across the country thousands of teachers and paraprofessionals do not know whether they will be employed in education any longer, because there is no commitment of funds with which to pay them. This is tragic enough for them, but what is to become of the programs and services they have been engaged in? Were they not needed in the first place?

2. There has been no final appropriation for public education this year and we are not likely to have one until long after the year closes. There is no real assurance that programs which the government has funded since 1917 will be funded any longer. All that we have had is a series of stop-gap "continuing resolutions."

3. Instead of intelligently planned policies derived from the experiences and insight of many people in education, we have had a series of slogans (of which "career education" is the most recent example). They are not defined. They are simply designed to trigger

a wave of action and reaction across the country. How can we expect that anything but confusion and frustration should come of this? Slogans are not an adequate substitute for policy, no matter how good one's intentions may be or how much good may actually be suggested in the idea expressed by the slogan.

4. When the government has authorized serious studies by competent people, they are often at odds with existing policy and they seem to me often to contribute more to the confusion than to its resolution. The recently published report entitled "Work in America" is a case in point. It blandly asserts, "Vocational education in the high schools has failed to give students useful skills or place them in satisfying jobs." Is it too much to ask for proof of this before the axe is given to a federal program which has had such a long and generally successful experience?

In spite of official ignorance in Washington of what is undoubtedly the most significant national development in public education since high schools became available everywhere, the community college movement is very much alive and it is in very great need of a consistent national policy about it. For if we do not have a consistent policy about it, we certainly have and will continue to have federal legislation affecting community colleges and technical institutes—piecemeal policy, made in a vacuum of indifference, ignorance and unconcern. The country cannot afford the luxury of such leadership.

What are we to do about this kind of ineptitude? The answer seems simple enough to me. We already have it. We have tried it in every school district and nearly every community college in America. We have tried it successfully in every state government in the union. It is perhaps America's most singular contribution to the governor of education.

It is uniquely American and practical. It opens the door to citizen involvement in educational policy making and it keeps it open permanently. It is the principal vehicle which citizens may use, and which they do use everywhere except Washington, to see to the sanity and the safety of American education.

What the country urgently needs is a representative national board of education with full authority over the U.S. Office of Education and the power to propose to the President and the Congress a consistent national policy in education. It should function in the way that boards of education function elsewhere and, therefore, I do not need to define its role any further.

Until we make up our minds to establish such a board, and in that way open the door to lay involvement in the development of policy, confusion and indecision will persist and the safety of the country will be at stake.

But children do not wait. While we debate and delay and do not decide, they grow up to take their places in a society for whose imperfections we are responsible. Too often they grow up unprepared, even though we had the opportunity to prepare them and did not really do our best.

I do not know about you, but I do not want that on my conscience any longer.

MEMORIAL DAY, VETERANS DAY
BILL

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, two of our national holidays are dedicated to Americans who have served in the military forces of our country.

Memorial Day pays tribute to those who gave their lives in such service. Veterans Day honors all men and women who have donned uniforms in defense of the United States of America.

It is my earnest belief that each of these—Memorial Day and Veterans Day—should be a time certain on each year's calendar. I do not think it is at all fitting for these days to be designated, as they now are, as "the last Monday" in May and November. Such a vague and almost anonymous designation is not worthy of our Nation.

I propose, and I have introduced a bill to this effect, that May 30 of each year shall be named as Memorial Day and November 11 of each year as Veterans Day.

These are the dates on which we observed these deeply meaningful holidays in the past. We should return to that custom and I hope we will. Our veterans of military service, those still living—many of them only recently returned from the war in Vietnam—and those no longer on Earth, are deserving of more than cursory honor. Memorial Day and Veterans Day should be occasions for showing that we remember and we care—days of rededication by Americans to the ideals which built our Republic and which we have fought to maintain.

WESTERN INTERSTATE NUCLEAR
BOARD SUPPORTS TRANS-ALASKA
PIPELINE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the good reasons it states therein the Western Interstate Nuclear Board on May 1 passed a resolution calling for construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline without further delay. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1 PASSED BY WESTERN INTERSTATE NUCLEAR BOARD, May 1, 1973

Whereas, the Western Interstate Nuclear Board is concerned about the best uses of this country's natural resources in the overall solution to the energy problems; and

Whereas, the balanced use of all forms of energy will be required to meet our future needs; and

Whereas, the use of domestically produced petroleum will continue to be of prime importance; and

Whereas, the Western Interstate Nuclear Board has confidence in the State of Alaska, working with duly authorized Federal officials, to conduct her own affairs with due regard for protection of the ecology and the environment; and

Whereas, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline can make an important contribution to the solution of our nation's energy problems;

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Western Interstate Nuclear Board hereby urges and encourages the prompt, environmentally sound construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline as proposed by the Department of Interior and the State of Alaska.

Furthermore, The Western Interstate Nuclear Board urges its respective Member States, Congressional delegations to give prompt, affirmative consideration to legislation to permit this project to commence.

CONNECTICUT'S FURLOUGH PROGRAM

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to point out for my colleague's information, the paper I have received from Dr. Anthony M. Scacco of Waterbury, one of the towns of my district.

As the transcript points out, Connecticut's program of furlough for prisoners is one of the most advanced and progressive approaches to prisoner rehabilitation in the country.

Allowing an inmate to leave the prison for the purposes of contacting prospective employers and find suitable residence upon release, is an effective way of reducing the rate of recidivism.

The text of Dr. Scacco's report follows:

Connecticut's furlough program was initiated in December of 1969. Since that time over six-thousand inmates, including women,¹ have been released to the community on leave. In only one major instance² did the program suffer as a result of the actions of one inmate.

Connecticut law, 18-101A, was amended to allow for this new rehabilitative endeavor. Originally, only those men within sixty days of completing their sentence could apply for furlough status. Recently, regulations were

changed, with the result that no mandatory time must be served before an inmate could apply for a furlough. Of course it requires a reasonable amount of time for any institutional staff to become acquainted with the needs of the offender. Therefore, there is little possibility that any convicted person would find himself confined on a Monday and eligible for a furlough on Tuesday. Good judgment and timing as well as faith in the intentions of the men being released, are the keys to the furlough program.

METHOD

From the beginning of the program, all inmates, even those convicted of murder, could apply for furlough privileges. There is one exception however, and that is, those convicted of any aggressive sexual act³ may apply but normally their request is not granted. This author feels that the authorities believe that they cannot take the risk of having an inmate convicted of this type of crime on leave because a violation of a furlough, especially due to a sexual act, could seriously jeopardize the entire program.

PROCESSING

Each correctional institution has its own furlough committee and established guide lines for reviewing requests. The committee includes the counselor, correctional officers, teachers and other professionals within the institution. The responsibility for making this request lies with the inmate himself. Many of the men and women feel that they need time to arrange for a sponsor and other responsibilities incurred in such a request and this acts as a "buffer" to "quickie" furlough applications. The inmate makes his intentions known to his counselor, work supervisor and even a correctional officer. Once the request is made, the counselor begins the processing procedures. However, as the deputy commissioner of Community

Services pointed out, the application request must be considered by the counselor before it takes its next step toward completion. The request is then considered by the furlough committee who in turn sends it to the superintendent of the institution. Upon his approval the form is then forwarded to the central office of the department, where the deputy commissioner of corrections must personally review and sign the request which then makes the furlough official.

FURLOUGH PLANS

The inmate must clearly state his reasons for requesting leave. These reasons appear on the Inmate Furlough Application which ultimately serves as the general guide for the granting institution as well as the central office. The reasons for requesting a furlough are:⁴

1. To contact a prospective employer.
2. To secure suitable residence for use upon release.
3. To obtain medical services not otherwise available.
4. To participate in training programs in the community.
5. To visit with a critically ill member of the family.
6. To visit with wife and family.
7. Other reasons consistent with the rehabilitation of inmate.

Number six is the most general reason and also includes the wishes of young men confined at the Cheshire facility whose ages range between sixteen and twenty-one. One counselor at this institution stated that "the furlough mechanism's contribution is helping to make life normal even for these youthful offenders who are confined." This author assumes that the reference to normal is that having to do with normal sexual desires held by these young men, who are not married, but often check number six as their reason for requesting leave.

TABLE 1.—FURLOUGHS, BY INSTITUTION, DURING THE PERIOD MAR. 1, 1971, TO FEB. 7, 1972

	February	March ¹	April	May ²	June	July	August	September	October	November ¹	December ¹	January	Total
1. Bridgeport.....	16	28	9	22	14	20	12	28	21	25	34	2	231
2. Brooklyn.....	4	12	7	16	12	13	22	17	20	24	37	4	188
3. Cheshire.....	13	45	39	33	43	44	40	23	32	48	50	8	418
4. Enfield.....	13	44	39	50	32	45	28	37	24	17	17	5	351
5. Hartford.....	22	48	42	36	33	28	27	42	27	10	21	23	359
6. Litchfield.....	3	8	0	14	8	14	12	11	15	17	35	0	137
7. Montville.....	4	12	11	5	11	11	10	10	6	39	70	2	191
8. New Haven.....	7	10	7	7	7	9	7	16	2	52	57	0	181
9. Niantic.....	28	45	20	33	27	26	23	24	28	20	83	23	380
10. Portland.....	2	5	1	0	1	2	2	0	4	10	5	4	36
11. ROC Center.....	26	45	31	27	28	32	38	55	42	45	41	24	434
12. Somers.....	6	1	11	11	1	7	4	11	2	17	14	10	95
13. Enfield at CVH and Cedarcrest.....	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	10
Sum total.....													2,993

¹ Totals are greater during these months since they represent the holidays of: Easter, Memorial Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. ² State hospitals treating inmates from which furloughs can be granted.

SOME DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED DURING THREE DAY FURLOUGHS

Table one clearly indicates that 2,993 furloughs were granted during the period of March 1, 1971 to February 7, 1972. The first twelve entries are correctional facilities, whereas the last are State hospitals where inmates are receiving treatment and from which furlough applications can be initiated. Table two³ shows the approximate number of violations during this period and the type of violation.

Table 2

Type of trouble:	
No known trouble (total furloughs, 2,993)	none
Arrested	11
Returned late	15
Returned late under influence of drugs	2
Returned late under influence of liquor	9
Turned self in late.....	2

Footnotes at end of article.

Escaped	7
Died (O.D. drugs).....	1
Total incidents.....	47

It is evident that the greatest difficulty was returning to the institution on time. The usual disciplinary action for violation of furlough privileges is loss of good time, which not only makes the sentence longer, but also affects his chance for future furloughs. It should be noted that among those who returned late, many called ahead to inform the institution of their condition and some even turned themselves in to local correctional institutions because they knew they could not return to the particular institution where they were confined, on time. Considering the large number of furloughs that were completed without incident, the program for the period stated, can be considered a success. Many of the furlough plans were accomplished, according to counselors at the institutions, and no severe legal incidents were noted in the table of violations.

Each inmate knows what constitutes a violation of his contract which is due in large

part to the specific listings on the contract itself. The inmates agree that:

1. He must not use alcoholic beverages or use any form of narcotics, nor be in the presence of others engaged in such activities.
2. He must obey all laws and must not be in the presence of others who are breaking a law or who have prior felony records.
3. He cannot leave the town where the person he is visiting resides.
4. Wilful failure to return to the institution in the prescribed time, or failure to remain in the geographical limits of the furlough will be considered an escape.
5. By accepting the furlough, the inmate agrees to a blood or urine test upon his return if so requested by the institutional authorities.⁵

EVALUATING THE PROGRAM

According to the deputy commissioner of corrections "it is difficult to distinguish any one particular gain made by each inmate as a result of the furlough program." He believed that those in corrections, in Connecticut, "felt that the program was part of the total rehabilitative effort" being directed to-

ward offenders. "In one instance" he said, "it might save a marriage. In another it can serve as a testing period for an inmate about to complete his sentence and re-enter society."

When asked about the obvious dangers in such a program, the deputy commissioner stated that "no one can minimize any negative incidents that occur as a result of an inmate being given furlough privileges. Each problem upsets us because we are concerned both for the public safety and welfare as well as the good of the individual on furlough." He went on to say that he felt that the program was a major step in correctional endeavors in general. Also, he emphasized the importance of confidence, caution, and screening as well as having faith in the men granted furlough status.

THE FUTURE OF CONNECTICUT'S FURLOUGH PROGRAM

The future of the program is always based on its present status within the community. Each successfully completed furlough is a reason to grant another, while any failures always endanger the continuance of the program. The deputy commissioner noted that the inmates believe it to be unquestionably a good program and know the repercussions that their behavior can have not only on their future furlough requests, but on the program itself. Some of the men have had as many as fifteen or sixteen furloughs before their release date and used this time in a most constructive manner. The department also noted that the failure rate (see table two) in the furlough program was a mere 1%.

The men in community release programs work at a normal job in the community during the day and return to the institution in the evening. This is the most "wide open" program next to educational release where the men are free to attend local schools and colleges and return to the institution in the evening. Often men in these two categories receive furloughs on the weekend and spend time with their families.

Connecticut remains keenly aware of other states that have not been so fortunate in their furlough programs. However, as long as the community and the inmate continue to benefit from the program, the department intends to continue and upgrade the program.

CONCLUSION EPILOGUE

The result of institutionalization is often considered to deny:

"autonomy, degrade dignity, impairs or destroys self reliance, inculcates authoritarian values, minimizes the likelihood of beneficial interaction with ones peers, fractures families, destroys the family's economic stability, and prejudices the prisoners future prospects for any improvement in his economic and social status."⁸

This quotation may have been a perfect description of institutions of the past, but not of the present, especially relating to the efforts in Connecticut Corrections. It is about time that those in the field of Corrections let it be known, and known emphatically, that we are not keepers. This program has faith in the inmates a faith in the people—a faith that something positive can be done to affect a man or a woman's life in a beneficial way. Therefore, the derision which implies that all correctional facilities are ineffectual, needs to be abated in this instance; for there is a State that has a working program designed to give responsible offenders freedom to leave the institution on a furlough which ultimately is a benefit to them and the community.

By granting furloughs, educational leave, and work release programs, the department is affirming the autonomy of the individual, his dignity, and is working to get him back into the community with responsive family

and friends. It may not be the final answer to re-integration of the former offender into a normal life, but it is a most significant step forward by a profession that often gets the negative end of the "stick".

FOOTNOTES

¹ Women are also granted furloughs. The women's correctional center at Niantic granted over 380 furloughs in 1972.

² One male inmate who had successfully completed several furloughs, committed a felony in March of 1973. While on furlough he robbed a motor-inn and was consequently captured and returned to confinement. State officials and the community apparently viewed this one incident as the chance undertaken in such a program.

³ Aggressive sexual acts are those of forcible rape, child napping and child molestation.

⁴ Furlough application, Department of Corrections, State of Connecticut, Directive 7.6, Cor-63, revised 17/71.

⁵ Furlough application, Department of Corrections, State of Connecticut, Directive 7.6, Cor-63, revised 17 71.

⁶ Furlough application, Department of Corrections, State of Connecticut, Directive 7.6, Cor-63, revised 17 71.

⁷ Officials in Massachusetts have filed bills with the intent of barred furloughs for any inmate sentenced for a crime of violence. Since many are convicted on this charge alone, many inmates will be ineligible for furlough programs should such a bill become law. (Boston Sunday Globe, April 8, 1973, p. 1.) California has taken similar steps to also limit furlough privileges.

⁸ Kenneth Polk and Walter S. Schafer, "The Changing Concept of Education," in "School and Delinquency," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1972.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, I will be attending an executive committee session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM—from Tuesday through Thursday, May 22 to 24 of this week.

Since this meeting is of the utmost importance regarding matters within jurisdiction of the Immigration Subcommittee, I regret that I will be prevented from casting a favorable vote for H.R. 7200. This measure, which would extend the temporary increase in railroad retirement benefits approved by Congress last year, is vitally needed by a large segment of Americans on fixed incomes and has my very strong support.

Finally, I wish to add that I look forward to a time, hopefully in the near future, when legislation will be forthcoming from our fine Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which will place our railway retirement system on a firm financial basis. The Congress must be about the business of assuring the railroad retiree and his dependents of a secure and equitable income following his years of service to the public. Chairman STAGGERS and his committee will have my firm support in their efforts

to meet the long range needs in this area.

THE TRIAL OF RICHARD NIXON

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon's New York Post contains a column by Max Lerner entitled "The Trial of Richard Nixon." In it, Lerner notes that—

As the vast TV and radio audience follows the Watergate testimony, . . . President Nixon is on trial.

The President may well be innocent. It is possible that he did not have advance knowledge of the Watergate break-in, and that he neither participated in nor knew of the coverup which followed it. But so long as he tries to forbid those in the know from testifying as to their conversations with him, doubt will persist in the minds of most Americans.

It falls to the House of Representatives, in pursuance of its power and responsibility under our Constitution, to fully investigate the conduct of any Federal officials who may have been involved and, if necessary, to discipline them.

The text of Mr. Lerner's column follows:

THE TRIAL OF RICHARD NIXON

(By Max Lerner)

WASHINGTON.—No, not a formal trial, nor yet an impeachment trial, but a trial nonetheless. For what is happening, as the vast TV and radio audience follows the Watergate testimony, is that President Nixon is on trial. He is on trial for whatever knowledge or collusion he may have had involving the whole undercover and coverup operation, of which Watergate was only the visible iceberg tip.

In effect the people are sitting in judgment on him, and will continue to sit in judgment as long as the hearings last and the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle continue to come together.

Washington is a poor place to tap the opinion currents. While it is the great fountainhead of new evidence, and streams of reports and counter-reports come gushing from it, Washington is in its own way too isolated from the American crossroads. It is a city of insiders, with a hothouse atmosphere, a city of government people and media people, but not the rest of the people.

But everywhere else in the country the feeling is clear without being bitter or partisan. There is hardly a man on the street who believes the President is telling the whole truth. Most people think he knew of the coverup but not of the original operation. Many think he knew both. Very few believe he was an innocent, wrapped in a cocoon of high-level policy decisions, guarded by a protective staff from the facts of the undercover operations.

If the evidence at the Senate hearings stands up, it is damning. It suggests strongly that while the President probably didn't know of the specific Watergate operation, he could not have been ignorant of the larger underground campaign, planned and pursued covertly, with secret funds. It more than suggests that he knew about the coverup effort, engineered by his top assistants, including the offer of clemency later for the silence of the convicted men.

Hence, as the President's trial proceeds in the court of public opinion, more and more people will conclude that he is lying. If so, what then?

At this point opinion divides sharply. Some feel that if he has lost credibility he should resign, or that if he has been involved in impeachable crimes he should be impeached. Others feel pretty cynically that all Administrations get involved in lying—a point that David Wise makes in his new book, "The Politics of Lying." Still others say quite soberly that there must be a measure of undercover operations and a measure of withholding the truth in every government, that otherwise governments can't function.

Without getting high and mighty and holier-than-thou about it, I can't agree. True, in dealing with foreign governments, historians recognize that kings, presidents and prime ministers have often lied for what is called "reasons of state." But no reason of state can explain or condone lying to the people, who have elected a leader inside a democracy.

This isn't a question of virtue and vice, but of what makes a democratic society work. Very few—if any—of those who are sitting in judgment on the President are angels. If men were angels, as James Madison used to insist, you wouldn't need either government or law. This applies all the way down the line, from the very human Senators sitting in that august tribunal of inquiry down to the lowliest sinner on a bar stool, watching the hearings on TV.

There is a working margin of lying in most lives and most governments. But there is a limit to the lies a people in a democracy will tolerate. America is today in the most serious crisis of credibility in the history of the Presidency. In such a crisis it becomes crucial to expect that the President will tell the truth. Otherwise he is doomed to conduct at best a limping government and at worst a paralyzed one.

Given what we know of the President's personality, he is likely to stick to his denials as long as he can, and try to "tough it out." But this would be unwise. Democracies usually get along with a saving sense of the frailties of the human animal. But in moments of show-down, when everything depends on a two-way dialogue of candor, a leader's lie of the soul is bound to do irreparable harm to the whole society.

President Nixon had a chance to level with the people right after Watergate, and he had a second chance right after the elections. He took neither. He has a third and final chance now to say what actually happened, and entrust himself to the people. If he doesn't seize it at the last moment of truth, history and the people are likely to be rough with him.

A WORD OF PRAISE FOR POSTAL SERVICE

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the U.S. Postal Service has come under much public and congressional criticism and has been charged with providing insufficiently prompt service. There is, no doubt, some truth to these statements of concern, but at the same time the Postal Service is making a concerted effort to improve and expedite service. These efforts have not gone unnoticed in my district, according to a complimentary article that appeared in one of the leading newspapers

in West Virginia, the April 25, 1973, edition of the Wheeling News-Register. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

LOG OF THE ROVING REPORTERS

The much maligned United States Postal Service must be doing something right.

A Wheeling man called a government office in Charleston Monday at 2:30 p.m., requesting a certain piece of information. Very much to the man's surprise and to the amazement of all his friends, the information arrived at 10 a.m. Tuesday.

In a time when people are grateful for miracles of even the smallest dimensions, that has to rate as a heartwarming experience.

ONE MAN'S LOVE FOR LIFE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the Supreme Court expressed its gross disregard for human life by legalizing abortion. I subsequently announced my protest of this decision by proposing a constitutional amendment which would guarantee the right to life to all unborn children.

Many concerned individuals share my concern over this inhumane action. One of them is featured in the following article written by Leonard Lueras in the April 1973 issue of Columbia magazine.

Mr. Robert J. Pearson, a resident of Maui, Hawaii, has been actively involved in the protection of the unborn. He has converted his house into a counseling center for pregnant women who are contemplating a possible abortion. The results have been most heartening and I would like to submit the article for the benefit of my colleagues.

ONE MAN'S LOVE FOR LIFE

"We live in a happy and hapal house. We're all happy and hapal. However you want to say it."

Mary was on her back, doing criss-cross leg and stomach exercises on the front lawn. A gekko clucked in a palm and turquoise she said, "Yup . . . one, two . . . happy and huffed through her daily muscle-toning routine.

Although she is from the mainland ("Texas," she said), Mary is fond of using the word *hapal* (ha-ple), Hawaiian for pregnant. "It sounds more fun than pregnant," waves splashed on a nearby beach as she hapal . . . hapal and happy."

"The last time I got hapal," she said, "I drove to Mexico for an abortion. I went to Matamoros on the Texas border. It cost \$250. The doctor gave me gas for pain and the only thing I had for presurgery preparation was soap and water. He just gave me gas and went in—with forceps and clamps—on an examination table.

"Then I got up and drove myself home—the all the way to Houston."

Mary was 25 then. Now she's 31 and pregnant again. But this time she wants her baby to live so she's waiting patiently through a normal pregnancy cycle.

A month earlier, before her conceived baby began kicking noticeably, she had been in Honolulu scheduling her second abortion. The operations are legal in Hawaii and she would have become one of more than 10,000 island women who have received "elective"

abortions in doctor's offices and hospitals here since the liberalized Hawaii abortion law—the first in the United States—was passed by the state legislature on March 11, 1970.

Mary was planning the abortion ("The doctor said: 'You'll be high the whole time.'"), but along came Robert J. Pearson, a building contractor from the neighboring island of Maui.

Pearson, 42, formerly of Algonac, Mich., had a talk with her and eventually persuaded Mary to preserve her unborn baby's life.

He offered her much more than words. Pearson booked Mary on a flight from Oahu to Maui, where Pearson's wife Kathleen, met Mary and took her to the Pearson home, a rambling, five-bedroom house on a four-and-one-half acre plantation adjoining the beach at Sprecklesville. There Mary found herself with some 10 other "sisters," all of them in different stages of pregnancy.

At the Pearson home, supported by the nonprofit Pearson Foundation, Inc., Mary and her baby will live out her last five months of pregnancy—all expenses paid.

"It's an unreal deal, unreal," was all Mary could say about the situation the Pearsons created for her and other women in similar predicaments.

Pearson, who converted to Catholicism while in his mid 20s, was the leader of an unsuccessful fight in 1970 against the repeal of Hawaii's 101-year-old abortion law. When state legislators began to consider making abortion legal, Pearson mounted a statewide protest against the move.

By February 1970, a month before abortion became legal in the islands, Pearson claimed to have spent more than \$7,000 of his own money fighting the new law. "I don't care if I have to sell my house," he said at that time: "I feel strongly and so does my wife."

The Pearsons continued their "pro-life" campaign but their efforts, which included full-page antiabortion advertisements in both of Honolulu's daily newspapers, apparently had little effect on the general public. Repeal of the abortion law passed unanimously and set a precedent for similar laws later passed in New York and other states.

At one time during his campaign Pearson and Bishop John J. Scanlan of Honolulu rallied some 1,000 demonstrators for an anti-abortion protest in the central courtyard of Hawaii's new state capitol.

"All of us are here because we believe in human life and we believe that the law should protect human life," Bishop Scanlan said. "There can be no question about it, the fetus has human life. This is known more clearly than ever before because of the progress of medical science." Pearson and the bishop then led fellow demonstrators in prayer—prayers which went unheeded by the state's legislators.

Last-ditch stands by Pearson included the collecting of some 8,000 letters signed by Maui residents who objected to the abortion law's repeal. He personally delivered the letters to the entrance of the state senate chambers in Honolulu.

In March, shortly before the law was repealed, Pearson announced plans to set up a home on Maui for expectant mothers who might be considering abortions. Pearson said he wanted to give women who are planning abortions a chance "to come to the beautiful island of Maui to think it over. No questions asked," he promised.

Pearson said if the state's abortion bill became law, pregnant women in Hawaii would be offered free trips to Maui, free room and board, free prenatal care and payments to replace the money they might lose from their jobs by coming to Maui.

"I just want to let women know that they have alternatives to abortion," he affirmed. He said he even would be willing to help women who are waiting out the three-months' residency clause which requires an

out-of-state resident to live in Hawaii that long before she legally can have an abortion.

"If they decide to have the abortion after staying here with us, then there is nothing we can do. I just hope the girls will realize this is not a hoax and that we are trying earnestly to help them," Pearson said.

By May 1970, two months after the abortion law was repealed, seven women had availed themselves of the Pearsons' offer. All decided against abortion and Pearson arranged to pay for their medical expenses.

The seven—six of them unmarried—included three girls from California and one each from Colorado, North Carolina, Indiana and Georgia. "They are normal, everyday people and some of them were very upset," Pearson said. "They needed counseling but psychiatrists were not necessary. They just needed someone to show love and concern for them."

Since then word has spread in Hawaii and on the mainland about Pearson's free *hapai* home. He estimates that more than 120 pregnant women (some of them married) have stayed at his home for varying periods of time. Only twice, he said, have girls decided to go ahead with an abortion after visiting his home and "thinking it over."

"One of the girls was with us for only two days," Pearson recalled. "She was on drugs and unfortunately we couldn't relate to her. She went back to Honolulu under the pretense of going home, but her mother and father wouldn't let her back in the house unless she had the abortion. So she had the abortion." The other girl decided that to abort her unborn baby was her best alternative.

"But other than that," Pearson said, "all of the girls have given birth and either placed the child out for adoption or have kept the baby themselves."

What is the ratio of babies offered for adoption to babies kept?

"I would say about 30% of the girls have kept their babies and the others have given them for adoption. The Catholic Social Service and the Department of Social Services handle the adoptions. We do not," Pearson said.

At last report there were 11 girls living in the five-bedroom, seven-bath home which is designed, dormitory-style, to accommodate 20. One girl was of Filipino descent, another Samoan and another was from a wealthy San Francisco Bay family. Most were Honolulu-area schoolgirls.

"This place has no name," said a pretty girl from Oahu's north shore. "It's just Pearson's home. It's not like an institution. We just live in his home with him and his family."

The same girl, 18 and just out of high school, said the Pearsons (who have five children of their own) give the expecting girls "more freedom than I ever knew at home." An extra car is available for running errands "or driving to a movie or some other fun," she said. There is no regimentation, such as wake-up or lights-out hours rules. "Like last night three of us felt like having a drink, so we went out to have a drink," said a girl from Seattle.

For recreation there is always the beach, but sewing and painting facilities plus occasional classes in arts and crafts also are available. "There's a Maryknoll nun who teaches Bible study to girls who are interested, and another nun (both from nearby St. Anthony's church and high school) who has been teaching us how to crochet," said one girl. Academic arrangements also have been made with local private and public schools to provide tutoring and credit examinations for girls who do not want to get behind in their studies during pregnancy.

Each girl prepares her own breakfast and lunch, but the evening meal is a communal one in which the women who are able to cook ("some of us aren't because we're ready to

give birth any minute") try out their favorite recipes on each other. "We go shopping on Monday to pick up the food for the week's meals," said Yydia, a pretty Filipino girl. She said they even buy special foods the girls may crave during pregnancy. "There always are cartons of ice cream around; also pickles and lots of bananas," she said half-facetiously.

"One girl," Lydia said, "is into health foods, so Mrs. Pearson goes out and brings her wheat germ or whatever she wants."

Pearson's *hapai* houseguests range in age from 14 to 36, so he's bound to have occasional peacekeeping problems.

"Occasionally we'll have girls with personality clashes, girls who can't get along, but we haven't had any conflicts that couldn't be worked out," Pearson related. "We try to run the home with a lot of love and concern for one another. Generally this feeling gets through to the girls staying here."

Pearson said that when they first arrive at the home, some of the girls are full of "I can't be getting something for nothing" suspicions.

"Some girls are very defensive in the beginning. They feel that you don't get anything for nothing today and, if you do, someone wants something. But we're fortunate because the girls stay with us for a long time, usually several months, and we're able to break through this defensive barrier and help them realize that we are concerned for them as well as for the life of their baby.

"Then they can start to relax and look at life a little differently."

Another advantage of Pearson's home is that it groups together girls with a common problem—or cause. The girls have impromptu rap sessions nightly. They comfort each other, do their prebirth exercises together and learn about birth from the expectant women ahead of them. When a "due" young mother begins to experience birth contractions, they get excited together and see her off to Maui Memorial Hospital (a 10-minute drive away).

"I'm looking forward to having my baby," said Candy, a junior at the University of Hawaii. "My baby's father is married, but I still love him. And I love his—our—baby just as much.

"The main reason I came here was pressure from my family to get an abortion a year ago and I didn't feel right about my first one. I didn't want to kill my baby but my parents hassled me till I did. 'What will the neighbors say?' they would tell me. And besides, everybody in Honolulu is so pro-abortion anyway. You go to the doctor and he says: 'Well, you better have an abortion.'

"I've done enough studying about the unborn child since my last abortion to realize it is indeed a living thing. The heart is beating after six weeks and they won't even do an abortion until about seven weeks. I don't want to kill my baby. It's as simple as that."

One girl at the house said she began arguing with Pearson about her decision to go ahead with an abortion. Instead of arguing back, she said, Pearson reached into his briefcase and took out a laboratory specimen bottle. Inside was the pickled body of an aborted fetus. "Do you deny this was a living being?" he asked the girl, explaining that the male fetus in the clear jar was "killed" at age 14 weeks.

"You can see everything—nails, nose, eyes. You can tell it's a baby boy. And he carries it around in his briefcase," the girl said. Pearson also carries around scientific photographs of the operative results of abortions—photos, he says, which show "the reality of abortion."

Pearson is so disturbed by the casual attitude of the general public that he has proposed the founding of a special cemetery on Maui to receive aborted human fetuses.

"Obviously," Pearson said, "if your mother had terminated your life one hour after you were conceived you wouldn't be sitting here and listening to me now. I believe that you

have to be either ignorant, a liar or a fool to believe your life didn't start at conception and not two months or three months afterward."

Pearson has an incredible job ahead (his foundation has reached only 120 of more than 10,000 women who have opted for Hawaii abortion, but he already is thinking and planning on a grandiose scale. In the works are plans to build a new, 25-bedroom home which will accommodate 100 women, five times more than he is able to care for now.

The home, to be constructed on 17,000 sq. ft. of beachfront church property at Kihei, Maui, will cost the Pearson Foundation approximately \$325,000. The land, he said, has been provided "at a very nominal cost" by Bishop Scanlan. Other monies for the project will be raised through private donations which Pearson regularly solicits at speaking engagements on all of Hawaii's populated islands.

"I think that someday we're going to be able to give protection back to the unborn," he says confidently.

"Lots of people I talk to say: 'You're against abortion. You must be a Catholic.' But when I was in Salt Lake City, everyone said: 'You must be a Mormon if you're against abortion.'

"It's a shame that the abortion fight is being pegged as Catholic, Mormon or anything. Although I am glad to hear that many Catholics are standing up for what they believe in, to me it's definitely not a matter of religion.

"It's simply a matter of human respect for another human being."

HOUSE ACTED WISELY AGAINST CAMBODIAN BOMBING

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the votes last week on the second supplemental appropriation bill included expressions of opposition by this body to continued bombing by U.S. planes in Cambodia.

In reaching my own position against the transfer or use of any such funds for U.S. air raids over Cambodia, I reflected what I believe to be a sound position for this administration and for the Pentagon to adopt.

I have been impressed by the support indicated by my constituents—including a thoughtful and persuasive editorial in the Monday, May 14, issue of the News Sun, Lake County, Ill., only daily newspaper—and a journal having a wide circulation and influence in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching this editorial for the attention of my colleagues: **BLIND ACCEPTANCE OF CAMBODIAN BOMBING PLAN IS UNTHINKABLE**

The U.S. House of Representatives has rightly voted against new defense appropriations to continue the bombing in Cambodia and success of the move was hinged on the defection of 35 Republican representatives, including our own Robert McClory, from the administration position.

The vote came on an amendment to a \$2.85 billion bill for supplementary appropriations for the Defense Department and other government agencies to provide additional funds for ongoing programs until the beginning of the new fiscal year July 1.

The vote was a direct rebuff to President

Nixon and Secretary of State William P. Rogers who made an impassioned plea before Congress to hold off its attacks on Cambodia bombing policy until after new Paris talks between Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho.

And the vote also was a blow to Defense Secretary Elliot L. Richardson, who only the day before House action had told Congress that to vote for the fund transfers so the bombing could continue would be "a vote at least to acquiesce in that activity."

Acquiescence, however, is not what the people of the country want, and the 219 House members who voted for the amendment rightly recognized that fact.

The Administration has yet to justify in any clear way the public can understand the continued involvement in and bombing of Cambodia. We get the same old line about helping a people defend themselves, guaranteeing the right to free choice, and stopping Communist aggression. But this line lies in direct conflict with the feelings of the American public who have had enough of war, enough of police actions, enough of death.

There was no reason for the House to blindly approve expenditure of more funds for bombing Cambodia. Until the Administration can come up with a logical explanation of what it is doing in Cambodia—and why—in terms that will engender support of the people, we encourage members of Congress to continue opposition to such plans.

Richardson has served notice the administration will find the funds to continue the bombing no matter what the House or Senate do. We hope the House action Thursday served notice on him and others in the administration that the people who have to foot the bill won't stand for it.

UNITED STATES HOSTS SOVIET COMMUNIST DIGNITARY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, every effort is being made in Washington, D.C., to prepare for the June 18-26 visit of Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary General of the Soviet Communist Party.

Already, an advance party of 35 Russian Communists are in the United States to handle public relations and security for the upcoming visit. As the host country, the taxpayers of the United States are to foot the bill, estimated at about \$250,000. It is not certain if this includes the usual gift exchange. During the President's 1972 visit to Moscow, he gave Brezhnev a 1972 Cadillac and presented the Soviet President and Premier rifles with special telescopic sights and appropriate ammunition. Perhaps the visiting Soviet may present Nixon with a Soviet tank to protect himself from the Watergate snipers.

I include the following newsclipping: [From the Washington Post, May 19, 1973] THIRTY-FIVE SOVIET OFFICIALS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO PREPARE BREZHNEV VISIT

(By Dusko Doder)

An advance party of 35 Soviet officials arrived here this week to prepare for the visit to the United States next month of Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet Communist party leader.

The group, headed by Yuri N. Cherniyakov,

general secretary of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, arrived at Andrews Air Force Base aboard a special Aeroflot Ilyuchin-62 jetliner Tuesday night. It includes officials dealing with the problems of security, communications, press, civil aviation, medical and food services.

While Brezhnev is expected to spend most of his time here, or at Camp David, Md., he will also visit President Nixon's summer home at San Clemente, Calif. No agreement was reached on other possible stops during Brezhnev's trip here from June 18 to 26. San Francisco, New York and Detroit were mentioned as possibilities, according to officials.

Soviet and American officials working on Brezhnev's itinerary are expected to fly to San Clemente today. The Soviet advance party is expected to return to Moscow late next week.

According to U.S. officials, preparations for the Brezhnev visit are going smoothly. The cost of the visit is estimated at about \$250,000 and will be paid by the U.S. Government. The Soviet government bore all the costs incurred during Mr. Nixon's visit to Moscow a year ago.

Well-placed administration sources said the arrival of the advance party was delayed by several days. These sources also disclosed that Soviet diplomats in the United States conducted an intensive effort earlier this month to assess the possible impact of the Watergate scandals on Mr. Nixon's domestic position.

This effort, which included numerous conversations with U.S. officials, journalists and public figures, coincided with the visit to Moscow of Henry A. Kissinger, Mr. Nixon's national security adviser. The Brezhnev visit was announced last Saturday, following Kissinger's return to Washington, an indication that the Russians believe the President will be able to ride out the storm created by Watergate.

Brezhnev will be the second Soviet leader to make an official visit to the United States. His predecessor, Nikita Khrushchev, made a trip around the United States in 1959. Khrushchev attended the United Nations General Assembly in 1960 and Premier Alexei Kosygin came to the U.N. in 1967 and while here met with President Johnson in Glassboro, N.J.

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing three bills, two of which are aimed primarily at our older citizens. As this is Senior Citizens Month, legislation to aid our elderly seems particularly appropriate.

The first bill I am introducing would authorize an experimental program under the Social Security Act to provide for the care of elderly persons in their own homes.

Specifically, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish an experimental program of subsidization of families who agree to care for their dependents who are 65 or older, and who would otherwise require the services of a skilled nursing home because of either physical or mental handicaps.

There are presently over 20 million older Americans. Of these, it is estimated that approximately one-fifth are in need

of some protective services. Some 900,000 of those in need reside in nursing homes and the like, while 111,000 are in mental institutions.

The remaining three-quarters of our needy elderly, or about 3 million persons, reside in the community. Often isolated in homes and apartments, they are unable to take care of themselves totally.

In 1971, at the White House Conference on Aging, it was recommended that "supplementary resources are needed to be allocated to means of financing alternate care," and that "efforts should be made at Federal, State, and local levels to develop options to institutional care." My bill recognizes both recommendations.

It is not always possible for an elderly person to remain independent, regardless of what kinds of social services that person may be eligible for and receiving—14.6 percent of the people over age 65 are unable to carry on their major activities—working and keeping house.

Ralph Nader reports that about 25 percent of the elderly in this country live alone or with nonrelatives. In his report, "Old Age: The Last Segregation," it was stated:

The practical alternatives for an aged person in need of limited care are a paltry three: hospitalization, institutionalization in a nursing home, or life with young, more capable relatives. Life at home is impossible.

Unfortunately, the cost of a nursing home or other intermediate care facility is too often beyond the reach of our elderly; \$600 a month is far from an unusual price, and for too many of our senior citizens, paying that price would be impossible.

Intermediate care can be provided to elderly persons through medicare, if they are receiving public assistance. However, only one in ten persons over the age of 65 receives public assistance, more than half of these as supplementation of inadequate social security benefits.

Also significant is a statement made by an Ohio housing authority official in regard to nursing homes:

The thought of the nursing home spells the end of the road. When this decision is made many people lose their incentive to live.

My bill would provide care for the elderly, by encouraging their younger relatives to take on some of the responsibility. Living with their children or grandchildren would solve at least two problems of our older Americans: assistance with the many everyday tasks that become so difficult with age, and helping to rid the older person of the loneliness that so often accompanies growing older.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 7957

A bill to authorize an experimental program to provide for care for elderly individuals in their own homes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1120 the following new section: "Authorization of Experimental Program to Provide In-Home Care for Elderly Individuals.

"SEC. 1121. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish an experimental program of subsidization of families who agree to care

for their dependents who are 65 years of age or older and who would otherwise require, because of physical or mental infirmities, the services of a skilled nursing home, in their own homes. Such subsidies may be made directly, in the form of grants, to families who are determined, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to be eligible for assistance under this program. For purposes of this section, a family shall be considered as caring for a dependent in the family's own home if it is caring for such dependent in its principal place of residence, regardless of whether or not such family or any member thereof is the legal owner of tenant of record.

"(b) Any grant under this section shall be made on such terms and conditions, and payments thereunder shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section and protect the financial interests of the United States.

"(c) Any grant under this section shall be made only upon application therefor, submitted in such form and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may by regulation require."

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The second bill I am introducing today would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income. Similar legislation has been introduced on the Senate side by Mr. RIBICOFF.

The bill would serve to narrow the gap between the increased level of social security benefits, and the base for the retirement income credit. It is designed to benefit those people who receive retirement income from sources other than social security and railroad retirement, such as the pensions of former public employees.

I would like to point out that the current inequity in the law was brought to my attention by the Hallandale Senior Citizens, Inc.

What the bill does is increase the maximum amount of retirement income for credit computation to \$2,500 in the case of a single individual, \$2,500 in the case of a joint return where only one spouse is eligible for the credit, \$3,750 in the case of a joint return where both spouses are eligible, and \$1,875 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

As pointed out by the Hallandale Senior Citizens group, if the present base is to be of benefit to our elderly, it must be revised to take into account the increase in the cost of living and equalized with the maximum primary benefit under social security.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 7958

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

"SEC. 37. CREDIT FOR THE ELDERLY.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of an individual—

"(1) who has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year, or

"(2) who has not attained the age of 65

before the close of the taxable year but who has public retirement system pension income for the taxable year,

there shall be allowed as a credit against tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 15 percent of such individual's section 37 amount for such taxable year.

"(b) SECTION 37 AMOUNT.—For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual's section 37 amount for the taxable year is the applicable initial amount determined under paragraph (2), reduced as provided in paragraph (3).

"(2) INITIAL AMOUNT.—The initial amount is—

"(A) \$2,500 in the case of a single individual,

"(B) \$2,500 in the case of a joint return where only one spouse is eligible for the credit under this section,

"(C) \$3,750 in the case of a joint return where both spouses are eligible for the credit under this section, or

"(D) \$1,875 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

"(3) REDUCTION.—Except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5)(B), the reduction under this paragraph in the case of any individual is—

"(A) any amount received by such individual as a pension or annuity—

"(i) under title II of the Social Security Act,

"(ii) under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 or 1937, or

"(iii) otherwise excluded from gross income, plus

"(B) in the case of any individual who has not attained age 72 before the close of the taxable year—

"(1) except as provided in clause (ii), one-half the amount of earned income received by such individual in the taxable year in excess of \$2,000, or

"(ii) if such individual has not attained age 62 before the close of the taxable year, and if such individual (or his spouse under age 62) is eligible for a credit by reason of subsection (a)(2), any amount of earned income in excess of \$1,000 received by such individual in the taxable year.

"(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR DETERMINING THE REDUCTION PROVIDED IN PARAGRAPH (3).—

"(A) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the reduction under paragraph (3) shall be the aggregate of the amounts resulting from applying paragraph (3) separately to each spouse.

"(B) SEPARATE RETURNS OF MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a separate return of a married individual, paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be applied by substituting '\$1,000' for '\$2,000', and paragraph (3)(B)(ii) shall be applied by substituting '\$500' for '\$1,000'.

"(C) NO REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN AMOUNTS EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME.—No reduction shall be made under paragraph (3)(A) for any amount excluded from gross income under section 72 (relating to annuities), 101 (relating to life insurance proceeds), 104 (relating to compensation for injuries or sickness), 105 (relating to amounts received under accident and health plans), 402 (relating to taxability of beneficiary of employees' trust), or 403 (relating to taxation of employee annuities).

"(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE UNDER SUBSECTION (a)(2).

"(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the section 37 amount of an individual who is eligible for a credit by reason of subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed such individual's public retirement system pension income for the taxable year.

"(B) In the case of a joint return where one spouse is eligible by reason of subsection (a)(1) and the other spouse is eligible by reason of subsection (a)(2), subpara-

graph (A) shall not apply but there shall be an additional reduction under paragraph (3) in an amount equal to the excess (if any) of \$1,250 over the amount of the public retirement system pension income of the spouse who is eligible by reason of subsection (a)(2).

"(c) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EARNED INCOME.—The term 'earned income' has the meaning assigned to such term in section 911(b), except that such term does not include any amount received as a pension or annuity. The determination of whether earned income is the earned income of the husband or the earned income of the wife shall be made without regard to community property laws.

"(2) MARITAL STATUS.—Marital status shall be determined under section 153.

"(3) JOINT RETURN.—The term 'joint return' means the joint return of a husband and wife made under section 6013.

"(4) PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEM INCOME.—An individual's public retirement system pension income for the taxable year is his income from pensions and annuities under a public retirement system for personal services performed by him or his spouse, to the extent included in gross income without reference to this section, but only to the extent such income does not represent compensation for personal services rendered during the taxable year. The amount of such income taken into account with respect to any individual for any taxable year shall not exceed \$2,500. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'public retirement system' means a pension, annuity, retirement, or similar fund or system established by the United States, a State, a possession of the United States, any political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or the District of Columbia.

"(d) NONRESIDENT ALIEN INELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT.—No credit shall be allowed under this section to any nonresident alien."

Technical Amendments

(b) (1) Section 904 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitation on foreign tax credit) is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h), and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection.

"(g) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR THE ELDERLY.—In the case of an individual, for purposes of subsection (a) the tax against which the credit is taken is such tax reduced by the amount of the credit (if any) for the taxable year allowable under section 37 (relating to credit for the elderly)."

(2) Section 6014(a) of such Code (relating to tax not computed by taxpayer) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(3) Section 6014(b) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking out paragraph (4),

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4), and

(C) by inserting "or" at the end of paragraph (3).

(4) Sections 46(a)(3)(C), 56(a)(2)(A)(ii), and 56(c)(1)(B) of such Code are each amended by striking out "retirement income" and inserting in lieu thereof "credit for the elderly".

(5) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 37 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 37. Credit for the elderly."

Effective Date

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972.

The third bill I am introducing today addresses itself to those people who will become senior citizens in the near fu-

ture—those people between the ages of 40 and 64.

In 1967, the Congress enacted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, which was designed to protect the job security of those people in that age bracket, as well as to insure that older persons seeking employment would not be discriminated against because of age.

At the time the law was enacted, several limitations were placed on its applicability. Firms employing fewer than 25 persons were exempted, as were all public employees.

The bill I am introducing today would lower to 20 the number of employees which an employer must have to be exempt from the provisions of the act, and would extend the protection of the law to employees of Federal, State, and local governments.

Second, my bill would increase the authorization for enforcement of the act from \$3 million to \$5 million.

Since 1967, job bias on account of age has hardly diminished. About one out of three firms investigated last year by the Secretary of Labor were found to be in violation of the act. From fiscal year 1971 to fiscal year 1972, instances of refusals to hire because of age alone increased from 683 to 818. There were 339 situations in which mature workers were failed to be promoted. This was close to a 28 percent increase from the previous year.

It is also significant to note that in 1972, a little over one-third of the unemployed were heads of households.

Today 875,000 persons over the age of 45 are out of a job. That is a 45 percent increase over the past 4 years. Again, it is significant to note that those between the ages of 55 and 64 have been out of work the longest, an average of 4 to 5 months.

Discrimination because of age poses a particular hardship for those in their later working years. Persons in that age bracket are perhaps entering those years of greatest expense, with children beginning to attend college and saving for retirement at the same time.

It is unfortunate that some employers in the past have discounted persons because of graying hair, and associated age with slowing down and inefficiency. Being shelved after reaching 40 years of age can have severely deleterious effects on a person's confidence. This loss of confidence can create an unwillingness to re-enter the work force, regardless of how necessary the income is or however well qualified a person may be.

In the years between enactment of the law and now, there have been less than 120 suits filed. Some 6,800 investigations were conducted in fiscal year 1971, and there was a 14 percent increase in violations uncovered.

Yet in fiscal year 1972, there were only 69 Labor Department positions specifically budgeted for implementing the law.

It is for this reason that the bill provides for an increase in funding authorization. In order to provide protection to the estimated 20 million persons now covered by the act, and those additional persons whom my bill proposed to be covered, additional funding is a necessity.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 7956

A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to increase coverage under that Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Age Discrimination in Employment Amendments of 1973".

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 11(b) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 630(b)) is amended by striking out "twenty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty".

(b) (1) The second sentence of section 11(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The term also means (1) any agent of such a person; and (2) a State or political subdivision of a State and any agency or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision of a State, but such term does not include the United States, or a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States."

(2) Section 11(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or an agency of a State or political subdivision of a State, except that such term shall include the United States Employment Service and the system of State and local employment services receiving Federal assistance".

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 is amended by striking "\$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000".

SEC. 4. (a) The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 is amended by redesignating sections 15 and 16, and all references thereto, as section 16 and section 17, respectively, and by adding immediately after section 14 the following new section:

"NONDISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF AGE IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 15. (a) All personnel actions affecting employees or applicants for employment (except with regard to aliens employed outside the limits of the United States) in military departments as defined in section 102 of title 5, United States Code, in executive agencies (other than the General Accounting Office) as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code (including employees and applicants for employment who are paid from nonappropriated funds), in the United States Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission, of the government of the District of Columbia having positions in the competitive service, and in those units of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government having positions in the competitive service, and in the Library of Congress shall be made free from any discrimination based on age.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to enforce the provisions of subsection (a) through appropriate remedies, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without backpay, as will effectuate the policies of this section. The Civil Service Commission shall issue such rules, regulations, orders, and instructions as it deems necessary and appropriate to carry out its responsibilities under this section. The Civil Service Commission shall—

(1) be responsible for the review and evaluation of the operation of all agency programs designed to carry out the policy of this section, periodically obtaining and publishing (on at least an annual basis) progress reports from each such department, agency, or unit; and

(2) consult with and solicit the recommendations of interested individuals, groups, and organizations relating to nondiscrimination in employment on account of age.

The head of each such department, agency, or unit shall comply with such rules, reg-

ulations, orders, and instructions which shall include a provision that an employee or applicant for employment shall be notified of any final action taken or any complaint of discrimination filed by him thereunder. Reasonable exemptions to the provisions of this section may be established by the Commission but only when the Commission has established a maximum age requirement on the basis of a determination that age is a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to the performance of the duties of the position. With respect to employment in the Library of Congress, authorities granted in this subsection to the Civil Service Commission shall be exercised by the Librarian of Congress.

(c) Any persons aggrieved may bring a civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction for such legal or equitable relief as will effectuate the purposes of this Act.

(d) When the individual has not filed a complaint concerning age discrimination with the Commission, no civil action may be commenced by any individual under this section until the individual has given the Commission not less than thirty days' notice of an intent to file such action. Such notice shall be filed within one hundred and eighty days after the alleged unlawful practice occurred. Upon receiving a notice of intent to sue, the Commission shall promptly notify all persons named therein as prospective defendants in the action and take any appropriate action to assure the elimination of any unlawful practice.

(e) Procedures under this section shall become effective ninety days after enactment.

(f) Nothing contained in this section shall relieve any Government agency or official of the responsibility to assure nondiscrimination on account of age in employment as required under any provision of Federal law."

CARPOOLING AND BUSPOOLING ARE ANSWERS TO SOME TRANSIT PROBLEMS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, despite the recent vote in the House against diversion of highway trust funds, I understand that our conferees have agreed with the other body's position to some extent and that the conference report on this issue will provide for some sort of diversion.

I oppose it because the sums involved in the diversion are inadequate to do much of anything at all in an effective way to improve the transportation of people in urban areas on a mass basis by bus or rail. Yet, they are sufficient in magnitude to appreciably deteriorate the transportation of people in these areas by automobile.

The problem we are approaching is a big and expensive one. We will not solve it by shuffling a limited amount of funds around, then putting our thumbs in our mouths, pulling out a plum and saying what good boys we are.

In southern California, and to a growing extent in other urban areas of the Nation, movement of people within metropolitan areas has increasingly become the exclusive province of the private automobile. Air pollution problems

and gasoline shortages are focusing attention on the need for improvements in the present means by which this movement of people is accomplished.

Considerable support has built up for the idea of rapid mass transit by bus or rail as a seemingly attractive alternative to the private automobile. It is claimed that mass transit will be quick, cheap, and clean. However, when one examines existing mass transit systems, such as those in New York City and Chicago, in practice they are found to be slow, expensive, and dirty. Of course, a completely modern system, newly installed, would incorporate improvements over existing ones, but it is by no means certain how many improvements. Certainly, none at all could be expected in the areas of capital costs or operation and maintenance expenses.

Moreover, implementation of a bus system would require a minimum of 5 years leadtime and construction of a rail system at least 10 years. Traffic congestion and air pollution must be dealt with effectively long before that. In any event, to assume that several billion dollars could be raised to invest in a mass transit system or, that once built, it could operate at less than prohibitive cost is quite risky.

It is even risky to assume that it would ever be possible for mass transit to serve the needs of people in any substantial way at all. This is because so many of the Nation's urban areas, due to the relative cheapness and convenience of automobiles, have developed in such a sprawling way as to defy application of mass transit techniques in any meaningful way to a majority of the population. And, even if somehow it could be applied for moving people from their homes to work and back, the system probably would be inadequate to serve individual personal needs. How many of us live where we could possibly get from our homes to the theater and back after an evening's entertainment on any mass transit system that anyone has suggested? Or to a friend's house on the other side of town? Or to the doctor's office with a sick baby?

The futility of the mass transit approach utilizing busses or rails is apparent if one considers the situation in the Los Angeles metropolitan area and environs where 10 million people live.

Let us assume that 3 million of these people work or otherwise commute on a daily basis. Utilizing round numbered estimates it can be said that only 10 percent of these both live and work at locations permitting a one-way trip to be made in less than 60 minutes other than by automobile. Thus, about 300,000 persons in the southland are presently accommodated by today's sidewalks and public transit. In fact, census figures indicate about half of them can and do walk to work and about half go by bus.

This latter half live close enough to point A where they get on the bus and work close enough to point B where they leave the bus so that their trip from home to work and back again takes an hour or less each way. For another 10 percent the trip requires 1 hour and 15 minutes or less. But for 80 percent of the Southland's commuters, 2,400,000 people, public transportation, if not utterly impos-

sible, would consume more than 2½ hours of each 24 hour day just getting to and from work. Most people will not accept it. It is just too time-consuming and inconvenient. So they ride in automobiles and 80 percent of them average less than 45 minutes from home to work—less than 1½ hours commuting time per day.

If one assumes that, including waiting time, an average mass transit trip in the Southland from point A to point B even on a brand new system will require 45 minutes, that leaves only a total of 30 additional minutes within which one must be able to get from home to point A and from point B to work if his two-way trip is to take less than the unacceptable 2½ hours. The geographic realities in southern California and most other urban areas are such that even a very extensive, and thus very expensive, mass transit system will not radically increase the number of commuters whose daily round trip can be made in less than 2½ hours. At best, possibly 1 million of the Southland's 3 million commuters might be induced to move by means other than the automobile. This would be but 700,000 more people using mass transit than use it now, and it would cost \$3 to \$5 billion just to build the system. Thereafter, estimates from the Highway Users Federation tell us that the daily cost of the commuter's trip will average \$3.04 per day if by bus or \$4.78 by rail. Costs this high would be vigorously resisted by commuters and the system would need heavy public subsidies to stay in operation.

There is a way, however, for mass movement of people in urban areas which actually can be quick, clean and cheap as well as convenient. Moreover, it can be put into effect in months rather than years, with only a modest capital investment. It will substantially reduce present commuting costs, eliminate air pollution, and cut gasoline demand by appreciable amounts.

All this can be done by such a mundane thing as car pooling.

Today the Southland's 2.4 million commuters via automobile drive 2 million cars between home and work. The average automobile carries only 1.2 persons. Doubling that average to 2.4 persons would get 1 million cars off the road, cut commuters' gasoline consumption in half, slash air pollution by 50 percent and cut commuting costs to \$1 or less per day per person.

And, there is every evidence that accomplishing all this, and doing it quickly, will not even prove very difficult.

Not long ago Burroughs Corp. in Pasadena and Operation Oxygen, a local environmental organization, established a car pool program to assist in the abatement of air pollution and traffic congestion. Backed by top management at Burroughs, the program was well received by employees. As a result of the car pool program, the parking demand there was reduced by 35 percent from 659 to 427 cars.

The Burroughs 54-percent increase in average automobile occupancy from 1.2 to 1.85 per car was achieved just by discovering for people who might be convenient carpool mates. There are additional incentives for pooling, such as small subsidies and preferential parking

for drivers, and many others which undoubtedly could boost that figure to 100 percent and more almost everywhere. In Poland, for instance, drivers are given national lottery tickets in exchange for special hitchhiking chits purchased from the government by riders, and the cost of the chits includes automobile accident insurance.

The plan works as well for busses as it does for automobiles and results are even more dramatic. We have been talking in terms of three people who live near each other and work near each other using just one automobile. Whenever computers can locate 50 to 70 such people, bus pooling will achieve even more dramatic results than carpooling.

Techniques for successful car and bus pools are detailed in the Federal Highway Administration's publication, "Car-pool and Buspool Matching Guide," published February 1973. What is needed, however, is more than just voluntary action by individuals and industrial organizations. Successful pooling requires more than just initial matching. Data processing must be kept current by continuous service; incentives and public information needs also must be carried forward on a steady basis. A plan should be established, financed, and run publicly by some governmental unit whose jurisdiction spans city lines and encompasses an entire urban area. Perhaps something like the air pollution control district would be a logical authority.

I strongly urge responsible public officials and concerned citizens at the level of State government and below to pick up this car/bus pool ball and run with it. Everybody is asking: What can we do to clean up pollution and eliminate traffic congestion? Well, pooling is an answer and it is something appropriately accomplished at the local, not the Federal level.

I hope the U.S. press will do all it can to make the idea widely known and accepted. After Watergate all of us need to do something constructive for our country.

JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, JR. DISCUSSES
THE RESIGNATION OPTION OPEN
TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful address on the problem confronting the President and the Nation was made on May 17 by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., the distinguished Washington attorney, to the National Capitol Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration at the George Washington University Club Ballroom. The text of Mr. Califano's address follows:

RICHARD NIXON: THE RESIGNATION OPTION

These are hard times for these United States and the people who live in them. We have moved light years beyond Lord Acton's adage; for history has subpoenaed us to bear witness to the fact that the mere concentration of power in our democracy creates a lust for more that corrupts with a vengeance usually reserved for the angry God of the

Old Testament. What are capsulized as "Watergate developments" in front page boxes in our major newspapers record the splash of the ugly venom of corruption over our democratic system.

The American people awake each morning much like the ancient Romans must have in schizophrenic anticipation of the bouts between the lions and the Christians: torn between the excitement of the circus of corruption with so much action in all three rings and the sinking recognition that offers silent prayer for some hope that it will all end without any "documentary evidence or hard proof" that President Richard M. Nixon himself directed the political sabotage and espionage or the criminal coverup so crudely (but effectively) pursued for so many months.

This sense of excitement at bizarre corruption in conflict with hope for the best for the President has set a stage of emotional confusion on which the players act their parts in this national tragedy. The press frenetically competes to be first to reveal the next scandal. Grand juries investigate in Washington, Florida, Texas, California and New York—and there may be others we do not yet know about. As a dozen or so White House aides and at least two cabinet officers become concerned that they might go to prison, each moves to protect his own flank. As more and more government departments and agencies are involved, more and more Congressional committees move to investigate. The White House staff is a shambles and the court calendars fill up with civil and criminal cases arising out of these sordid events. As Samuel Beckett said, "One does not have to look for distress; it is screaming at you."

At the center of this confusion are President Richard M. Nixon, and the office he holds—the most powerful office in the free world, the Chief Executive Office of our own nation and the Office of the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces.

It is essential to step back from the splatter of headlines and scandal and look at the Office and the man who occupies it in the cold steel of national interest. Only with that cold steel can we cut through the confusion that has developed between the Office and the man, between standards of public morality and private morality and between the burden of proof that is a condition precedent to criminal conviction or impeachment and the burden of persuasion sufficient to convince the man that the national interest requires his resignation from office.

The first step in any analysis of the option of resignation is to separate the Office of the Presidency from the person of the President. In very different ways, this is as difficult for anyone who has been involved in bureaucratic Washington as deeply as you and I have as it is for the 200 million Americans who live and work outside a Capital city dominated by national politics. We in Washington tend to view the Office of the Presidency very much through the glasses of the man who occupies it because we are aware of how differently the Office is sculptured in the hands of a conservatively passive Eisenhower than by the hands of a liberally aggressive Johnson. At a much less sophisticated level, the average American identifies the Office and the man as one; for in psychological perception and publicly received image the Presidential shield takes on the shape of the man who holds it.

The recovery of national decency and integrity is too expensive in these times to permit the luxury of confusing psychological and programmatic identification with political and constitutional reality. The distinction between the Office and the man who occupies it for a few moments in history is essential, not only in civic and constitutional theory, but also in the reality of survival for a decent democratic system in these United States.

Whether we believe that Richard Nixon should resign or remain in office, we must

examine that question in terms of the long run of our Republic and not in terms of the final forty-three months of one man's active political career. To confuse the man and the Office is to perpetuate the confusions which permeate the sordid, who-dun-it excitement of the Watergate affair: the confusion between end and means; the confusion between the CIA and an intelligence arm of a domestic political machine; the confused vision that reads the leftward trend of Democratic Party politics in 1972 as communist subversion or tough investigatory reporters as a danger to legitimately established institutions.

Confusing the person of the President with the Office of the Presidency is a dangerous reflection of the elitist attitudes that led many in the Democratic left to believe they had the only answers in 1972, just as their brothers and sisters on the Republican right anointed Goldwater as a Messiah in 1964. Unquestionably, the same sort of elitist philosophy brought so many of the President's men to the end-justifies-the-means conviction that only Richard M. Nixon could save America from continued moral and political decline in the 1970's. These men confused the Office and the man, identified them as inseparable and acted in ruthless accord with their confused perception.

By contrast, our founding fathers were very much aware of the difference between the man and the Office. For elitist political theory was the rationale of family-blood monarchy and dictatorship that led them to renounce their European citizenship and sail the perilous seas in search of a new nation. Because of their bitter experience and concern with that kind of government, our founding fathers developed a Constitution very much based on a system of law that takes into full account the fallible, human nature of the few who, from time to time, have been entrusted with governing the many; a Constitution quite deliberately designed to protect the body politic from the bad man in the good office and to distribute power in healthy conflict for the good of the people. By providing clear lines of succession, and by setting forth procedures for the impeachment of a felonious federal judge, cabinet official or president, and by limiting terms of office for elected officials, the founding fathers recognized that human history was plagued by death, corruption and excessive concentrations of power. They drafted a Constitution designed as much to protect the Office from the man as it is to give the man who holds the Office the authority he needs to serve the people.

The second distinction that must be made in analyzing the resignation option is the difference between public and private morality. John Courtney Murray, the great American Jesuit philosopher, wrote that one of the most dangerous misconceptions of the modern world is the idea that the same standards that govern individual morality should also govern national morality. The American citizen, as an individual, is steeped in private morality. He learns it from his parents, from his schools, from his church. Private morality is essentially what is right or wrong for an individual, as an individual, to do at any given time under any given set of circumstances.

Public morality is little taught in our schools, rarely preached in our churches and within the personal experience of only one or two percent of our population. Thus, for one man to kill another may be murder; to do so in war may be justifiable and publicly moral. For one man to steal from another for personal gain is privately immoral and perhaps publicly punishable as a crime. For one nation to steal the secrets of another nation is legitimate within current standards of public international morality. I know John Connally, for example, and I do not believe that John Connally would use his public office as a White House aide to enhance his private law practice; but it offends minimal

standards of public morality to represent at the same time the President in the White House and a major corporation in the grand jury room.

This distinction between private and public morality is of major importance in a President's decision whether to resign. For if the paramount consideration is personal morality, the decision could be quite different than if the paramount consideration is public morality. Negligence, bad judgment in making appointments, lack of specific knowledge, refusal to face tough facts—presence of any or even all of these factors would still permit a conclusion that a man did not commit a personal wrong sufficient to require his resignation from office. But the presence of these same factors might very well justify resignation because of the offense they give to any reasonable standard of public morality. And no acid erodes the public respect essential for political leadership in a democracy more rapidly than public immorality.

Throughout this sordid affair, there has been a disturbing failure of many individuals involved to evidence any sense of public morality. John Ehrlichman casually dismisses the burglary of Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office with a "don't-do-it-again" admonition to the burglars on his own White House staff, apparently confusing his public obligation with his sense of private innocence because he did not personally steal the psychiatric reports. Patrick Gray can equivocate in statements to the press, campaign while Acting FBI Director for the Republican Presidential Candidate and destroy "politically dynamite" documents, but his Catholic upbringing and schooling did not permit him to lie under oath because that involves personal morality and perhaps serious sin. The Haldeman and Ehrlichman letters of resignation pay lip service to public morality, but protest their private morality as though that were the ultimate standard by which their exercise of the public trust should be judged.

This brings us to the third element of confusion that runs through this tragic chapter of national history: the failure to recognize the distinction between the standards of proof required to protect a man's freedom against imprisonment and an official's rights against forcible removal from office, on the one hand, and the standard by which he should make a decision whether to resign from office, on the other. Whatever you or I may believe about Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Dean, Stans and Mitchell, before they can be sent to jail, a jury of twelve men and women must be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that they are guilty of criminal activity. Similarly, before a cabinet officer, judge or President can be involuntarily removed from office, the House and the Senate must be satisfied that a severe burden of proof has been met and the Senate must vote to impeach not simply by a majority of its membership, but by an overwhelming "two-thirds of the members present."

But these standards for criminal conviction and impeachment are quite different than those a man should apply in determining whether he should continue to sit on a court, or hold a Cabinet post or occupy the White House. Thus, more than a dozen federal officials have resigned professing their personal innocence of criminal acts, but recognizing, at least rhetorically, their inability to fulfill their public trust. In this context, a man sitting in the Oval Office should impose upon himself significantly different standards in determining whether he should resign, than the Congress should impose prior to impeachment or a jury must find prior to criminal conviction. Indeed, the higher the office, the higher the standard of conduct its occupant should demand of himself.

The three factors I have mentioned—the distinction between the Office of the Presidency and the man who holds it at any given time, the distinction between public and

private morality and the different standards for criminal conviction or impeachment and resignation from office—should shape the context in which the President and the American people face this central question: is Richard Nixon capable of governing this nation at home and abroad at a very difficult and dangerous time in our history. More than most other Americans you should be acutely aware of the subtle difficulties of Presidential government: effective control over the Executive Branch, fruitful relationships with the other branches of government and foreign nations, and political leadership of the American people.

Under the best of landslide election circumstances, it is extraordinarily difficult to assume effective policy direction and control over the 2.5 million civilian employees and 2.2 million military men and women in the Executive Branch. But the practical problems of governing in today's climate are almost beyond belief. The questions are brutally tough, but they must be asked. Suppose, for example, that a White House aide who worked for Messrs. Ehrlichman, Halde- man or Dean called your department and asked that something be done. Except for the most routine request, would you accept it on the faith and trust essential for a working relationship between the White House staff and the Executive Branch of the government? If you were Secretary of Transportation, how would you handle a White House staff personnel recommendation after Egil Krogh had been sent to you as Under- secretary? And what will the reaction of most other departments be after Odle was sent to Agriculture, Magruder to Commerce and Caulfield to Treasury? A cabinet officer or department head would be derelict in his duty to the public if he did not greet such recommendations with the most cautious skepticism.

If you were in the FBI, the CIA or the State Department, would you honor a White House staff request that someone be investigated because he might be a subversive, a request to undertake a clandestine operation, or a request to open up all your top secret cables on U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic? These might be legitimate requests, important to our national security. But, would you promptly honor them simply because they were not coming from Halde- man, Dean, Ehrlichman or Colson, or would you be suspicious so long as Richard Nixon was the President? For no matter the staff member who makes the request, it comes in one man's name—as it must, since all power of White House aides is derivative from the only man they report to, the President.

Perhaps the major element of effective policy direction of the Executive Branch is the people a President attracts to government service. With forty-three months remaining to be served, the President must ask himself what kind of people he will be able to attract to fill key government posts. There are between forty and fifty high policy level appointments, including Assistant Secretar- ies and above which are vacant. These, as you in this room well know, are the journeymen of national policy in our nation; the men in these posts are critical to the intelligent development of that policy and they carry the burden of assuring its implementation. Can the President attract bright young lawyers, analysts and economists from the best law firms, universities, and major corporations to join this Administration and serve in it? It is fair to assume that Mr. Nixon is as aware as the rest of Washington of the importance of bringing new blood into the White House and into the top cabinet posts of his Administration. Yet what we have seen in the shuffles of the last ten days more nearly resembles a desperate game of musical chairs with the same old people dancing as best they can to a cacaphonic chorus of corruption.

The government of our nation should not be directed by second-rate people or "acting" department heads and "acting" assistant secretaries for three-and-one-half years. Patrick Gray is a tragic personal example of what can happen with an "acting" appointee who yearns for permanent status. We simply cannot afford any more Grays.

Presidential relations with the Congress are delicate under the best of circumstances. After the loss of Democratic seats in the mid-term House elections in 1966, the surviving Democratic majority came to appreciate that a vote for the Great Society did not necessarily provide an insurance policy for re-election. We on the White House staff came to realize that it was markedly tougher to persuade Congressmen to go along with our legislative proposals. Yet that seems a small difficulty when we try to appreciate the problems that those who work in this Administration will face when they seek to convince a Congressman that a vote should be cast in favor of their President's proposed program. Dealing with the Democratic majority may well be less difficult than trying to persuade Republican Congressmen who are seeking as many ways as possible to separate themselves from the Watergate White House for their own political survival.

Take foreign trade as an example. It probably makes eminent good sense to give the President a great deal of discretion in foreign trade negotiations so he has the flexibility to bargain swiftly and shrewdly in our national interest. But will Congress give this President that kind of authority, when it inherently carries the power to make and break corporations and individual millionaires each day? And whatever the merits of Cambodian bombing, it is naive not to recognize that the sold House, and unanimous Senate Appropriations Committee votes against it came in the wake of the Watergate scandal.

In foreign affairs, the difficulty of governing will also be attended by special problems. A Breznev must recognize the increased importance of concluding major detente agreements with the Soviet Union to an Administration wracked by scandal than to an Administration riding high on a landslide election victory. If the President went on television tomorrow night to proclaim a major new crisis in the Middle East or Southeast Asia, would the American people or the press take him at his word? Or, would there be instant analysis and newspaper columns about how such a crisis eases his Watergate problems or the historical fact that popular support for a President increases in time of foreign crises? The real danger is that the President might not be manufacturing or exaggerating such a crisis—in which event, failure to believe him would indeed be a tragedy for our nation.

Mr. Nixon must also face the hard fact of the relationship that a Justice Department under his control will have with the Federal judiciary. Elliot Richardson's present problems with the Senate Judiciary Committee provide preview of this problem: many Senators and the President of the American Bar Association are on record for a special prosecutor totally independent of Mr. Richardson because of his prior associations with the Administration. The stretching of the anti-bugging statute to cover newspapermen and White House staff and the instigation by his own staff of clandestine operations against an American citizen with the Justice Department's knowledge raise the most serious questions of credibility for U.S. Attorneys across this nation. Not only did the Justice Department delay revealing these activities to Judge Matthew Byrne in the Ellsberg case, but the Department indicated that files related to the wire-tapping of Ellsberg and others had been destroyed. It was not until the case was dismissed that Acting FBI Director Ruckelshaus obtained those files from the safe of John Ehrlichman.

Finally, major interests in American society respond not to Presidential orders, but to Presidential political and moral leadership. Perhaps the most significant groups at the present time are big business and big labor.

The restraint essential to pursue what Mr. Nixon's chief economic advisers perceive as the best economic policy for our nation can only be achieved by the ability of the President to persuade the big corporations, the major banks and the large unions to go with his leadership. What is the reaction likely to be of a businessman or labor leader when Mr. Nixon asks them not to raise their price another penny or their wage increase another percent? The nose dive of the stock market, the rocketing price of gold and the decline of the dollar provide grim testimony to the special problems now attendant on conducting a coherent and sound economic policy.

The point is not to convict or impeach Mr. Nixon without a trial. Nor is this an attempt to present the case for resignation. The point is, however, to help bring to the public dialogue some sense of the standards that should govern a decision to remain or resign.

This is a distinctly public decision on which our nation and our President should hear and consider thoughtful debate. The leprosy of Watergate abounds with personal tragedies; many of us have close friends who are or may yet be infected by it. It is, for Mr. Nixon, the greatest personal tragedy of his long career in public life. But most important, the tragedy is America's.

And Americans must not ignore or sweep under the rug the resignation option of their President. Robert Louis Stevenson tells us that "The cruelest lies are often told in silence." To silence public debate on this issue is contrary to the way our entire system is poised to achieve political truth. It is difficult for any American citizen to raise this issue because belief in the President is so deeply ingrained in our lives. It is undoubtedly even more difficult for a man as private and remote as Mr. Nixon seems to be to ask himself these questions or to tolerate a debate on the issue whether he should resign or remain. But this is no time for Mr. Nixon "to gut it out" alone. For it is our nation's guts that must be protected now, not his.

There was a time in the history of the world when the Duke of Windsor abdicated because he did not think he could govern England and marry the woman he loved. That seems like a quaint fairy tale compared to our national dilemma.

There was a time, just five years ago, when Lyndon Johnson withdrew as a Presidential candidate because he considered his credibility on peace in Southeast Asia and domestic economic problems more important to the nation than his personal Presidency.

Perhaps it is a measure of these times that Mr. Nixon seems not to have considered his option to resign in favor of the country. If so, he may end up as the Nero of the 1970's, fiddling with personnel shakeups and legal maneuvers, while Washington burns out as the leader of a free people and the free world.

DOUBLE STANDARD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the column by Bob Wiedrich of the Chicago Tribune, which I am inserting into the RECORD at this point, basically deals with

issues and personalities in the Chicago area. However, the point Mr. Wiedrich effectively makes concerns the double standard employed by certain radical spokesmen which has a certain practical application to issues which arise here in Washington.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 16, 1973]
DOUBLE STANDARDS IN CONFRONTATIONS
(By Bob Wiedrich)

The vocal anti-Establishment forces in Chicago don't often practice what they preach.

In fact, they sometimes act very much like the demagogic parent who declares to his kids, "Don't do as I do. Do as I say!"

Two recent incidents at City Hall are illustrative of that kind of behavior—the chaotic City Council meeting last week and the equally chaotic invasion of Mayor Daley's office Monday by the Citizen's Action Program.

Both were prime example of the politics of confrontation. Neither accomplished a thing except disruption.

On the one hand, a minority of seven aldermen managed to demonstrate their ability to throw a council meeting up for grabs by shouting and yelling and carrying on like a bunch of nincompoops.

But their uproarious conduct proved nothing else, except perhaps a first-hand exercise in the deterioration of the governmental process for a group of school children in the galleries.

It may even have reminded some of the youngsters of their own temper tantrums when they were still in diapers.

The Citizens' Action Program caper was something else, bordering on hypocrisy.

First, a band of 90 boisterous C. A. P. members stormed into Daley's outer office demanding to see the chief administrator of the nation's second largest city without an appointment. Presumably, Daley was expected to drop everything to entertain their whim of the moment.

Led by the Rev. Leonard Dubi, a Roman Catholic priest who is no novice at the art of honking and hollering face to face with Mayor Daley, the group demanded Daley sign a pledge he owns no land in the path of the proposed Crosstown Expressway.

Then, after finally getting to see Daley in a stormy two-minute confrontation, six representatives of the group spilled into Daley's outer office again to tell reporters he had rejected their demand.

They also produced as purported evidence of his denunciation of their efforts a tape recorder they admitted had been smuggled into his conference room by one of the C. A. P. women. Unfortunately for them, their attempt at political espionage failed. The recorder didn't record.

Now, keep in mind, this is the same crew that denounced the Watergate electronic bugging of Democratic national headquarters. In their tirade to reporters, they even likened the Daley administration to the Watergate scandal.

Yet, this group didn't hesitate to engage in the same electronic bugging they were denouncing. Really, it's a small point. We understand neither Daley nor his staff were aware the exchange was being recorded. And, we suspect, they could have cared less.

But attempting to clandestinely reduce the confrontation to tape was electronic bugging—no two ways about it.

That's why the invasion of Daley's office smacked so of hypocrisy, that plus the demand Daley sign a piece of paper that legally was meaningless.

Father Dubi's stunt was strictly an attempt to gain a propaganda advantage by furnishing grist for the TV cameras. It was an impolitic, impolite transgression on a busy

man's time to demand that he play a role in a charade.

In short, it was a cheap trick on a man who is entitled to the dignity of his office. After all, a vast majority of the citizens of Chicago did elect Daley mayor for an unprecedented five terms.

The incident smacked of the tactics pioneered by Paul Booth, an early C. A. P. co-chairman, who helped found the radical Students for a Democratic Society, thereby bestowing upon the United States a decade of violent confrontation and bloody rioting.

That kind of duplicity stinks. If Father Dubi and his followers have something to say, let them declare it in a free forum. Forget the infantile games.

The same goes for the seven aldermen who did their best to disrupt the City Council with petulant behavior. Both they and C. A. P. are guilty of practicing a double standard of conduct. They want to be heard but the voice of the majority must shut up. Protest in an atmosphere of rational debate and calm deliberation is apparently not their bag.

There are established methods for insuring responsiveness by government. One is the elective process, which has survived nearly 200 years of American democracy. It does work.

If you don't like an elected official, throw the rascal out the next time around. That's what makes government work, not irrational screaming and yelling.

MALCOLM X REMEMBERED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker—

Let All the Enemies
Of The Persecuted
Blacks Tremble . . .
I Am In Earnest . . .
I Will Not Retreat A
Single Inch . . . And
I Will Be Heard

These are the words of El Hajj Malik El Shabazz, known to most of this Nation as Malcolm X. In remembrance of Malcolm, on what would have been his 48th birthday—May 19—I now submit excerpts from the speeches and writing of this great black American:

REVOLUTION

We are living in an era of revolution, and the revolt of the American Negro is part of the rebellion against the oppression and colonialism which has characterized his era.

It is incorrect to classify the revolt of the Negro as simply a racial conflict of black against white, or as a purely American problem. Rather, we are today seeing a global rebellion of the oppressed against the oppressor, the exploited against the exploiter.

The Negro revolution is not racial revolt. We are interested in practicing brotherhood with anyone really interested in living according to it. But the white man has long preached an empty doctrine of brotherhood which means little more than a passive acceptance of his fate by the Negro.

(The Western Industrial nations have been) deliberately subjugating the Negro for economic reasons. These international criminals raped the African continent to feed their factories, and are themselves responsible for the low standards of living prevalent throughout Africa.

One thing I am determined to do, is to make America practice what it preaches.

The time has come for the American Negro to fight back in self-defense whenever and wherever he is being unjustly attacked.

AN EXTREMIST

Yes, I'm an extremist. The Black race here in North America is in extremely bad condition. You show me a Black man who isn't an extremist and I'll show you one that needs psychiatric attention.

EDUCATION

Education is our passport to the future, for tomorrow belongs to the people who prepare for it today.

FREEDOM

You get your freedom by letting your enemy know that you'll do anything to get your freedom; then you'll get it.

CITIZENS

They tell us that we are all citizens, that we were born in this country. Well, a cat can have kittens in an oven but that doesn't make them biscuits! The Black man in America can never be called an American until he is enjoying what America is offering to everybody else . . . Black people here in America today are called "second class citizens" . . . you are either a citizen or you are not a citizen. No country has citizenship by degrees.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY

Unemployment and poverty has forced many of our people into this life of crime. As we pointed out a couple of weeks ago, the real criminal is in City Hall downtown, the real criminal is in the State House at Albany the real criminal is in the White House in Washington, D.C., the real criminal is the white man who poses as a liberal, the political hypocrite and it is these legal crooks posing as our friends forcing us into a life of crime and then using us to spread the white man's evils and vices among our people.

BLACK PHILOSOPHY

This racial dilemma poses a serious problem for white America, civil war between white people on the one hand and a race war between the entire dark world is watching, waiting to see what the American government will do to solve this problem once and for all. We must have a permanent solution, a temporary solution won't do.

MY CREDENTIALS

I do not pretend to be a divine man, but I do believe in divine guidance, divine power, and in the fulfillment of divine prophecy. I am not educated, nor am I an expert in any particular field—but I am sincere, and my sincerity are my credentials.

FORGIVE AND FORGET

I'm not out to fight other Negro leaders or organizations. We must find a common approach, a common solution, to a common problem. As of this minute, I've forgotten everything bad that the other leaders have said about me, and I pray they can also forget the many bad things I've said about them.

SELF-DEFENSE

We should be peaceful, law abiding—but the time has come for the American Negro to fight back in self-defense whenever and he is being unjustly and unlawfully attacked.

If the government thinks I am wrong for saying this, then let the government start doing its job.

THE UNENDING HURT

The problem facing our people here in America is bigger than all other personal or organizational differences. Therefore, as leaders, we must stop worrying about the threat that we seem to think we pose to each other's personal prestige, and concentrate our united efforts toward solving the unending hurt that is being done daily to our people here in America.

ACCENT ON YOUTH

Our accent will be upon youth; we need new ideas, new methods, new approaches. We

will call upon young students of political science throughout the nation to help us. We will encourage these young students to launch their own independent study, and then give us their analysis and their suggestions.

ARE DEMONSTRATIONS JUSTIFIED?

So, again I ask, where will all these demonstrations end and who dares to say that our people are not justified by demonstrating their resentment over the injustice and mistreatment that our people have suffered these 400 years at the hands of this cruel, inhuman American white man. We have nothing to lose but our chains. We have nothing to lose but the hell we experience every day living here in these rat-filled slums, and as I mentioned at our rally a couple of weeks ago, the worst housing conditions in every city of America always exist in the so-called Negro community, yet the white liberals who own these run down houses force us to pay the highest rent, and that's who owns these houses, the white liberals, yo white friends, yo white benefactor, yo white buddy who joins yo integrated organizations, that's the white man who's yo landlord, that's the white man who is milking you and robbing you and exploiting you, that blue-eyed thing who walks around here in Harlem collecting rent, trying to pat you on the back and tell you how much progress you are making when you're catching more hell today than your grandfather caught a hundred years ago. (applause)

UNITED BLACK FRONT

If capitalistic Kennedy and communistic Krushchev can find something in common on which to form a united white front despite their tremendous theological differences, then it's time for the so-called Negro leaders to submerge all our trivial, minor differences in order to figure a common solution to a common problem posed by a common enemy to our people—by forming a united black front.

If the American government which is a white government and the Russian government which is a white government can get together and form a united white front—then it is time for you and me, time for us to forget our little differences and in some way try to find how we can form a united black front. When you see the white man forming a united white front, he's forming that front against a common enemy, an enemy that's common enemy to them, and that enemy is not considered by them as white.

EULOGY TO MALCOLM X

The following is the eulogy delivered by actor-director-writer Ossie Davis at the funeral of Malcolm X.

EL HAJJ MALIK EL SHABAZZ

Here—at this final hour, in this quiet place Harlem has come to bid a fond farewell to one of its brightest hopes—extinguished now, and gone from us forever.

For Harlem is where he worked and where he struggled and fought—his home of homes, where his heart was, and where his people are—and it is therefore most fitting that we meet once again—in Harlem—to share these last moments with him.

For Harlem has ever been gracious to those who have loved her, have fought for her, and have defended her honor even to the death. It is not in the memory of man that this beleaguered, unfortunate but nonetheless proud community has found a braver, more gallant young champion than this Afro-American who lies before us—unconquered still.

I saw the word again, as he would want me to: Afro-American—Afro-American Malcolm, who was a master, was most meticulous in his use of words. Nobody knew better than he the power words have over the minds of men. Malcolm had stopped being a "Negro" years ago. It had become too small, too puny,

to weak a word for him. Malcolm was bigger than that. Malcolm had become an Afro-American and he wanted—so desperately—that we, that all his people would become Afro-Americans too.

There are those who will consider it their duty, as friends of the Negro people, to tell us to revile him, to flee, even from the presence of his memory, to save ourselves by writing him out of the history of our tubulent times.

Many will ask what Harlem finds to honor in this stormy, controversial and bold young captain—and we will smile.

Many will say turn away! away from this man, for he is not a man but a demon, a monster, a subverter and an enemy of the black man—and we will smile.

They will say that he is of hate—a fanatic, a racist—who can only bring evil to the cause for which you struggle!

And we will answer and say unto them: Did you ever talk to Brother Malcolm? Did you ever touch him, or have him smile at you? Did you ever really listen to him? Did he ever do a mean thing? Was he ever himself associated with violence or any public disturbance? For if you did you would know him. And if you knew him you would know why we must honor him: Malcolm was our manhood, our living, black manhood! This was his meaning to his people. And, in honoring him, we honor the best in ourselves.

Last year, from Africa, he wrote these words to a friend: "My journey" he says, "is almost ended, and I have a much broader scope than when I started out, which I believe will add new life and dimension to our struggle for freedom and honor, and dignity in the States. I'm writing these things so that you will know for a fact that tremendous sympathy and support we have among the African States for our Human Rights struggle. The main thing is that we keep a United Front wherein—our most valuable time and energy will not be wasted fighting each other."

However much we may have differed with him—or with each other about him and his value as a man, let his going from us serve only to bring us together, now. Consigning these mortal remains to earth, the common mother of all, secure in the knowledge that what we place in the ground is no more now a man—but a seed—which after the winter of our discontent—will come forth again to meet us. And we will know him then for what he was and is—a Prince—our own black shining Prince!—who didn't hesitate to die, because he loved us so.

FINAL WORDS

Malcolm said he believed that the white man "will make use of me dead, as he has made use of me alive, as a convenient symbol of 'hatred'—and that will help him to escape facing the truth that all I have been doing is holding up a mirror to reflect, to show the history of unspeakable crimes that his race has committed against my race."
"As-Alaikum-Salaam." "Peace also unto you."—Malcolm X 1925-1965

THE ADMINISTRATION FAILS VETERANS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two comments from media in my district on problems of concern to us all. The first, from WOR-TV in New York, involves the failure and shortsightedness on the part of the administration in its policies toward Vietnam Veterans. The

administration, despite its overblown rhetoric, has failed to meet the many needs of the thousands of men, not only in New York City, but all over our country, who gave so much time and dedication and service to our Nation. The WOR editorial is eloquent in pointing that out.

The second item, an editorial from the Long Island Police News, refers to a more localized problem, but one that certainly has national implications. I am referring to the announced closing of the St. Albans Naval Hospital in Queens. That hospital, a modern, efficient facility, is capable of alleviating the suffering of thousands of our Veterans and active service personnel, but in the name of false economy the Defense Department is seeking to halt its operation. That approach is neither sound nor humane. The only answer is an immediate transfer of the hospital to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

The two editorials are printed below:
WOR TV EDITORIAL—APRIL 19, 1973

Despite claims by the President, the federal government's response to the needs of Viet Nam veterans has been insensitive and inadequate.

The freezing of funds under the Federal Emergency Employment Act has had a disastrous effect on opportunities for veterans. More than fifteen percent of the one quarter million veterans in the New York City area are unemployed. More than seventy-five hundred of them are on public assistance.

Present educational benefits fall far short of those offered veterans of earlier wars. Last year, Congress appropriated twenty-five million dollars to help colleges provide programs for returning veterans. The Administration has now impounded those funds.

The problem of drug abuse has affected countless veterans at all levels of the military. Those accused of drug use are denied honorable discharges, and so the Veterans' Administration turns away those who need drug rehabilitation the most.

Clearly, there is a need for emergency action on behalf of our returned veterans. Veterans programs should be exempt from the budget cutbacks proposed by the President. Impounded funds for veterans educational programs should be released immediately. And the burden of meeting our veterans' needs should certainly not be left to the states and cities, as might well happen under present revenue sharing formulas.

As we said in an earlier editorial, failure to meet the legitimate needs of our veterans, suggests that the system they were sent to defend, really doesn't give a damn.

[From the Long Island Police News, Apr. 19, 1973]

VA SHOULD MAKE A MOVE

There are too many Veterans out here on Long Island, particularly paraplegic and quadraplegics, who must go trucking into the Bronx and Manhattan, for out-patient treatment. This newspaper strongly urges all Veterans' Organizations; American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Navy League, Marine Corps League, to name just a few of many, to have their responsible elected County and State Commanders and Commandants exert every pressure possible to help turn the United States Naval Hospital, St. Albans, Queens, into a Veteran's Hospital.

The help that it will provide for our wounded and disabled personnel is academic. It would also create jobs—and if the move is to be considered in the realm of economics it will save millions of dollars that would otherwise be used for presently contemplated "New" . . . slap some paint on it, staff it,

and let's open the doors to thousands of Veterans who now must rely on friends, neighbors and loved ones who must now travel to under-staffed and over-crowded Veteran's Hospitals located in the city proper.

Most of these "Joes" did not hesitate to travel 10,000 miles when their country called, and there is no necessity in this day and age, for their mothers and fathers, wives and sweethearts to have to place their wheel chairs in the trunks of cars, and be required to go to the Bronx for treatment and annual check-ups.

Now is not the time for talk, but for action. Instead of waiting for the regular monthly meeting dates, of all Veteran's Posts and Detachments, emergency meetings of all Veteran's groups should be called immediately, to, "hit the beach" hard and fast and initiate demands to elected officials and the Veteran's Administration.

FDA LEAVES MANY QUESTIONS UNANSWERED

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed regulations recently publicized by the FDA in the Federal Register have caused a large number of my constituents a good deal of concern. I have spent time trying to search out the merits and shortcomings of these regulations. I wrote a letter to then Commissioner Edwards requesting clarification of these proposed Federal regulations, and received a response from him which was not fully satisfactory. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting copies of both letters in the RECORD:

MARCH 13, 1973.

HON. CHARLES C. EDWARDS,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs,
Rockville, Md.

DEAR COMMISSIONER EDWARDS: The publication on January 19, 1973 in the Federal Register of the final order regulating vitamins and mineral supplements is, to me, unclear and complicated. I would like, in detail, your general comments on this order and specific answer to the following questions:

(1) Will the regulations bar many health food suppliers from the market because of the suppliers inability to comply? Could the regulations be construed to do this? Please be specific as to your interpretation of the regulations in each case.

(2) What is the reasoning for calling certain vitamins (above 150 percent of R.D.A.) drugs? Why should people not be allowed to take, without a prescription, as much of a vitamin as they wish? Please respond with regard to vitamins other than A and D to be regulated when such substances as alcohol, tobacco, aspirin, etc., which are demonstrably harmful in easily obtainable quantities, are not?

(3) It appears that the regulations prohibit possible true claims, for example, that storage or cooling of foods may result in a deficient diet. If such claims are in fact true, and if such claims would be prohibited, what is your reasoning in prohibiting them?

(4) It appears arbitrary to prohibit a combination of rutin and other bioflavonoids with vitamin C. Would you explain this reasoning? Are such combinations prohibited only if nutritional claims are made?

(5) How are these regulations to be en-

forced? Do you foresee a black market in prohibited drugs?

(6) Does the F.D.A. plan to change these regulations when new data is obtained as for example in the true claims aspect of the regulations?

I look forward to getting your response in the near future.

Sincerely,

WAYNE OWENS.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Rockville, Md., April 25, 1973.

HON. WAYNE OWENS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OWENS: Dr. Edwards has asked me to reply to your request of March 13, 1973, for answers to specific questions concerning our new regulations relating to vitamin and mineral supplements. Our answers will be in the order in which you have stated your questions.

(1) We see no reason why "health food suppliers" would be barred from selling products which are properly formulated and labeled to meet the regulations. The ultimate deadline setup is December 31, 1974, which would appear to give firms ample opportunity to make whatever revisions are necessary.

(2) Your second question relates to the basis for classifying vitamins and minerals as drugs rather than foods. The levels or potencies for the vitamins and minerals which are set forth in the standards for dietary supplements are based on the Recommended Dietary Allowances established by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. Details of how these quantities were determined and the scientific literature on which the Committee based their conclusions, can be found in *Recommended Dietary Allowances*, Seventh Edition, 1968, Publication 1694, Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number 63-65472. The Academy's report describes these RDA's as: "Designed for the maintenance of good nutrition of practically all healthy people in the U.S.A." and "The allowance levels are intended to cover individual variations among most normal persons as they live in the United States under usual environmental stresses. The recommended allowances can be attained with a variety of common foods, providing other nutrients for which human requirements have been less well defined."

Expert testimony during the two years of public hearings on these regulations showed without doubt, that the Recommended Dietary Allowances were adequate and sufficient for all normal food uses. Our regulations provide an additional amount of leeway by setting the maximum or ceiling potencies for vitamin and mineral supplements at 150 percent of the recommended daily allowance for practically all of the specified nutrients. Potencies of vitamins and or minerals above the maximum dietary supplement levels clearly exceed any recognized nutritional need and are useful only for drug or therapeutic purposes.

In view of this fact, it would be false and misleading to represent these high potency items to the public as dietary supplements. When the regulations become effective, high potency products currently being sold as dietary supplements, will continue to be available, but as over-the-counter (nonprescription) drugs pending review by a panel composed of outside experts in various fields. This review is part of a study of all over-the-counter drug preparations being conducted on a category-by-category basis. For a discussion of this review, we refer you to the second full paragraph in the right-hand column on page 2157 of the enclosed *Federal Register* reprint. The contention that all vitamins and minerals exceeding the upper limits of the standards will require a prescription is absolutely incorrect.

The potencies of aspirin products available without prescription are restricted and the labeling of these products must bear specific directions for safe use. In addition, we have issued regulations requiring child-proof containers to be used in the packaging of such items. However, we have no more control over the number of bottles of aspirin a person purchases and consumes than we have over the number of bottles of a dietary supplement a person purchases and consumes.

As you know, the production and marketing of alcoholic beverages are subject to the strict provisions of the Alcohol Administration Act which is administered by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms of the Treasury Department. Neither that agency nor the Food and Drug Administration has any control over the amount of alcohol a person buys and consumes. While our laws do regulate the production and marketing of dietary supplements, we have no control over the number of dietary supplements a person buys and consumes.

The laws administered by the Department provide no authority for the restriction of the sale of tobacco products offered strictly for smoking pleasure. However, through numerous public announcements, the Department has attempted to inform the consumer about the potential dangers of smoking.

(3) Findings of Fact Numbers 39, 40, and 41 on page 2147 of the *Federal Register* of January 19, 1973, taken from the testimony of qualified experts, state that the loss of nutrients from the ordinary effects of cooking, processing, transportation, and storage have not significantly impaired the nutritional qualities of food in the United States and "There is no need or scientific justification for recommending, for example, the routine use of dietary supplements of vitamins and minerals to offset losses that occur as a result of these processes." Further, "It is reasonable to prohibit representation or suggestions in labeling * * * of foods offered for special dietary use based on vitamin and mineral qualities, that imply that a dietary deficiency of vitamins or minerals exists or is threatened in the United States by virtue of loss of nutrients which occur from processing, transportation, storage, and cooking."

(4) Finding of Fact Number 3 states, "Many dietary supplements include named ingredients which are of no value as supplements to the human diet. However, many consumers will purchase such products with long lists of ingredients, believing them to be of better value than products with a lesser number of ingredients. Such consumers believe that if an ingredient is listed, it must significantly contribute to the value of the product as a dietary supplement." Finding of Fact Number 4 further states, "It is scientifically inaccurate to list a dietary property of a food for special dietary use that is of no significance in human nutrition, and listing of dietary properties should be limited to ingredients of significant value and need in human nutrition."

The prohibition against combining ingredients of no nutritional value in a dietary supplement (such as rutin) with ingredients of recognized nutritional value is necessary to prevent consumer deception. This approach has been upheld in the courts as reasonable and, indeed, required by law, since these ingredients " * * * would not have been listed on the label (or included in the product) except for the purpose of attempting to persuade a purchaser that the product is of more value as a dietary supplement by reason thereof than a product which does not contain some or all of these inconsequential ingredients." *United States v. Nuclomin*, No. 71C585 (2) (E.D. Mo.).

Nevertheless, we feel there is no reason why rutin, other bioflavonoids, and similar substances having no value as dietary supplements, cannot be sold as foods as long as

they are not sold in a manner which represents, suggests, or implies they are of therapeutic or nutritional value.

(5) The new regulations are expected to be enforced in a manner consistent with the seizure and penalty provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Since vitamin and/or mineral products will be available either as properly formulated and labeled dietary supplements, as drugs, or as ordinary foods, we see no reason why any of these products would be black marketed.

(6) In answer to your last question, the law provides for the changing of regulations when new and valid information supports such change. This may be proposed by the Commissioner on his own initiative and under the authority delegated to him by the Secretary or by any interested person in accordance with the procedures set forth in 21 CFR 2 and in the form found in 21 CFR 2.65.

If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,
GERALD F. MEYER,
Director,
Office of Legislative Services.

In his letter to me the Commissioner has left many questions unanswered. The regulations appear to be arbitrary and quite vague. The FDA has failed to justify such tight control over these substances not yet proven harmful for human consumption.

These proposed regulations tend to suppress the freedom of individuals to supplement their diet with safe foods. After evaluation of these facts, and the letter I received in return from FDA, I feel the best course for me to take would be to cosponsor H.R. 643. This bill, sponsored by Representative HOSMER, clearly defines food and food supplements. I would, however, be in favor of a labeling procedure whereby consumers are made aware that these products may not be helpful to their diet. I believe that people should be free to take these products until they are proven harmful and for these reasons I support Representative HOSMER's bill.

PROHIBIT FOOD STAMPS FOR STRIKERS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7798, a bill introduced by Mr. DICKINSON on Tuesday, May 15, which I agreed to cosponsor. This legislation is intended to exclude from coverage of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 every household with a member out on strike.

Mr. Speaker, I can hardly hope to improve upon or add to the impressive array of arguments in support of this bill which have already been voiced by various Members of this body. I endorse these arguments as do the large majority of my constituents, and, I believe, most of the American people as well.

Although there are many reasons why the distribution of food stamps to strikers is contrary to the public welfare, the basic objection to such distribution—a practice of recent vintage but growing

rapidly—is that it upsets the balance in collective-bargaining relationships between labor and management. It strengthens the union's position, and in so doing tends to produce higher wage settlements than would otherwise be the case, and consequently, results in higher prices to the general consuming public—all this at the expense of the general taxpayer, who is paying for the food stamp program. When negotiations fail and a strike is called, the Government should remain strictly neutral. Lending economic aid to either side is not just unfair; it is an open invitation to labor to take the strike route instead of making an effort to settle peacefully.

A neutral Government stance in industrial disputes is one of the cornerstones of Federal labor law. The importance of such neutrality was stressed very recently by President Nixon, not in connection with food stamps, but in another context. In his April 12, 1973, message to the Congress on revising the Federal unemployment insurance system, the President stated that—

We must . . . insist on strong safeguards to preserve the neutrality of the unemployment insurance system in industrial disputes. The unemployment tax which an employer is required to pay was never intended to supplement strike funds of those engaged in a dispute with the same employer . . . I therefore propose that the Federal Unemployment Tax Act be amended to prohibit . . . the payments of unemployment insurance benefits to strikers.

Although the Presidential recommendation dealt with unemployment insurance and not the food stamp program, the principle of governmental neutrality is the same in both cases.

Leo Perlis, community services director for the AFL-CIO, has stated that public aid has become a much more important source of strike support than union strike funds. The principal aid programs to which he was referring are three: The food stamp program, aid to families with dependent children, and the unemployment compensation system. Mr. Perlis' statement may come as a surprise to most Americans as they may have been under the impression that financial support of strikers is the responsibility of the strikers themselves and of their unions, not of the Federal Treasury.

One ironic point is that organized labor in this country has always been a stalwart defender of free collective bargaining without government intervention. As an example of this laissez-faire attitude, American unions unanimously oppose compulsory arbitration for labor-management dispute settlement, even in cases where work stoppages may precipitate national emergencies. The reasoning of the unions is that such governmental interference would destroy the delicate balance of free collective bargaining between the only two principals who, they say, should be involved—labor and management. Yet, when the collective diplomacy fails and war is declared—that is, when a strike begins—organized labor is no longer opposed to governmental interference. On the contrary, at that moment they actively seek it and many workers go directly from the strike vote

to the welfare office to sign up for food stamps and other benefits.

Organized labor wants it both ways—they want the Government to stay out of it when things are going labor's way, but they want Government help at the first sign that labor is in trouble. The desire to eat one's cake and still have it may well be a human failing with which we can all identify, but that is why we have laws and lawmakers—to protect the general public against the inequities which would otherwise arise from the unchecked expression of such human failing.

The food stamp program has grown tremendously in very recent years as a welfare benefit to strikers. This was amply documented in the statements made on the floor of this House last week, on May 15. As food stamp distribution to strikers has been rapidly expanding, the general public has become increasingly aware of the danger and increasingly alarmed and congressional concern has mounted.

Twice during the 92d Congress efforts were made to deny food stamps for strikers; both times the efforts were defeated. In June 1971, an amendment to the fiscal 1972 agricultural appropriations bill which would have denied food stamps for strikers was turned back by a 172 to 225 rollcall vote. Again in June 1972 a similar amendment, this one attached to the fiscal 1973 agricultural appropriations bill, was defeated, by a 180 to 199 vote.

I believe that the facts, as they become better known to the public and to the Congress, will cause a reversal of these votes, and that the Food Stamp Act will be amended. I hope that this will happen in the 93d Congress.

The Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended in 1971, is intended to "permit low-income households to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet through normal channels of trade." It is not intended to subsidize strikes. That is the basic issue, all the rest is commentary.

NO ABANDONMENT OF CHINA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, some in the media and even some of our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol have been advocating courses of action which would result in the abandonment of the Republic of China. There have been calls for total withdrawal of all American forces and military aid to the Republic of China, reexamination of the U.S.-ROC Mutual Defense Treaty, and repeal of the Formosa Resolution. Numerous newspaper articles have pushed the theme that the Free Chinese will eventually become part of Communist China. These same articles proclaim that perhaps Taiwan and the other Free Chinese islands—including the Pescadores, Quemoy, and Matsu—may be given some type of semi-autonomous status under

the Communist rule. Of course, there is never mentioned any other region under Communist control that enjoys such status in more than name only. And with good reason no such mention is made—because in reality there are no such autonomous regions.

However, there is also another point to be raised in this regard. The promulgation of Free Chinese absorption by the mainland theories serve to undercut American support of the Free Chinese. The view becomes, "Why should we support Free China if they are only going to join the Communist Chinese in the next 5 to 10 years." And if absorption by the mainland is the desire of the Free Chinese there would be good reason for the acceptance of such view. But there is no such desire on the part of the Free Chinese. In the words of the ROC's Premier Chiang Ching-Kuo:

Let me give you my word of honor that we will never enter into any negotiations with the Chinese Communists. Our decision in this respect is not based on political dispute or personal grudges. It is a matter of life or death.

The Free Chinese make themselves clear as the above quotation shows. They are not interested in becoming part of the "Mainland." They are interested in their own further development as a free country, to improve their citizens' lives and to serve as a successful example for other developing countries.

Let us not be deluded by those who, under various guises, are arguing for abandoning Free China in return for promised closer relations with Communist China. Such a delusion would be tragic indeed. The exchange of Free China for Red China would be no bargain. Relations between free nations should not be compromised by faint hopes of gain with totalitarian states.

There is widespread agreement that the progress of Free China is phenomenal. One can only speculate on what the progress of the whole mainland would have been by now if it too were free. I support our friends, the Free Chinese, and urge our Government to do nothing which would compromise their continuing free existence.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gordon C. Baker, a distinguished senior citizen leader and a good friend of mine, recently wrote an article which I feel deserves the attention of my colleagues.

His article points out an inequity in existing social security law. Our older citizens over 65 who are either forced to continue working to supplement social security benefits—or who do not wish to retire—are being penalized by a requirement to continue paying social security taxes on earned income.

Again this year, I have introduced

legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code and provide a full exemption to those individuals who have attained age 65, and I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank Gordon Baker for his support of this measure and his determined efforts over the past few years to have it enacted into law.

The article follows:

TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY

How many people realize that people over age 65 still have to pay Social Security tax on any earned income whether or not they are being paid Social Security? When this question has been put to groups of people, not one in a hundred is aware of this injustice unless they happen to be an employer of such people or are self-employed themselves.

Without attempting to be actuarially precise, there are some 200 million people in the United States of which 13% are alleged to be age 65 or more. Of this 13%, it is reasonable to suppose that 6%-7% are adequate retired executive types who don't pretend to work. Of the remaining 6%-7%, it is also reasonable to assume that half or more are physically incapable of work.

This leaves say 3% who either have to supplement Social Security, small pensions, and other savings to keep body and soul together or are professional types whose continued activity is a positive asset to society, the economy of the community and country, and themselves.

Most of said 3% have paid into Social Security since its inception over thirty-five years ago and now not only cannot draw on it but have to continue paying taxes for it while, every month they live, they diminish the Federal Government's liability to provide what has been bought and paid for only because they refuse to vegetate in an economic sense, cannot afford to do so, or still have valuable skills or services to provide.

It is reasonable to assume that such an injustice crept into the original law incognito but any administration that allows it to continue is guilty of nothing less than financial rape of its senior citizens.

Two Bills were introduced in the 91st Congress to correct this injustice by Hon. John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin and Hon. Barber B. Conable of New York but both died in the Ways and Means Committee. In the 92nd Congress, both gentlemen submitted similar bills and were joined by Hon. Jack F. Kemp of New York and those suffered the same fate. In the 93rd Congress, Mr. Kemp has already introduced No. HR-3444.

Possibly, the Hon. Mr. Byrnes said it all in the fewest words when he stated, "Present law makes the working oldster a two-time loser; under the law, a person working past 65 has his Social Security benefits reduced or eliminated and also pays the tax".

The present law literally persecutes all classes of the working elderly who are, in reality, a small minority actually being "penalty-taxed" by the huge majority. The problem is totally non-partisan, non-regional, and non-sensical in view of the fact that every month an oldster lives, he or she diminishes a government responsibility that has already been paid for and thus constitutes a "penalty" for either living too long or remaining useful. It affects the part-time janitor of the crossroads country church, the charwoman, the farmer, the small businessman, or the professional.

This is not a matter of concern only to the present oldsters because the only way the younger and middle-aged can avoid a similar fate is to die off or get this obnoxious law changed. Write your own Congressmen and Senators!

The present law is not only unfair—it is downright dishonest.

OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING IN THE ATLANTIC—A REASONED DISCUSSION

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, because of my continuing concern with the prospect of opening up the Atlantic Ocean for offshore oil drilling and because there is much current discussion about an energy crisis, it is gratifying to occasionally come across voices of reason on these subjects.

Although we have differed in the past on some issues, *Newsday*, Long Island's most widely read daily newspaper, recently, May 20, 1973, offered an excellent editorial discussing the prospect of offshore drilling in the Atlantic and the alternatives thereto.

I found it a sensible, forward-looking comment on the problems the people of the entire Atlantic coast might soon face if confronted with the question of "to drill or not to drill."

Because I have been attempting to make many of the same points with our colleagues here in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the *Newsday* editorial here in the hope that other Members equally concerned will find it enlightening and informative:

POWER FOR THE FUTURE (VI): OFFSHORE OIL RESERVES

For Long Islanders, the energy shortage is no longer an esoteric national problem. Our geography makes it a critical local problem, one that goes far beyond the occasional closing of a few gas stations.

The seabed off the coast of Long Island is a gently sloping series of sedimentary layers like those that yielded important oil and natural gas discoveries off Louisiana and Texas. Those offshore fields are now supplying more than 10 per cent of all domestic oil production, and the U.S. Geological Survey thinks the waters off the East Coast could easily match that output.

The oil industry obviously thinks so too. It will spend 1,000,000 this summer to explore the geology of Baltimore Canyon, a 22,500-square-mile area that begins about 50 miles south of Long Island, Georges Bank, about 150 miles east of Montauk, is also considered a top-priority area. If the Supreme Court rules that the federal government has jurisdiction over Atlantic coastal waters, the Interior Department will soon begin to sell offshore oil leases. The areas off Long Island will be among the first to go on the block.

They will not lack for bidders. The economics of drilling for oil only 40 or 50 miles away from major northeastern metropolitan areas are enough to make any oilman's mouth water. A relatively inexpensive pipeline from Baltimore Canyon could supply refineries in the very heart of the world's most lucrative gasoline market. In contrast, it will cost more than \$2 billion to build an 800-mile-long pipeline to service the Alaskan oil fields.

With the Interior Department already on its side, the oil industry has moved into Phase II of its campaign to win access to the black gold off the Atlantic Coast. One can hardly pick up a paper or turn on a television set without being told that offshore oil could alleviate the energy "crisis"; that 14,000 offshore wells have already been driven with only three major accidents; that

the drill platforms would be invisible from land because most offshore oil is located "30 to 300" miles off the coast.

All of this is true, but it isn't the whole truth. The oil companies have indeed sunk 14,000 offshore wells—starting as far back as 1938—but most are located in shallow, protected waters in the Gulf of Mexico and the Santa Barbara Channel, and even so both areas have suffered major oil spills. The full truth is that the industry has never attempted large-scale drilling in deep, open waters so close to major population centers.

It's also true that the Atlantic oil fields that seem to offer the best potential are located from 30 to 300 miles offshore. But the whole truth is that the industry does not now possess the technology to drill 300 miles out in the Atlantic. The closer-in sedimentary fields would be exploited first, and that would greatly increase the chances of shoreline damage.

And it's true that a derrick located 20 miles at sea would not be visible from land. But the support facilities needed to service off-shore wells would most certainly be visible. How many land-based terminals and refineries would be needed? Where would they be located? Is a deep ocean pipeline system a foolproof transportation system? Would tankers be needed?

The biggest unanswered question of all is whether offshore drilling is really necessary. According to the oil industry's own estimates, it could take 10 years or more to locate the oil, drill the wells, lay the pipelines and build the terminals and refineries needed to exploit the offshore fields. By that time the nation should be well on the way to developing alternate energy sources, and hopefully an alternate automobile engine. It is even possible that sharply higher prices for all types of energy will induce the public to conserve it.

The energy shortage is real, and this series of editorials has pointed out many steps that must be taken to assure a continuing supply of energy. But this is a shortage, not a crisis. And it makes no sense to attempt to alleviate it by creating an environmental crisis offshore.

A CALL FOR RESPONSIBILITY IN NEWS COVERAGE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an address given by the gentle lady, formerly from Connecticut, who served in this body, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce who appeared before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C. on May 3, 1973.

I think it unfortunate that this excellent address by Mrs. Luce did not receive broader publicity. This address is of particular significance, inasmuch as it contains a certain objectivity which those of us either serving in the Congress or living in this highly political Nation's Capital cannot achieve. It is a statement of a woman who stands high in the ranks of the Members of the fourth estate—her husband, Henry Luce, recently deceased, having headed Time magazine for some considerable period of time, and Mrs. Luce herself having been a significant contributor to the literature of this coun-

try and her articles are still read with a great deal of care by those who value informed and knowledgeable comment.

It is also significant to me that the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce's statement, which is thoughtful, objective and balanced, free of hearsay and innuendo, appeared if at all in our Nation's newspapers in brief references found only on the society pages. On the other hand, the charges and countercharges, to a large extent political and to some extent partisan in nature appear consistently on the front pages of all the Nation's newspapers.

I would urge the press, as does Mrs. Luce, at this critical time to be at its responsible best. The Nation's press cannot, it seems to me, on the one hand print articles by those who have political axes to grind who call for the highest standard of moral standards and unquestioned leadership from the President, and who at the same time, as Mrs. Luce states it, fail to move the political dialog to a higher and safer ground for America.

I would ask, as Mrs. Luce asks without answering—will the Nation's press help to lead America out of this painful hour it is experiencing, or will it with the awesome power it has, misuse that power by adding to mistrust and suspicion and give added currency and distribution to the voices of those opponents of the President who see this as an opportunity for vindication of their harsh judgments of President Nixon's earlier decisions on the war, balanced budgets, et cetera?

I trust that all of us will call upon the press to act responsibly during this period. I include the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce's address challenging the Nation's press to meet this call to responsibility in its entirety:

THE HONORABLE CLARE BOOTHE LUCE—ADDRESS BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 3, 1973—12 NOON

When John Knight wrote to me in Hawaii asking me to talk to you, I chose as my subject, the condition of the 4th estate. I have, in these past years, given a lot of thought to this subject. It is very dear to my heart for all that I have done fruitfully in my time, all that has been interesting in my life, all that has assured my fortune. I owe to the circumstance of having been a great editor's wife, and of having lived and worked among you for forty years. Now I thought I had a few provocative thoughts to present. But like so many provocative thoughts I have had in the past, they have wound up in Harry Luce's waste basket. And last night I seemed to hear him saying, "Look dear, you've got to do it, as a journalist, a Republican, and as my wife: You've got to talk about Watergate."

What is the most obvious and unassailable fact about Watergate? It is, is it not, that the press, acting in its traditional role of the watch dog of the Republic—and in obedience to its historic instinct for the presidential jugular—has drawn a fearsome amount of blood from the President, and in terms of official accountability, may have destroyed the efficacy of the presidency.

The story of Watergate is not ended. But its inglorious beginnings give little hope for any but an inglorious ending. The caper will remain a catastrophe. Burglaries have been exposed, a great deal of money—or maybe

not so much at the going rate of inflation—has been circulated through dubious political channels. The power of the White House, and, it would seem, of the Federal law agencies themselves, have been manipulated to keep these happenings from seeing the light of day. The criminal law seems to have been breached by men who knew the law and were sworn to uphold it. Politics, as we all know too well, can be a dirty business. But dirt becomes stygian in its blackness against the background of the White House.

Few among us can possibly excuse these happenings. And though it grieves many of us to see proud heads roll, we certainly cannot cry martyrdom with any conviction. Washington is a political city. Here bloodshedding and human sacrifices are ritual. We can hope that the blood lust will find in Watergate, a partial appeasement. I do not wish to suggest that all the watchdogs of the press are joyfully licking their chops of the rich blood that they have drawn. To many the taste is exceedingly bitter. A job that just had to be done. But to some it is passingly sweet. To these, the President's journalistic political opponents, the embarrassment, the shame that now envelops the administration is being taken as kind of overall vindication of all they have stood for in their long running war with the President.

It is, indeed, a vindication of their single minded, journalistic pursuit of a story—a triumph of investigative reporting. The measure of their triumph is that Mr. Nixon has been finally forced by their zeal to accept the entire responsibility for what has happened and may yet happen to the characters so far involved. But I raise the question: Has Watergate, as some of the President's journalistic opponents seem to feel, vindicated the entire case against him—his conduct of the Vietnam war, and the cease fire negotiations, his challenge of their right to publish the Pentagon papers that Ellsberg burgled; his counter-attack against their advocacy journalism in the reporting of anti-war movements and civil rights disturbances, his championship of "law and order," and so on and so on, all the way back to Checkers, Alger Hiss, and Helen Gahagan Douglas.

I do not dispute, if only as the widow of a famous journalist who was no stranger himself to advocacy journalism, the sincerity of those who believe that Watergate raises the legitimate question of the President's judgment of men, and to the extent this judgment has proved poor it is bound to weaken the country's faith in his leadership. But does this mean that his policies have in one fell stroke, been proven as wrong as his judgment of the men that he trusted?

What now do you say about Mr. Nixon's extraordinary victory last November? That victory may not have signified unequivocal approval of the AMN. But it was an unmistakable rejection of what his opponent, and his supporters stood for.

Are the policies and decisions that overwhelmingly re-elected the President to be retroactively discredited because too many of his staff seem to have been involved in discreditable actions? By what logic does Watergate prove for example, that Americans should now accept the solutions to our domestic and foreign problems offered by the President's opponent last November?

This question will have to be answered by the entire press if confusion is not to paralyze the entire government.

I have another. Is it not also, perhaps, the task of a responsible press to try to explain to the American people what may have motivated the men who were involved in such an unbelievably clumsy, incredibly stupid, and altogether counter-productive and immoral Watergate enterprise?

The only explanation that seems to make sense to me—though you may have a better

one—lies in the wide spread climate of mutual suspicion and mistrust. Yes, even of hatred that began to pervade American politics over the conduct of the Vietnam War. By the spring and summer of 1972 each side had come to believe that the other side was being led by fanatics. One side believed that the other was committed to a never ending ruinous war. The other believed that it had to deal with men committed to a ruinous peace, and the radicalizing of American society. On the evidence, the demons of suspicion that drove Ellsberg and Russo to burglary were the same demons that took possession of Watergate burglars. I hold no brief for either bunch of burglars, or for those who seek to condone their crimes because they sympathize with the politics of the criminals. And I venture to suggest that neither do the American people. Nevertheless, we should seek to understand that their motivations which were politically inspired and not criminally inspired. And then we can condemn, in toto, the folly of political fanaticism.

Can a responsible press hold that in Ellsberg's betrayal of his oath of secrecy, and his theft of secret Government documents his political ends justified the means, while in the Watergate affair the same ends are *unjustified*? Must not McCarthyism be stomped out wherever it appears in our political life—above all in our newspapers? If we fail to do so, the mistrust and suspicion that have divided us over the long Vietnam war and its tragic failure, will go on endlessly and it will become impossible for either side to govern the country.

If a President whose actions have carried a majority of the people with him is now so crippled he cannot rule, how then shall we avoid a disaster that must encompass not only the President but each and every one of us?

Consider that while we are in the midst of a material prosperity unmatched on the face of the earth, and while for the first time in ten years we are not involved in a serious ground war, we are nevertheless slipping fast into a second class nation status, and at home we face agonizing domestic problems which if not dealt with firmly can wreck our economy.

Mr. Kissinger in a talk before the newspaper publishers last week in New York spoke of the need, in this hour of doubt and dismay, to keep that which is enduring in our political policies ahead of that which is ephemeral. The Economist of London finds "some nobility" in that counsel. Permit me to put it in somewhat less noble language. Is the pleasure of soaking the captain worth the price of sinking the ship? The press, at its responsible best, must handle this delicate and painful question in the best interests of the Nation. It must move the political dialogue to a higher and safer ground for America.

The power of the press, as Watergate showed is awesome. Few and far between are those who do not fear it. Don't think for a single second that behind this stand my knees haven't been knocking but I know that if the press has the power to hurt, even to ruin, it has also the power to heal and restore. What Watergate may have made impossible for the President to do—the press must now do—bring us together. Considering what is at stake not just for Mr. Nixon but for all Americans will the press help to lead us out of this painful and dangerous hour? I leave the question unanswered.

The power of the press is all but absolute. It can be held responsible by no person, no institution and to no party. It is indeed a free press accountable only to its collective conscience. But such is its conscience, throughout most of its history, that it has made itself voluntarily accountable to the American people.

PROJECT PRAYER

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the board of advisors of Project Prayer recently honored and commended one of my constituents for his significant and substantial contributions to God and country.

This constituent, George C. McKay of Battle Creek, Mich., is a highly esteemed and regarded friend and acquaintance of mine who is most deserving of such recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and thank Mr. McKay for his many contributions to his community and to his fellow man and commend the board of advisors of Project Prayer for its selection of Mr. McKay as one to be so honored. The text of the commendation follows:

PROJECT PRAYER COMMENDATION FOR
GEORGE C. MCKAY

George C. McKay, for the past 93 years has lived a life few persons can match and many would envy.

To this day, George C. McKay follows his life's work and pleasures—most often one and the same—which have taken him to the pinnacle of success in business and for humanity.

Each day Mr. McKay goes to his office in the Security National Bank in Battle Creek, Michigan where he has actively served as Chairman of the Board for 36 years. There he keeps close touch with his employees, friends and customers.

George C. McKay has often proven his belief in the adage "The Lord helps those who help themselves." With only a tenth grade education, George C. McKay helped himself by going the extra steps necessary to attain the highest in whatever he chose to do. After reaching a top level position with the Kellogg Company he resigned in 1936 because of a belief that his talents were not being fully utilized and both he and the Company were therefore being short-changed.

He put those talents and abilities to work as he simultaneously learned the banking business and attained financial stability and control of the bank to back up his management control. He will soon complete his 37th year with the bank as its Board Chairman.

George C. McKay has proven to be a man of many talents: businessman, humanitarian, poet, sportsman and philosopher, to name a few. All based on his sense of fair play and love of God and people.

George C. McKay has consistently supported Project Prayer as a member of the National Advisory Board. Project Prayer exists for one reason only . . . to bring about the restoration of the right to say a voluntary prayer in our schools and other public buildings. His counsel has been sought and used in this effort.

Mr. McKay has written a set of rules which have governed his life and could well serve others as they seek the most from life. He has aptly titled these rules "A Way to Live" and Project Prayer highly commends them.

Project Prayer salutes George C. McKay for his shining examples of how to succeed in every way under our American system and includes these rules in this commendation for distribution to our supporters throughout the Nation.

A WAY TO LIVE

If you wish to live while here on earth in peace and happiness, the following rules will assist you in doing so:

1. Make friends, never lose one, as you go down life's highway. Friendship bought with friendship lives forever and a day.
2. Always believe in God.
3. Love and honor thy father and thy mother.
4. Be honest, not only that you will not steal, but be honest in whatever you do or say.
5. Treat your neighbor with the same respect that you expect him to treat you.
6. Do not expect to have something that your neighbor has, but be willing to work and earn sufficient money to buy something similar.
7. Do not abuse the body by smoking or drinking or by using drugs.
8. Do not swear or cuss which will also hinder your success in life.
9. Never do anything to injure your neighbor either by lying or assaulting.
10. Never destroy the virtue of one another.

With the greatest respect for George C. McKay, the man . . . and George C. McKay, the example. . . . The Board of Advisors of Project Prayer, on behalf of its three and one half million supporters, does hereby honor and commend his giant contributions to God and country.

Presented this 10th day of May in the year of our Lord 1973.

SAMUEL M. CAVNAR,
General Chairman.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND
CONSTRUCTION ACT

HON. EDWARD MEZVINSKY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposed budget eliminates all funding for the Library Services and Construction Act.

Today, I would like to insert in the RECORD a series of letters from some of my younger constituents who believe, as I do, that Congress should act to assure full funding for LSCA.

The letters came to me from a class of fourth grade students who attend school in Keystone, Iowa. These young people enjoy reading and realize the threat to both their entertainment and education if LSCA funds are terminated.

When Congress enacted LSCA in 1956, its purpose was to provide Federal grants to the States to assist them in the establishment, extension, and improvement of public library services. In Iowa, LSCA funds have been used outstandingly to provide services to our libraries which local communities could not have considered had it meant an additional burden on property taxpayers.

Iowa organized seven regional cooperative library systems throughout the State with a computerized system which provides all citizens easy access to nearly all books in their region.

I believe my colleagues can understand the great benefit and value of such a system, especially to our citizens who live in small towns and rural areas. Without LSCA aid, the availability of books could be severely limited.

The Seven Rivers library system is the regional cooperative which serves the

students whose letters I commend to your attention.

Few of us would disagree with the importance of young Roberto Glime's belief that "little boys and girls need books so when they get older they can read better."

I personally agree with Diane Daniels who says:

If you cut off these funds there won't be as many books for us to read and the money is for a good cause.

In addition to requesting that these letters be reprinted in the RECORD, I ask my colleagues to join with me in responding in the affirmative to Jeffrey Reiss' plea:

So could you tell the President to stop the cutback for your library and ours.

The letters follow:

KEYSTONE, IOWA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEZVINSKY: We are very much concerned about the proposed cutbacks in federal spending. I am joining many others in appealing to you to do what you can to prevent this.

We are especially concerned about the funds for the Seven Rivers Library System. Several towns in our district depend a great deal upon its services.

My fourth grade pupils have tried to express to you, as best they could, their interest and concern.

We will appreciate your serious consideration of this matter.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. LEORA SAUERTEIG,

4th Grade Language Arts and Social Studies.

Please help save the small town libraries. My name is Jodi Lynn Demmel. I live in Van Horne, Iowa. But I go to school in Keystone, Iowa. I use the Van Horne library a lot and like it very much. Right now the library in Van Horne is getting books from the Seven Rivers Library System. And other towns use this system also. They all need help! I love to read and I have a little sister named Leanne who is in second grade. (I am in fourth grade.) My sister likes to read also. As I say once more. Help the libraries in smaller towns for the children and adults! Please!

Yours respectfully,

JODI LYNN DEMMEL.

I like to read books from the library. We have a lot of Seven Rivers Library System books. I go to school in Keystone, but I go to the library in Van Horne where I live. Will you please help save the money cut back? We want to help but there isn't much we 10 year olds can do. Please help.

Yours respectfully,

CHRISTY GEATER.

Please don't cut money for library. I use our library sometimes and I need it very much. We won't get very many books. We get our book from Seven Rivers Library. And we need the money.

Yours respectfully,

MARK JENSEN.

I live in the country by Keystone. Keystone may be a little town but we have a nice library. I like going there a lot.

I have two sisters that like it very much. I like the Seven River Library Systems books very much.

I also go to Van Horne and get books there.

The librarian in Keystone is very nice. She is a good friend of mine. Her name is Mrs. King. Mrs. King also helps at our school library. Please help save our town library.

CXIX—1033—Part 13

I like all kinds of book. Mostly Mysteries. Every one should have one book of their own.

Yours respectfully,

SUZANNE HOLST.

I like our library in Keystone. I think that little boys and girls need books so when they get older they can read better.

I'm in 4th grade and I like to read books too. So this is why I want to keep the public libraries.

Yours respectfully,

ROBERTO GLIME.

I hope you can help spot the cutbacks in money for the Libraries. Because I love to Read!!!

Yours respectfully,

GREG NASO.

I go to school in Keystone. I like to read. I go to the Library in Van Horne sometimes. Do you like to read?

Yours truly,

DARLA DUNCALF.

I live by Van Horne but I do not use the library but I want your help. We are running out of money for the public library. We need the money to buy books from the seven rivers library system. So could you tell the President to stop the cutback for your library and ours.

Yours respectfully,

JEFFERY REISS.

I use the books that come from Seven Rivers Library System and they are very good to read. But with the cutback we can not get the books from Seven Rivers Library System so I am asking you to help by save some money for all the schools Library.

Yours respectfully,

GARY BRAKSIEK.

I live in Van Horne, Iowa. I like the Library. I go to the Library. I read the Books. But if there is cutback I will not have mine Books.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN TAPPMAYER.

I live by Keystone and I don't go to the library but I am going to go to some day and would like to see lots of books and see new and better ones. Please help this Library for all people.

Yours respectfully,

CRAIG VEST.

I live in Keystone and I go to the library as much as I can and I like to read. So try not to close up the System.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN BRADY.

I like to read a lot I get books from both libraries the library at school and the one uptown. Check out a book at least once a week.

Yours respectfully,

LYNN LAFLEIR.

I like to read. I get books from the library at Van Horne.

Yours respectfully,

DANNY LINNABERY.

We have a library in Keystone, Van Horne and other centers. I like to use the library very much. We get books, records, films from Seven Rivers Library System. There is a cutback in the money then we don't get books etc. . . .

Yours respectfully,

JEFF PARR.

I hope there is enough money for the libraries in the towns and cities.

Yours respectfully,

DAVID SCHULTZE.

Please help our libraries problem in Van Horne, Keystone and other towns as well. I go to the Van Horne library that is the town I live in. Please do what you can to help us.

Yours respectfully,

MICHAEL HANKEN.

Please help our library. I go to Keystone library and I like the book in Keystone library. And you can help I hope. And I live in Keystone too and help the Seven Rivers to seen as books and rounds and tapes and film. And I like the books and rounds and tapes.

Yours respectfully,

ANGE STEINFORD.

I go to the Keystone Center, and I use the Keystone Library. Please do what you can to help. Because I like to read. And so do other kids, and littler kids would like to use it too. So please try to stop it. So we can get more books from the Seven Rivers Library System. So we can have a bigger place to get books and more books to read.

Yours respectfully,

LORI ENGELKING.

Please do not cut off the funds for the Seven Rivers Library System because the library in this town gets books from the Seven River Library System. If you cut off these funds there won't be as many books for us to read and the money is for a good cause.

Yours respectfully,

DIANE DANIELS.

I use a library in Van Horne. I live in the country by Van Horne.

Sometimes I get the Seven Rivers books. I like the Seven Rivers books very much and I would like to read more of them. I want you to stop the Congress in not sending more books to our library and other small libraries in our community.

Yours respectfully,

DOUG KELLY.

I go to the library in Van Horne where I live a lot. I really enjoy the books from the Seven Rivers Library System. In Van Horne and the places around it have a lot of books from the Seven Rivers Library System. I like the books from it and read them very often.

So please try to save it so that everybody can enjoy the books longer. I hope you can.

Yours respectfully,

ADAM DAVIS.

We have a library in Keystone and Van Horne and I use them a lot.

The library gets books from Seven Rivers Library System but we can't get them unless we keep getting money.

My name is Doug Junge and I hope you consider helping us.

Yours respectfully,

DOUG JUNGE.

I am from Elberon, Iowa and I use the Keystone Library and the books come from Seven Rivers Library System. We want you to help us so the funds are not cut in the Library at Keystone.

Yours respectfully,

SUSAN DVORAK.

I go to the library in Van Horne, Iowa. There are a lot of good books there. The books there are very good to read. One of them is called Black Jack.

Yours respectfully,

DAVID WIESE.

I have been using the library for quite some time. I would like to keep receiving books from Seven Rivers Library System. And I would be grateful if you could help us keep receiving the books from Seven Rivers Library System.

Yours respectfully,

BILL BOIES.

I go to Van Horne Library and Keystone Library too. We have 6 boys and 3 girls, 2 moms and 2 dads.

Your reasonable friend,

DAVID DOWES.

Mr. Mezvinsky, I go to school at Keystone but I live in Van Horne, Iowa.

I'm writing because I like to read the books we get. And I would like it if we could still get books from the Seven Rivers Library System.

Yours respectfully,

DEBBIE O'GRADY.

I got to school in Keystone and I like to go to read and I like to go to the library. I hope you help us save our library. I hope that we will still get books from the Seven Rivers Library System.

Yours respectfully,

DARLA VITEK.

How are you? I use the library at Keystone and I got a book Saturday there and I like the library very much. I go to Benn. Comm. school and I like the school library very much too. Seven Rivers Library System gives us books, tapes, records, and tape recorder. I hope they won't take the money away so we couldn't have books and things. Please help.

Yours respectfully,

JEAN HARTY.

I go to school in Keystone and I like to read books and I would like to keep going as we were. I would not like the library to not have nice things.

Yours respectfully,

BROOKE DUAKER.

I live in Keystone, I like to read do you? I like to go to the library so could you keep the help for the books high.

Yours respectfully,

CRYSTAL KUCH.

I live in Van Horne. I like to read. I'm in fourth grade. I do not want them to lose the money coming from Seven Rivers Library System.

Yours respectfully,

JEFF ENGLAND.

I sometimes go to the library. And I like to read, the libraries all have good books. Even though I don't live in a town where there is a library I can come to Keystone, Iowa. And so please don't cut down on the money.

Yours respectfully,

DENISE DVORAK.

I live at Van Horne, Iowa, but I go to school at Keystone. I like to read so could you help that we can keep on getting books and not cut off the money so we can get more books from Seven Rivers Library System. If you can help, thank you.

Yours respectfully,

RICK BURRELL.

I go to Van Horne to the library for my books I read and I do not want to stop getting the books because I sometimes like reading.

Yours respectfully,

DALE A. WERNING.

I live 8 miles from Keystone. I like to read a lot. I wish that we can keep getting books

from the Seven Rivers Library System. I would appreciate that very much.

Yours respectfully,

MATT PICKART.

I like to read and go to the Library. The books are good, too. I wish it could keep on going this way.

Yours respectfully,

LAURIE GARBERS.

I hope that you can do something about the problem with Seven Rivers Library System.

Yours respectfully,

TODD STAUFFER.

I go to school at Keystone. I like to go to the Library at Van Horne, Iowa. I read ten books three weeks.

Yours respectfully,

RONNIE JAY DAWES.

Would you please send more books for the kids so they can read? I go to the Library in Van Horne. I go to school in Keystone. I go to the Library in Keystone. Does Keystone and Van Horne get the Seven Rivers? How come if the books are overdue how come we have to pay for them? Our Keystone Library is little because it does not have many books. I live in Van Horne. I have three sisters and two brothers and a cat he is black and his name is Mouse.

Yours respectfully,

CONNIE HAACK.

COSTLY DEFENSE SYSTEM

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in this day of rising budget deficits it is little wonder that citizens are calling for economy in Government. Yet Congress has been presented a Defense Department budget that is a substantial increase over last year's, raising the question whether peace is to be more expensive than war. The point in debating the defense budget seems to me to be a matter of more defense for the dollars than more dollars for defense. We have seen in some of our social programs that throwing money at a problem does not necessarily solve it. Likewise, throwing more money into the Pentagon does not necessarily mean we have a stronger defense structure.

As we continue to struggle in Congress with this issue that is central to our survival, I commend to our colleagues a recent analysis of rising defense costs published in the St. Paul Dispatch. This analysis clearly shows some of the past fallacies in our hardware procurement and strongly suggests that a stronger defense structure will come about not only through spending money, but changing the system:

COSTLY DEFENSE SYSTEM

Members of Congress who are serious about finding ways to cut the nation's defense budget without weakening the nation's defense should devote some study to the causes of the unbelievable rise in the unit costs of our military hardware.

For example, the Navy's new supersonic, carrier-based interceptor, the F-14 Tomcat, will cost at least \$13 million per airplane. The F-4 Phantom, which the Tomcat will replace, sells for \$4 million. The planes are similar in performance characteristics.

Last year Congress gave up on the Army's new main battle tank, the MBT-70 prototype, when estimated production costs went above \$1 million each. The tank it was to replace, the Mark 60, still is being purchased for \$343,000.

Estimates for the Navy's new Spruance class destroyers now exceed \$100 million a ship. Just four years ago the Navy estimated that a Spruance class ship would cost \$60 million. The last destroyers delivered to the fleet in the mid-1960's cost less than \$40 million each.

There seems to be more than simple inflation at work here. If it were merely a matter of increased costs of steel and labor, other manufactured products, such as automobiles, would have taken similar leaps in price. We all know that even though auto prices have increased, they have not gone up in nearly so dramatic a manner.

The prime suspect should be the systems concept of doing business. Ever since this method of dealing with defense contractors was embraced by the Defense Department in the early '60s, weapons costs have been soaring.

The systems concept came into being because much of our defense hardware became so complex that the items required for maintenance and support of a weapon exceeded the cost, size and manpower needs of the weapon itself. The discovery of highspeed digital computers which can perform fantastic feats of data gathering have combined with a human penchant for details to create an enormous mountain of paper work for every defense project.

Where large weapons systems once were broken into components, with contracting done separately and simply, contracts now have been broadened to give total responsibility for a weapons system to a single contractor, who must use the magic words of systems management (such as "life cycle costing" and "maintainability reliability") and submit reams of computer read-outs to the Pentagon to get them. There have been instances of contract proposals weighing more than a ton. As one weapons expert said, "The process of management had become more important than the product such management was being asked to yield."

This is the approach that produced the Lockheed C-5 fiasco and is being implemented in the Spruance class destroyer building program.

One of the major weaknesses in the systems approach is that it seems to encourage overstaffing of management at every level. Thomas P. Cheatham Jr., senior vice president of Grumman Corp., which is building the F-14, once wrote in a report to the Defense Science Board:

"The country is too fat at its management and administration levels. Less and less is going into the direct and tangible good—and more and more into the planning, officialdom and rain-dance operations. In a single expression, our overhead is too high."

Another problem with the systems approach is that it replaces mutual trust and confidence with stacks of meaningless paperwork. An example: The manufacturer of an oil pressure gauge used on the Boeing 747 airliner offered Grumman the same instrument for the F-14. The company described the gauge, but systems management demanded more detail. Consultants were hired to prepare elaborate documentation and the final proposal was nine inches thick.

As a result, the Navy got the same gauge as Boeing, but paid 67 per cent more than the commercial price—plus whatever Grumman charged for its systems management.

There seems to be considerable potential for saving defense money without giving up needed weapons if Congress and the Administration are willing to explore the weaknesses of the systems concept. Too much paper and too many people mean too much money for too little results.

CYNICAL TRICKS INSTEAD OF
JOBS—THE NIXON PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the major issue in my campaign for election last year was the serious unemployment problem we have been facing for the past 4 years. I promised the citizens of the 38th Congressional District that I would fight to solve that problem, and I have been making every effort to do so. You, of course, are familiar with the various legislation which I—and many of our colleagues—have sponsored this year as part of our efforts to improve the situation. And I know that you are familiar with some of the other activities which I have engaged in to alleviate the unemployment problem in my district.

But every once in a while, Mr. Speaker, when I see another example of how much easier it is for Richard Nixon to make the situation worse than it is for us to make it better, I must admit to getting a little bit frustrated. It is very difficult for me to understand why Richard Nixon would rather see people on welfare than doing productive work, but that appears to be his policy, as demonstrated time and again during the last few months.

Gus Tyler, assistant president of the Ladies' Garment Workers, wrote an interesting column related to this situation recently. The column appeared in the May 12 issue of the AFL-CIO News, and I would like to share it with our colleagues at this time:

REVENUE SHARING PLANS BASED ON POLITICS
OF DIVIDE AND RULE

(By Gus Tyler)

To help "cool" the cities that were burning in hot riot a few years ago, the federal government has been pouring funds into urban areas for summer youth employment programs. This year, fearing that President Nixon's budget cuts would mean the end of federally financed summer jobs, many cities and private agencies pleaded with the White House for youth employment funds. The President's response late in March came as a pleasant surprise. He announced that this year he would make \$424 million available—about \$3 million more than last year.

"The outlook for young people this summer is encouraging in many ways," he announced. Mayors across America breathed easier—until they looked at the fine print.

Most of the money for the summer youth program—\$300 million of it—will not be new money but old money already appropriated for Emergency Employment Assistance Act that provides for year-round public service employment for adults. If the youth want the money they will have to take it away from the "old man." The decision as to who gets the funds will be made by each city. The federal government has washed its hands of the dirty business.

Republican Sen. Jacob Javits howled his protest: "This is more than impoundment, it is impoundment and breach of promise. Cities are left with the Hobson's choice of firing the father in order to hire the son."

The "breach of promise" refers to the promise made to the mayors of America in 1971 that revenue sharing would not mean the end of any ongoing programs: sharing

would mean more funds—over and above what the cities were getting for a variety of programs, such as summer youth employment.

On this "promise," the mayors pushed for revenue sharing. But, as the Wall Street Journal put it: "Right now at least, revenue sharing is promising little revenue and less sharing." Milwaukee Mayor Henry W. Maier says flatly: "The President is breaking the promise he made us at the White House."

The mayors, however, are not just angry about broken promises, they are fearful about the coming civil war in the cities. The conflict of sons versus fathers over funds will turn city halls into a battleground.

What is true of the summer youth program is true of dozens—actually hundreds—of other programs. Revenue sharing is being used as a way of wiping out many vital programs directly and still other programs indirectly. Lump sums are given to the cities in place of categorical aids earmarked for clearly defined programs. If any deprived group comes to Washington to find out what happened to some program, it will be told: "Go fight City Hall. We gave them money. It's up to you to get it out of them."

As a political ploy, it's a pip. It takes the heat off the President and puts it on the mayor. If he can't come up with the needed funds, he—not Nixon—is to blame. If he puts up the tax—which he will have to do—to get the vital funds, he will have to take the gaff—not the President.

Meanwhile, in the cities, things will heat up. The various "tribes" that make up our uptight towns will be on the war path. They will all be demanding their share of a dwindling federal appropriation. Black neighborhoods will be pitted against white, sons against fathers, working mothers against those on welfare, ecologists against educators, the poor against the near poor, the mentally ill against the physically handicapped.

The Romans had a phrase for the kind of politics hidden in the present revenue sharing: *divide et impera*. Divide and Rule. So long as you can keep the little people busy scratching one another's eyes out, they will be too blind to see what the big boys are up to.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that some of the people most responsible for some of these policies are among the casualties of the Watergate scandal. But I am afraid that most of the responsibility lies with Richard Nixon himself. And since I do not expect Nixon to change his stripes, I can only hope that the Congress will display more spunk and independence toward future abuses of the executive branch than I have seen displayed here so far this year. This Nation can take a lot of steps backward in the remaining 3½ years of Nixon's term, if the Congress is willing to let us slide back.

THE PASSING OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE
JEANNETTE RANKIN

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, Jeannette Rankin was one of the Members of Congress who made a mark for herself. Her accomplishments are outlined in the obituary which appeared in the New York Times of May 20. With the thought

that it would be of interest to my colleagues, I am appending that obituary: EX-REPRESENTATIVE JEANNETTE RANKIN DIES; FIRST WOMAN IN CONGRESS, 92—SUFFRAGIST LEADER WAS ONLY MEMBER VOTING AGAINST U.S. ENTRY TO BOTH WORLD WARS

(By Robert D. McFadden)

Jeannette Rankin, the first woman to serve in the United States Congress and the only Representative who voted against the nation's entry into World Wars I and II, died Friday night at her apartment in Carmel, Calif. She was 92 years old.

Miss Rankin, a lifelong pacifist and one of the country's earliest women's suffragists, served only two terms in the House of Representatives, 1917 to 1919 and 1941 to 1943. But in both those terms, by an odd turn of history, the United States decided to go to war.

Her dissenting votes were consistent with her lifelong belief that violence cannot solve human disagreements.

Miss Rankin also introduced the first bill to grant women citizenship independent of their husbands, and authorized the first bill for Government-sponsored instruction of hygiene in maternity and infancy.

A Republican from Missoula, Mont., she ran her campaigns on a peace platform. After leaving the Congress, she devoted her widely admired energy to peace organizations and women's activist groups.

A LONG ACTIVE LIFE

Until her health began failing seriously last year, Miss Rankin's only concession to age was a cane and a slight weariness at seeing the ideas she had been advocating for seven decades treated as if they were still radically new.

There were no consciousness-raising groups to liberate Jeannette Rankin in 1916, when, as the United States moved toward war with the Central Powers, the small, trim woman from Missoula undertook her successful Congressional campaign.

"I knew the women would stand behind me," she said when told she had won. "I am deeply conscious of the responsibility. I will not only represent the women of Montana, but also the women of the country, and I have plenty of work cut out for me."

Miss Rankin took her seat in the House on April 2, 1916. Four days later, in the predawn hours of April 6, after months of mounting pressure, she told her colleagues in a moment of high drama: "I want to stand behind my country, but I cannot vote for war."

She then cast her dissenting vote. The final House vote to declare war was 373 to 50. Hers was an unpopular stand, and she became the target of many barbs. But she contended afterward: "I'd go through much worse treatment. If you know a certain thing is right, you can't change it."

After her first term, Miss Rankin sought but lost the Montana Republican nomination for the Senate, and for more than two decades devoted herself to peace organizations, particularly the National Conference for the Prevention of War.

"Prepare to the limit for defense; keep our men out of Europe," was her slogan in 1940 for her second successful race for the House. Many years later, she said: "The women elected me because they remembered that I'd been against our entering World War I."

Despite Pearl Harbor, the pleadings for unanimity by Everett McKinley Dirksen, then a member of the House, and the eloquence of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his Dec. 8, 1941, address to Congress, Miss Rankin cast the only dissent in the 338 to 1 House vote on the Declaration of War against Japan.

"I voted against it because it was war," she said afterward.

In recent years, Miss Rankin who never married, continued to march and make speeches for the causes in which she believed.

DENOUNCED VIETNAM WAR

She led the Jeannette Rankin Brigade in a massive march on Capitol Hill in Washington in 1968 to protest the war in Vietnam, which she denounced as a "ruthless slaughter."

The following year she participated in moratorium marches in Georgia and South Carolina. She continued, too, to write letters and to make phone calls and visits to members of Congress, urging an end to United States involvement in Indochina.

In an interview several years ago, Miss Rankin called the Vietnam war "stupid and cruel," and put the blame on "stupid leaders" and a "military bureaucracy." She added: "The people really aren't for war. They just go along, but war is evil, and there is always an alternative."

At the polls, she said, people are given a "choice of evils, not ideas."

As for women, for whose rights she labored a lifetime, Miss Rankin said: "They've been worms. They let their sons go off to war because they're afraid their husband will lose their jobs in industry if they protest."

Jeanette Rankin was born on June 11, 1880, on a ranch near Missoula, the oldest of seven children of John and Olive Rankin. Her father was a rancher and building contractor, and her mother was a native of New Hampshire who had gone West to be a schoolteacher.

Miss Rankin graduated from the University of Montana in 1902 and went into social work, which took her to New York City. Here, she joined the suffrage movement and lived in the Suffrage League house on East 86th Street. In 1908-09, she was a student at the School of Philanthropy here, then did social work in Seattle for a year, before turning increasingly to the women's movement.

She later became field secretary of the National American Women's Suffrage Association and chairman of the Montana State Suffrage committee. In 1912, she took the suffrage fight home to Montana, addressing the State Legislature—a precedent for a woman—on the subject.

Two years later, Montana passed a suffrage law. This was six years before that right became a Constitutional Amendment. Miss Rankin later said she first ran for Congress "to repay the women of Montana who had worked for suffrage."

Miss Rankin long advocated electoral reforms, with a view to greater diversity among candidates. "Now," she said, "we have a choice between a white male Republican and a white male Democrat." And, with equal vigor, she urged unilateral disarmament, contending: "If we disarmed, we'd be the safest country in the world."

WATERGATE REVEALS GAMY ELECTION MONEY

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate scandal has helped bare the powerful and adverse affect of big money on our political process and raised serious questions about the viability of our present system of financing election campaigns.

We have found out that during the course of the 1972 Presidential campaign people who did not want the public to know they were giving money to a particular candidate found secret ways of giving that money, often with the illegal complicity of the candidate's campaign committee. We have discovered how that secret money was used for il-

legal bugging, burglary, and political sabotage. And we have seen how that money—as well as openly given large contributions—have resulted in governmental favors: Ambassadorships, a Federal Power Commission devoid of consumer representation, and tax breaks, subsidies, and beneficent antitrust rulings for the wealthy contributors of the campaign funds.

In a recent Washington Post article, Morton Mintz traces these recent revelations and raises the question of whether our present system of financing elections is capable of eliminating these corrupting influences. I know we are all considering this question and so I commend Mr. Mintz' article to your attention as most useful background on this matter:

WATERGATE REVEALS GAMY ELECTION MONEY

(By Morton Mintz)

The Watergate scandal has bared the green underbelly of election-campaign financing: laundered money, secret money, stashed money, political switch-hitter's money.

Exposures of the origins of large chunks of money has been accompanied not only by exposures of the destinations—including bugging, burglary and political sabotage—but also of additional gamy aspects of fund raising:

Foreigners' money, tax-free money, money followed by assorted governmental favors—ambassadorships, a Federal Power Commission barren of consumer representation, tax breaks, subsidies, beneficent antitrust rulings.

These disclosures, coupled with the indictments of a former attorney general and a former commerce secretary in connection with a \$200,000 campaign gift, have raised anew the ancient question of whether the American government is or appears to be for sale.

In the present heated atmosphere it is no wonder that, only 13 months after the effective date of the first major election financing reforms since 1925, a sudden sense of urgency about the need for further reforms pervades Capitol Hill.

Should Congress legislate more reforms, such as stripping enforcement power from the Justice Department and giving it to an independent elections commission? Only last Wednesday the Senate Democratic Caucus unanimously adopted a resolution to accomplish this, and a bill to the same effect was previously introduced by Minority Leader Hugh Scott.

Has the time come to grant outright federal subsidies to lessen or remove the dependence of candidates on private donors? Presidents starting with Theodore Roosevelt have urged this, without anyone paying much heed, but now the Senate Democratic Caucus has endorsed the idea, in the same unanimous resolution.

The political fund raising practices in controversy are illustrated below, with cases originating before a new disclosure law, the Federal Elections Campaign Act, became effective on April 7, 1972.

Until that date, President Nixon's campaign organization contends, it was not required to disclose contributors—a contention Common Cause is challenging in the courts. Sen. George S. McGovern disclosed his contributors months before he won the Democratic presidential nomination.

LAUNDERED MONEY

Early in 1972, Robert H. Allen, chairman of the Texas Finance Committee to Re-elect the President and president of the Gulf Resources & Chemical Co. of Houston, either contributed \$100,000, or raised it in Texas or over a wider area of the Southwest.

By phone on April 3, the money was transferred from Houston into the bank account in Mexico City of an inactive subsidiary of

the coal and silver mining firm. Shortly, a Mexican lawyer for the company withdrew \$89,000 in four bank drafts and, apparently, \$11,000 in \$100 bills. On April 5 a courier delivered the checks and the cash in Houston to executives of Pennzoll United Co. Its president, William C. Liedtke, Jr., raised funds for the Nixon campaign in the Southwest.

Later on April 5, a Pennzoll plane ferried a suitcase containing the \$100,000 plus an additional \$600,000 in anonymous contributions—cash, securities, a few checks—to Washington. The same night, Pennzoll lobbyist Roy Winchester delivered the money to the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President at 171 Pennsylvania Ave. NW.

G. Gordon Liddy, then counsel to the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President, next routed the \$89,000 in checks into the bank account in Miami of Bernard L. Barker. Later, Barker and four other men broke into the Watergate headquarters of the Democratic National Committee. All five subsequently were arrested and pleaded guilty. Liddy was convicted.

In early January, the Justice Department told Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.) that it was making a criminal investigation. Two weeks after this became known, Gulf Resources executive Allen requested and got a refund of the \$100,000. He claims to have given it personally and not to have made an illegal donation of corporate funds.

Last Thursday, The Washington Star-News reported that a federal grand jury in Houston had that day opened an investigation. Allen and Pennzoll's Liedtke and Winchester were among those called to testify.

SECRET MONEY

Hugh W. Sloan, treasurer of the Finance Committee, swore last October that Nixon fund-raisers gathered in "somewhere between \$1 million and \$2 million" in cash from unidentified sources and destroyed the records of the gifts before April 7, 1972, the date the new federal campaign financing law became effective. During the same period, Herbert W. Kalmbach, Mr. Nixon's personal attorney and then his leading fund solicitor, destroyed his personal campaign-financing records, a close associate of Kalmbach said recently.

One of the secret contributors was later disclosed to have been Robert L. Vesco, former board chairman of Investors Overseas Services, Ltd. The Securities and Exchange Commission, in a civil suit last November, accused him and 41 corporate and individual defendants of having looted four IOS-controlled mutual funds of \$224 million.

Vesco contributed \$200,000—the largest single cash contribution the Finance Committee got—three days after the Federal Elections Campaign Act took effect.

A Vesco associate and the committee's top fund-raiser in New Jersey, Harry L. Sears, delivered a suitcase containing the money—2,000 \$100 bills—to former Commerce Secretary Maurice H. Stans, along with a message: Vesco wanted help on the SEC investigation.

The government now says that two hours later—at 1 p.m. on April 10—Sears met with then Attorney General John N. Mitchell to tell him the cash had been delivered. At 4 p.m., at a meeting Mitchell arranged, Sears conferred with then SEC chairman William J. Casey and his successor, G. Bradford Cook. More such meetings followed. The SEC complaint, when filed in November, made no mention of the \$200,000.

On May 2, the Justice Department filed a criminal information against the committee—but not against Stans—for having concealed the Vesco contribution from Congress' General Accounting Office. The committee has pleaded innocent.

Last Thursday, a federal grand jury in New York indicted Mitchell, Stans, Vesco and Sears for having obstructed justice in their dealings with the SEC and the GAO. The former Cabinet members, who denied the charges, also were indicted for having lied to the grand jury.

STASHED MONEY

Between . . . \$350,000 and \$700,000 or more was kept at any one time in a safe in the Finance Committee office of former Commerce Secretary Stans. Included were the Vesco and Allen contributions. Some \$235,000 was paid out to Watergate conspirator Liddy.

The Washington Post has reported that those controlling the money in the safe in addition to Stans, were Kalmbach, Mitchell, then White House chief of staff H. R. Halde- man and former White House special assistant Jeb Stuart Magruder.

Before the law took effect, \$350,000 reportedly was transferred out of Stans' safe to a safe in the White House on Haldeman's orders.

In Newport Beach, Calif., meanwhile, Kalmbach kept up to \$500,000 in campaign funds in an account in a Bank of America branch. At least \$30,000 reportedly was paid to Donald H. Segretti to conduct political sabotage.

Segretti was indicted on May 4 on charges that he fabricated and distributed a letter designed to damage three Democratic presidential candidates in the Florida primary.

SWITCH-HITTERS MONEY

Early last year Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) disclosed the leading contributors to his campaign for the presidential nomination. First on the list was Dwayne O. Andreas, a Minneapolis investor and soybean tycoon down for \$75,000 (a brother, Lowell W., was listed for an additional \$25,000).

However, Dwayne Andreas in early April, 1972, contributed \$25,000 to the Nixon campaign which, along with the \$89,000 laundered in Mexico, went into the pre-Watergate Miami bank account of Bernard Barker.

Andreas and the man to whom he gave the \$25,000, Kenneth H. Dahlberg, President Nixon's Midwest finance chief, were members of a group that applied to the comptroller of the currency for a federal bank charter soon after the contribution was made. Of 424 such applications submitted since 1966, only 12 received swifter approval than the Andreas-Dahlberg proposal.

After the election financing law took effect, Andreas gave the Nixon campaign an additional \$114,000, of which almost \$40,000 was not disclosed until after the November election.

Other leading political switch-hitters:

Walter T. Duncan, an elusive Texas financier who gave the Nixon campaign a \$305,000 i.o.u., later cancelled, after giving Humphrey \$257,000.

Meshulam Riklis, head of the conglomerate Rapid American Corp., also a former leading Humphrey contributor, who gave the President an estimated \$150,000, much of it after the expiration of the final pre-election reporting period.

Edward J. Daly, chairman of World Airways, gave \$51,000 to Humphrey, followed with about \$100,000 to Nixon and then was listed for \$2,000 to McGovern.

John L. Loeb, an investor reported by the General Accounting Office to have given \$48,000 to Humphrey in the names of others although the election law requires the true donors to be identified. He later gave \$42,000 to Mr. Nixon. The Justice Department has taken no action, although the GAO reported the apparent violation 11 months ago.

FOREIGNERS' MONEY

The McGovern as well as the Nixon campaign received sizeable sums from foreign nationals. The largest known contribution from such a source, about \$220,000 went to the Democratic presidential candidate from Alejandro Zafferoni, a Uruguayan citizen but a California resident who is president of the Alaza Corp. in Palo Alto, Calif. He is the developer of a synthetic hormone for contraception.

Two of the President's contributors are the subject of inquiries by the GAO to the Justice Department because they have ties to foreign corporations.

One is Frank McMahon, a multi-millionaire Canadian oil man who contributed in excess of \$80,000 to the Nixon campaign after Oct. 26, the final day of the last pre-election reporting period. He maintains homes in Vancouver, New York and Palm Beach.

The other contributor, Greek oil man Nikos Vardinoyannis, says he contributed \$15,000 to Mr. Nixon in January, 1972, a few days after disclosure that the U.S. Sixth Fleet would be based in Athens.

The Navy awarded a fuel oil contract for the Sixth Fleet to Motor Oil Hellas, the oil man's family firm, on Sept. 25, although the Greek press did not announce the contract until Nov. 2. On Nov. 10, according to reports filed by the Nixon organization, Vardinoyannis gave an additional \$10,000. He denies any connection between his contributions and the contract award.

Howard Hughes, a \$100,000 contributor, used to play an unusual variation on the foreign theme, according to Noah Dietrich, who was the elusive billionaire's chief executive officer for 32 years, until 1957.

Dietrich, in his 1972 book, "Howard: The Amazing Mr. Hughes," and in an interview, said that in the 1940s and 1950s Hughes laundered hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in bipartisan political contributions through a Canadian firm set up solely for that purpose.

Dietrich said that lawyer Frank P. Waters, then counsel to Hughes and his wholly owned Hughes Tool Co., was the primary conduit for distributing the laundered money to American candidates at all political levels. Waters, reached in Los Angeles, refused to comment.

TAX-FREE MONEY

The tax laws permit a person to give up to \$3,000 in a year to a single recipient without owing federal gift taxes.

But the Internal Revenue Service, with an extraordinary ruling, made it possible for a fat-cat political contributor to give hundreds of thousands of dollars to a single recipient—a candidate—and yet avoid gift taxes. The ruling did this by the simple device of treating multiple paper committees for the same candidate as if they were truly independent entities.

If the gift was in the form of stock that had appreciated in value rather than in the form of cash or checks, capital gains taxes also were avoided—not only by the donor, but by the recipient as well.

As a practical matter, the avoidance of gift and capital gains taxation amounted to a legalized subsidy from the public treasury even if it was not so labeled.

Moreover, the formation of literally hundreds of Nixon and McGovern committees for no purpose but to avoid gift taxes frustrated the timely disclosure of campaign financing—the primary stated purpose of the new election law—by burying the law's administrators and newsmen under mountains of paper.

Although the Democrats benefitted from tax-free gifts, the Republicans were far and away the principal beneficiaries. Some examples:

W. Clement Stone, the Chicago insurance tycoon, who gave Mr. Nixon \$2.1 million before April 7, 1972, (and has said he gave him \$2 million for his 1968 campaign).

Richard Mellon Scaife, heir to the Mellon fortune (Gulf Oil, banking, aluminum), \$1 million, also before the effective date of the new law.

Milledge A. Hart III, president, and Thomas J. Marquez, vice president, of Electronic Data Systems Corp., a Dallas firm whose chairman is multi-millionaire H. Ross Perot.

Together, Hart and Marquez gave stock in the firm valued, when the Nixon organization sold it, at \$224,000. Each share, for which the donor had paid about 20 cents, skyrocketed by the time of sale to as much as \$60, congressional sources say.

The House Intergovernmental Relations

Subcommittee, in hearings in 1971 on the firm's contracts to process Medicare and Medicaid claims filed by Blue Shield groups, heard testimony that Electronic Data had made profits of an estimated 100 per cent—that it, its profits equaled its costs.

Witnesses testified that the firm, which needed approval from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the contracts, valued at about \$100 million, had violated federal regulations, including those requiring competitive bidding and access to company records. Perot, who made a much publicized effort to aid American prisoners of war in North Vietnam, has denied there were any violations.

LATE REPORTED MONEY

Between Oct. 26, the final day of the pre-election reporting period, and election day, Nov. 7, the Nixon organization received contributions exceeding \$1 million. Each of the gifts involved at least \$5,000. The law requires a committee receiving such a gift to report it within 48 hours, but the President's organization reported none until Jan. 31—almost two months after the election. This violated "the spirit" and "clearly the intent" of the law, the GAO said.

One contribution of \$100,000 came from a political committee of the Seafarers International Union, AFL-CIO, on election eve after being borrowed from a New York City bank a short time before. Several weeks earlier, the Justice Department had dismissed a prosecution of the union begun under the old campaign financing law, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

The larger issue raised by practices such as late reporting of contributions to a President's campaign organization is whether that President's Justice Department will prosecute them. In this case, a senior GAO official admitted to a reporter, his agency did not recommend prosecution because of despair, based on past experience, that anything would come of it.

His concern was consistent with the affirmative record of the White House in keeping contributors happy.

AMBASSADORS

Take ambassadorships. American embassies the world over are presided over by men and women distinguished by their wealth and largess but not always by their credentials.

In London, there is Walter H. Annenberg, the former Philadelphia media magnate and principal stockholder in the Penn Central. He is listed for a \$254,000 donation.

In Luxembourg there is Ruth L. Farkas, sociologist wife of the founder of the Alexander's department store chain in New York; she gave \$100,000 before the election and \$200,000 afterward. All \$300,000 was given before President Nixon nominated her.

In El Salvador there is Henry Catto, \$25,000; in Trinidad, Anthony D. Marshall, \$48,500; in Austria, John P. Hunes, \$100,000; in Jamaica, Vincent P. de Roulet, \$29,000, plus \$86,000 from his wife's parents, Charles S. and Joan Whitney Payson.

In Paris there is John N. Irwin II, down for \$50,000 in the partial list of contributions obtained by Common Cause for the period preceding April 7, 1972. A former under secretary of state, Irwin is also the brother-in-law of the previous ambassador, Arthur K. Watson, who in the same list is down for \$300,000.

Watson came from and is now a director of International Business Machines, where the chairman of the executive committee is Thomas J. Watson Jr., his brother, Thomas Watson, a lifelong Democrat, joined Democrats for Nixon as a vice chairman. Then as now, one of the largest anti-monopoly suits ever filed by the Justice Department was pending against IBM.

ECONOMIC POWER

Possibly more than any other regulatory agency, the Federal Power Commission has come to symbolize the process by which the

economic power of large contributors translates into government actions and policies virtually indistinguishable from their own.

To take an outstanding specific example, the oil and natural gas industry wants the prices of new natural gas at the well-head to be set by the buyers and sellers, rather than being under ceilings based on actual costs. So do the President, the three men he has put on the FPC and the two men he has nominated to be commissioners.

To be sure, everyone involved may honestly believe that an end to ceiling prices is the best approach to assuring an adequate supply of gas at acceptable prices.

But some who would be only skeptical toward such a proposition are pushed to ward cynicism by considerations such as these:

The estimated cost to consumers of deregulation of new natural gas will be at least \$750 billion, over the varying but lengthy time periods it will take to exhaust known supplies.

Contributors with financial stakes in the industry gave millions of dollars to the Nixon campaign.

While all of Mr. Nixon's appointees to the FPC have sided with the industry on deregulation, the commission staff recently disagreed on the ground that the industry is monopolistic and, consequently, will charge prices unchecked by competitive forces. In a current case, the commission over staff opposition, is expected to approve gas prices that will yield one company, Tenneco, 48 per cent on equity.

A case in point concerns Pennzoil United, which owns United Gas Pipeline, a firm regulated by the FPC. As was noted, Pennzoil president William Liedtke helped to raise most of \$700,000 in contributions that was flown to Washington in a company plane two days before the disclosure law took effect.

Liedtke also sounded out a former commissioner, Rush Moody Jr., before Mr. Nixon appointed him to the FPC, Sen. Frank E. Moss (D-Utah) has said. Gordon Gooch, former general counsel of the commission, came from a Texas law firm whose senior partner was Pennzoil's general counsel. On resigning from the FPC last year Gooch became a Nixon fund-raiser.

Leaving aside broad questions of equitable taxation and distribution of income and wealth, controversial tax breaks, subsidies and antitrust rulings have been prominent in the Nixon era.

For more than 40 years, bipartisan support maintained the oil depletion allowance, a vastly lucrative tax break for a small number of people, at 27½ per cent. Congress finally did cut it to 22½ per cent—but only over Mr. Nixon's opposition.

For more than three years, the President rejected a recommendation of his own Cabinet task force that the mandatory oil import quota system—mostly benefitting the major oil companies—be abandoned in favor of a tariff. The quota's cost to consumers was at least \$5 billion annually—5 cents on each gallon of gasoline and 4 cents on each gallon on household heating oil.

The Agriculture Department, in the spring of 1971, rejected a request from dairy producers to raise milk price supports. However, the administration changed its minds and raised the price supports several days after a group of dairy co-op leaders met with Mr. Nixon. At the same time, the co-ops started to make contributions to the Nixon campaign which now total \$422,500.

International Telephone and Telegraph, which pledged up to \$400,000 to finance the 1972 Republican National Convention, wanted to preserve its merger with the \$2 billion Hartford Fire Insurance Co. The then antitrust chief in the Justice Department, Richard W. McLaren, was opposed. A mass of government and ITT papers shows that numerous top aides to the President—in-

cluding Attorney General Mitchell and Commerce Secretary Stans—helped ITT. The dispute ended with a settlement that preserved the merger.

AN OLD TAIN

Tainted political campaign financing has long been a fact of American life.

"From the Civil War on, the great corporations and those who amassed fortunes from American industry paid a major share of campaign costs," Herbert E. Alexander, an expert on campaign financing, told a Senate hearing last March.

"It was accepted that businessmen should support the political party which most clearly favored their interests."

In the campaigns of the late 19th century the genius of fund-raising was the GOP's Mark Hanna. "In 1888, he raised more money than the Republican National Committee could spend," said Alexander, who is executive director of the Citizens' Research Foundation.

In 1896, helping to elect William McKinley, Hanna determined the contributions of businessmen "by ability to pay," Alexander said. "Banks were assessed at one-quarter of 1 per cent of their capital."

Last year, Maurice Stans similarly was urging big contributors to donate at least 1 per cent of their gross income. "That's a low price to pay every four years to ensure that the Executive branch of government is in the right hands," he told an interviewer.

But there can be no universal imputation of venal intent. Look at the enormous gap that separates, say, billionaire Howard Hughes from Clement Stone, who has given Mr. Nixon at least \$4.1 million for new presidential campaigns.

Hughes' biographer, Noah Dietrich, wrote of his former boss, "He cared nothing about candidates or issues—unless they had some effect on Howard Hughes—'Everybody has a price,' he always said. And he was willing to offer that price. . . ."

Stone, in contrast, cares so much about Mr. Nixon that he idolizes him. Reacting breezily to the Watergate scandal, Stone said, "Mr. Nixon has PMA (Positive Mental Attitude) and therefore . . . will do the right thing because it is the right thing to do."

The \$4.1 million Stone gave to Mr. Nixon represented no sacrifice at all, so great is his wealth. When he began his massive money infusions he had no way of knowing that legislation seriously affecting his health and life insurance enterprises might become a serious possibility. That possibility happens to exist now; and few would question that Stone, if he wanted to, could have easy access to White House ears on the subject, however pure his motive and positive his attitude.

But why, former Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) asked on the Senate floor six years ago, "should we perpetuate a system that would permit one man, because of the size of his pocketbook, to offset the ballot of 1,000 ordinary citizens; or one industry, or one interest, because of its vast holdings and resources, to usurp the public will? This is a threat to our democratic processes. This is a threat to free government."

A TRUST THAT WAS BROKEN

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Meg Greenfield, deputy editorial page editor of the Washington Post, raises very serious questions in her analysis of the Wa-

tergate affair leading to her conclusion that there is no substitute for decency. Her article which appeared on the Post's editorial page of May 18 follows:

A TRUST THAT WAS BROKEN

(By Meg Greenfield)

I keep returning to that part of the President's April 30 address that dealt with means and ends. It seems to me to hold the key to our present confusion. We should not fall into the "trap," Mr. Nixon said, "of letting the end, however great that end is, justify the means." Now, this is a sentiment which practically everybody applauds and practically nobody believes. And the fact is that stated in this familiar, absolute way, it is not worth believing because it bears no relationship whatever to the way we must organize our affairs as individuals and as a democratic society. How many times has Mr. Nixon himself told us that the desirable end (peace with honor) justified the undesirable means (carpet-bombing) in Vietnam? How many times has he insisted that the goal of maintaining civil order through the deterrence of crime justifies capital punishment—the taking of human life by the state?

The point is not that the President somehow stands guilty of violating a precept by which other people live. (It was, after all, Mr. Nixon's most passionate anti-war critics who justified all manner of violence and destruction in the name of protesting and—they believed—ending the Vietnam war.) The point is that the political and social organization of a country of 200 million people—the definition and achievement of those objectives considered to represent the common good—necessarily involves a continuous weighing of ends versus means, a kind of perpetual cost-benefit analysis that is the essence of our political discourse. We curtail some freedoms to achieve order. We take some risks with order when we agree that such risks are justified by the need to maintain certain personal freedoms. We authorize our officials to engage in a certain amount of coercion to protect the society at large, and we also authorize them to conduct much of our business in secret (from us) because we believe the maintenance of our national security requires it and thus justifies our doing so. Our principles are rarely in conflict—but the means of fulfilling them almost always are.

Very few people needed to be reminded by Mr. Nixon in his April Watergate address that the ends do not justify the means when we are talking about men in positions of great power behaving like common criminals to achieve their political ends; a schoolchild knows as much. But many people—Mr. Nixon evidently among them—seem to need some reminding of the more complicated relationship between means and ends that lies at the heart of the democratic condition. For our statute books and our administrative regulations and our judicial opinions faithfully reflect all the compromises and accommodations we have felt obliged to make. In consequence, they bestow grants of authority on our officials that in an ideal abstract world, free of competing needs, we would not make. And because of this, those laws presuppose good faith on the part of those who exercise the authority.

To take a case: if we did not believe that the end justifies the means in certain circumstances, we would not have a Central Intelligence Agency at all. But for national security reasons we clearly consider overriding, we do have such an agency and we have empowered the people who direct it to spend our money in amounts we don't even know for activities of which we are kept ignorant—activities which we do know, however, include a certain amount of violence and a certain amount of subterfuge. Surely, the supposition of a democratic nation conferring such powers on its elected leaders

and the men those leaders appoint, is that this trust will be taken seriously and responsibly—that it will not be misused. The same set of assumptions prevails in the case of the FBI, which we have given enormous license to act in coercive and secret ways for the protection of the society as a whole. And it also underlies our grant of authority to the government to conduct its cable traffic—which is to say our foreign affairs—by classified communication. The list doesn't end there. It only begins.

It seems to me that it is in this particularly vulnerable area of the law, in this area where the public is necessarily most helpless and most trusting, that the great betrayals have occurred. We all have talked till hell wouldn't have it about the inroads the Watergate scandals have made on public confidence in the system or public faith in the political process. I think the terms need a little refinement. Anyone who has moved around the country at all knows that most of the people you meet share the views of Will Rogers and/or Mr. Dooley when it comes to reverence for politicians and the political system. But people do not expect that the most delicate, dangerous and precious powers they have yielded up to their officials will be abused. A White House employee being given access to classified State Department cables so that he could try to forge a few implicating President Kennedy in an act of murder? A White House effort to cover up acts of political corruption by involving the CIA in the corruption and getting its officials falsely to claim that national security was at stake in order to quash the investigation? Public lies from those who preside over our system of criminal justice and are privy to its well-guarded secrets? A director of the FBI burning evidence in a criminal case?

L. Patrick Gray III, a victim/perpetrator of the Watergate scandals himself and the man who burned the evidence (which he had first hidden in his closet), spoke wistfully and unpersuasively at one point during his confirmation hearings of a "presumption of regularity" he, of necessity, made in his dealings with the White House. That is in fact a presumption everybody made—and everybody was wrong. For what we now know about these men is that they willfully and cynically violated the few things that really matter, that there was no public trust too important or too fragile to be mindlessly abused by them.

If you read the meaning of the Watergate disgrace this way, it suggests certain limitations on what can be done to prevent a repetition of these affairs. The point is best illustrated by Mr. Nixon's own insistence, for example, on a whole new system of reformed campaign finance and expenditure laws. We surely need them. But to concentrate on this need should not be to ignore a central fact of what has already happened: we had a collection of laws on the books for 1972 and the President's agents and colleagues are charged with having broken them repeatedly. Should we have a law against red wigs? A law compelling search of all suitcases for \$100 bills? A law obliging audited reports of all conversations between campaign officials and prospective campaign contributors? The point is not frivolous. It is that there are certain limits to what we can expect the written laws to do for us and certain dangers in trying to write laws that will cover and control every possible aspect of human malfeasance. Such laws can fail of their purpose and suppress much of the nation's political freedom and vitality in the process.

Which brings us back to ends and means. For what people must now decide is how much they wish to pay in for measures that will reduce the chance of these things happening again. They should do so in full

knowledge of the particular nature of the betrayal that occurred, however, and of the limits of the law as a remedy. That seems to me the lesson of Watergate: There are plenty of things you can legislate. But there is no substitute for decency.

AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS OVERLOOKED AS A SOURCE OF FUEL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis crowd continue to beat the drums of shortage. Dozens of "easy" solutions are being suggested to test public reaction. However, to date all proposed solutions, both immediate and long range, relate only to increased petroleum sources.

Already we hear recommendations to force our people to live and perform within our present petroleum energy supply. Suggestions that automobiles be limited to a 50-m.p.h. speed limit, that the proposed Alaskan pipeline, and increased oil imports from the Middle East or expensive long-range oil developments in the Soviet Union and off the coast of China are put forth as our only alternatives.

Silence prevails as to any alternative sources of fuel, however. An early American source of energy was wood, but with forest products now also approaching a critical state, wood is a doubtful alternative.

Our coal resources are said to be sufficient to supply the energy for hundreds of years, yet coal is seldom mentioned as one of the alternatives to prevent the restrictive effects of an energy shortage.

One of the greatest potential sources of fuel seldom discussed is that of farm products. Food is energy. Corn, wheat, barley, rice, sugarcane and beets, potatoes, and even peanuts can be used to produce alcohol which is an energy source as well as a usable fuel. Over the years the American farmer has been curtailed in production and in the past had been paid not to utilize his full food-producing acreage.

Considering the tremendous productive capability of our farmers, the agricultural sector could certainly be called upon to substantially contribute to solving any energy shortage as well as meeting our future fuel needs.

While experts agree that farm products can be utilized as fuel sources, the usual response is that the investment in conversion and production is not economically feasible.

But these same petro-authorities are silent as to the billions of dollars proposed to be invested, and the uncertainty of success in supplementing our domestic production by foreign oil pipedreams.

Few Americans are ready or willing to confine their present activities, or turn the clock of our civilization backward.

U.S. agriculture poses a viable source for future fuel needs—an American source and under American controls.

REAR ADM. DRAPER KAUFFMAN ENDS DISTINGUISHED NAVY CAREER

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the change of command ceremonies at which I will be in attendance at Great Lakes Naval Training Center on Saturday, May 26, 1973, means that my friend, Rear Adm. Draper Laurence Kauffman, will be relieved of his command as Commandant of the 9th Naval District for the U.S. Navy—and will be retiring from his long and distinguished career as an officer of the U.S. Navy.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Kauffman's military service began with his education at the U.S. Naval Academy, from which he was graduated in 1933. In 1940 he joined the American Volunteer Ambulance Corps with the French Army and was captured by the German Army. He was awarded the French Croix de Guerre with Star for valorous service in the Ambulance Corps. Still later, Admiral Kauffman served with the British Royal Navy, where he developed a technique and expertise in bomb and mine disposal, a service which became particularly valuable to the U.S. Forces following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

In connection with his return to service with the U.S. Navy, Admiral Kauffman disassembled an unexploded Japanese bomb, risking his life in the process, and performing with such skill and courage that the individual parts of the Japanese bomb were retained for analysis and study by our U.S. Forces. Later, he became well-known for organizing and commanding the underwater demolition teams of the U.S. Navy, a vital service which saved countless American lives in various island landings in the Pacific engagements against the Japanese. In this connection, Admiral Kauffman, as a Navy officer was involved in individual operations in which the men under his command detected and removed mines and bombs in offshore waters enabling subsequent successful landings and attacks against enemy installations.

Mr. Speaker, in all of his illustrious career in the Navy, Adm. Draper Kauffman served with great skill and courage without regard to his personal safety—and always in behalf of protecting the lives and safety of his men, and defending our national security.

Mr. Speaker, in his later service as Commander-in-Chief Pacific Representative in the Philippines, Admiral Kauffman participated as Operational Control Authority in developing an aggressive community relations program, contributing immensely to the image of the United States in that critical area.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the point of my personal contact with Admiral Kauffman and his attractive wife, Peggy, when Rear Adm. Draper Kauffman was designated as Commandant of the 9th Naval District, and as Com-

mander of Great Lakes Naval Training Center in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed firsthand the generous and compassionate attitudes displayed by this great leader of the modern Navy. Admiral Kauffman has endeared himself to his fellow officers and men, and even more markedly to the citizens and citizen leaders of the area which the 9th Naval District serves. If there were any earlier misconceptions indicating that Naval officers are an aloof or impersonal cadre, Admiral Kauffman and the policies which he has pursued during the past 3 years at Great Lakes Naval Training Center, and in other areas throughout the 9th Naval District should dispel any such misconceptions.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the extraordinary service rendered by Rear Adm. Draper Kauffman in behalf of the overall missions of the Navy, he established an enviable record of fairness and equity to all naval personnel without regard to rank, color, race or creed, and in promoting high morale among the men and officers of the Navy under his command. In addition to his numerous contacts with community and civic leaders, including the Great Lakes unit of the Navy League, Admiral Kauffman performed outstandingly in behalf of substantial community and public relations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a special commendation to Peggy Kauffman, wife of Rear Adm. Draper Kauffman, who in her special leadership and interest in behalf of the environment, sparked the organization of an environmental center, which developed into a major influence in behalf of cleaner air and water in this great area of the Midwest, resulting in a clearinghouse of environmental activities, and educational program from which many thousands of persons, both in the Navy and in civilian life have benefited, in a large-scale recycling activity of paper, glass and metal—and in many other ways.

Mr. Speaker, having reviewed the distinguished career of Admiral Kauffman, I cannot help but feel that his greatest contribution to the Navy and to the Nation has been during his final duty as Commandant of the 9th Naval District, and as commander of the Great Lakes Naval Training Center. To Admiral and Mrs. Kauffman, I extend a heartfelt and sincere "well done," in behalf of my wife, Doris, and myself, who count Admiral and Mrs. Kauffman as our personal friends. In behalf of my constituents throughout the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, I extend appreciation and congratulations for his dedicated service to the Navy and to the Nation—and best wishes for good health and happiness, as well as a future career of active and useful service.

ABORTION—DEATH BEFORE BIRTH

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, The Supreme Court's recent abortion decision

states that it is only a theory that the child is alive prior to birth and that the States are not free to adopt this theory. To hold today that it is only a theory that human life exists before birth is as unscientific as to hold that it is only a theory that the world is not flat. Recent electrocardiographic studies in a New York hospital show that it takes 45-120 minutes for the unborn child's heart to stop beating after it has been burned by the toxic solution used in the saline method of abortion.

Equally fallacious is the Supreme Court's minimalization of the medical hazards of abortion to the mother. The net result of the Supreme Court's abortion decision will mean the deaths of millions of unborn babies each year and the physical and psychological maiming of millions of women who will suffer the natural consequences of the unnatural act of abortion.

One of the most tireless defenders of human life who has devoted thousands of hours and his personal funds to the cause is Dr. Joseph R. Stanton, M.D., F.A.C.P., Associate Clinical Professor Medicine, Tufts Medical School. The following commentary, "Abortion—Death Before Birth," was written by Dr. Stanton.

The article follows:

ABORTION—DEATH BEFORE BIRTH

(By Joseph R. Stanton, M.D., F.A.C.P.)

The magnificent Life Magazine Series "Life Before Birth" with the pictures of the human embryo and fetus by Lennart Nilsson began with the following statement, "The Birth of a Human Life Really Occurs at the Moment the Mother's Egg Cell Is Fertilized by One of the Father's Sperm Cells."

Abortion attempts to destroy the life that begins with conception. It usually but not always results in the death of the growing child within the womb. After the first six months of liberalized abortion in New York City, the Health Department reported "eleven live births after abortion procedure, all infants died within the next day or so. Two living infants were discharged from hospitals" having to be classified as live births rather than as abortions.

During the first 12 weeks of life, abortion is carried out by either (A) D&C or (B) Suction Curettage. After twelve weeks, the fetus is too large to be removed by (A) or (B), so abortion is attempted by (C) Saline Injection, and if this is not effective, (D) Hysterotomy is carried out.

No method of abortion is carried out in any significant number of cases without hazard to the mother. A recent paper from England makes the following statement: "The morbidity and fatal potential of criminal abortion is widely accepted while at the same time the public is misled into believing that legal abortion is a trivial incident, even a lunch hour procedure which can be used as a mere extension of contraceptive practice. There has been almost a conspiracy of silence regarding risks."

Listed as immediate complications are:

1. The birth of a living child.
2. Cervical lacerations—4.2%.
3. Uterine perforations—1.7%.
4. Fever—15%.
5. Peritonitis—1.2%.
6. Retained products of conception requiring D&C—5%.
7. Septicemia—0.37%.
8. Endometritis—2.5%.
9. Urinary tract infection.
10. Pulmonary embolism.
11. Amniotic fluid embolism.
12. Hemorrhage greater than 500cc. in 9-17% of abortions done by various methods.

Later, additional complications are depressive reactions, subsequent sterility, subsequent abnormalities of placental implantation and a predisposition to premature labor in future pregnancies. A paper from Czechoslovakia states: "We find the immediate acute inflammatory complications in about 5% of cases—permanent complications in 20-30% of all women who had pregnancy interruptions."

It is believed that this presentation shows abortion for what it is—a negative and destructive approach to life and one of its problems. Those who have portrayed abortion as safe, easy, and almost without psychic trauma have not spoken from the facts. The current efforts of the American drug industry now spending millions of dollars to perfect the prostaglandins so that abortions may be made microscopic should be no less objectionable than the destruction of life at 8 weeks or 12 weeks or 24 weeks—before or after birth. Each one of us began life as a single cell and that biological process has continued without interruption to the moment this line is read. Abortion interrupts, despoils and destroys human life.

A. D&C OR DILATION AND CURETTAGE

A brief history is taken, the blood typed and a consent form signed by the patient. The patient is premedicated and an intravenous is started. Anesthesia, either regional or intravenous pentothal is induced. The operative area is cleansed with antiseptics, a retractor is inserted and the mouth of the womb or cervix is grasped with a tenaculum or clamp. A sound or calibrated measure is inserted to measure the depth of the womb. The mouth of the womb is then dilated—"The amount of dilation will depend on the size of the products of conception." A sharp curette—like a long spoon with sharp serrated edges is introduced and the interior of the womb methodically scrapped. "Often little tissue comes away at first but the products of conception are loosened and the ovum forceps is used to remove them." An oxytocic is then given to shrink down the uterus and lessen bleeding. The patient is watched until recovery from anesthesia occurs and then sent back to her room. The pathetic pulp in the photos above, what were once fragile, living objects of simple innocence and complex wonder, are consigned to furnace or sewer . . . unwanted, undefended, unknown. What greater sacrifice could the innocent unborn but to lay down their lives for their mothers' convenience.

B. SUCTION CURETTAGE

Preoperative medication and preparation the same as for D&C. Anesthesia is induced usually with intravenous pentothal. A speculum is inserted in the vagina. The cervix (mouth of the womb, ed.) is grasped with a tenaculum. Pitressin, to cause the womb to contract—is injected. The cervix is forcibly dilated. The suction curette, a tube, is inserted into the uterus, the suction turned on, preset at 70 mm Hg. negative pressure. The curette is worked in and out rotating it slowly. "Because the curette and tubing are transparent, the site of implantation can be ascertained from the amount of tissue withdrawn from different areas of the uterus. . . . The procedure is completed by concentrating in the area from which the bulk is obtained." The end point of the procedure is reached when no further tissue is obtained by suction. The embryonic parts, broken and crushed are caught in a tissue trap attached to the machine. A physician long accustomed to witnessing suffering and death has said of suction curettage, that in all his life he has known no more horrible sight or sound than that produced as the little human parts thud into and are caught by the tissue trap.

C. SALINE INJECTION

After twelve weeks, the fetus is so large that D&C and Suction Curettage are too dangerous to the mother. At twelve weeks,

there is not enough amniotic fluid in the sac in which the little aquanaut lives and moves to do amniocentesis safely. Usually the physician waits until the unborn child has grown to 16 weeks size. Life Magazine states that it is now 5½ inches long and, "quite recognizable now as a human baby." After the patient has emptied her bladder, the abdomen is then prepared with antiseptics. The skin and subcutaneous tissues are injected with a local anesthetic. A long 18 inch gauge needle is inserted through the abdominal wall and the wall of the uterus into the amniotic sac of fluid surrounding the fetus. Four to five ounces of fluid are withdrawn and 5-7 ounces of toxic salt solution 20% saline (more than 23 times the concentration of salt solution that is used for intravenous therapy normally—ed.) is injected. The patient is then given oxytocics to contract the uterus and often also an antibiotic. After the toxic solution is injected, electrocardiographic studies in a New York hospital show that it takes 45 to 120 minutes for the unborn child's heart to stop. When the child dies or the uterus is sufficiently irritated, after a latent period of hours—labor begins and the dead child is born 24 to 28 hours later. A New York physician who does saline abortions has said of this procedure, "I hate to do saline injections—when you inject the saline you see an increase of fetal movements—it's horrible." That increase of fetal movements occurs as the unborn child struggles in his or her death throes.

D. HYSTEROTOMY

If Saline injection is ineffective or cannot be completed because of technical difficulty or reaction, abortion is accomplished by Hysterotomy. Hysterotomy has been called the "miniature Caesarean section". The patient is prepared and anesthetized, the abdomen and womb are opened. The fetus is lifted out. The cord is clamped. The fetus struggles for a moment and dies. This is obviously unpalatable, particularly to nurses, so much so that Kaye states "The large fetuses aborted at greater than 22 weeks gestation become abhorrent to the nursing staff. This necessitated the change in policy limiting abortion up to the 20th week." Hysterotomy or Caesarean section has a long and honored history in medicine, often saving the life of the mother and the child. When deliberately used to abort, it destroys the life of the child. Occasionally, at least, it also leads to the loss of the life of the mother.

TERMS AND DERIVATIONS

Abortion—Latin Ab-orior, orire, ortus sum—the one kept from arising.

Embryo—Latin Embryon—the offspring before its birth.

Fetus—Latin Foetus—the young one.
"Products of Conception"—the abortionists' term for the embryo or fetus.

Termination of Pregnancy—abortionists' term for the act of abortion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Life Before Birth", Life Magazine, April 30, 1965.
2. Fuchs, F., Modern Treatment, p. 206, February, 1971.
3. American Heritage Dictionary.
4. Whites, Latin-English Dictionary.
5. B. E. Marbury, M.D., "Anesthesia in Abortion", Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, vol. 14, pps. 81-84, 1971.
6. G. Shaefer, M.D., "Technique of Dilatation and Curettage for Abortion", Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, vol. 14, pps. 85-98, 1971.
7. B. N. Nathanson, M.D., "Suction Curettage for Early Abortion Experience with 645 Cases," Modern Treatment, vol. 8, pps. 64-71, Feb. 1971.
8. J. M. MacKenzie, M.D., A. Roufa, M.D., and H. M. M. Tovell, M.D., "Midtrimester Abortion: Clinical Experience with Amniocentesis and Hypertonic Instillation on 400

Patients", Modern Treatment, vol. 8, pps. 72-88, February, 1971.

9. T. D. Kerenyi, M.D., "Outpatient Intra-amniotic Injection of Hypertonic Saline", Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, vol. 14, pps. 124-140, March, 1971.

10. S. Edmiston, "A Report on the Abortion Capital of the Country", New York Times Magazine, April 11, 1971.

11. R. E. Kaye, "Procedures for Abortion at the New York Lying-In Hospital", Modern Treatment, vol. 8 pps. 101-113, February, 1971.

12. V. Bonney, A Textbook of Gynecologic Surgery, 6th edition, Carroll, London.

13. H. Stallworthy, A. S. Moolgaoker, and J. J. Walsh, "Legal Abortion: A Critical Assessment of Its Risks", Lancet, December 4, 1971, pps. 1245-1249.

14. A. Kotasek, Int'l. J. of Gyn. and Obs., vol. 9, pps. 118-119, 1971.

HEATING OIL SHORTAGE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times carries an article noting that Mr. Nixon's Oil Policy Committee "has informally suggested to the States that they temporarily relax air-pollution controls on sulfur emissions." The alleged reason for this suggestion is that we are facing a serious shortage of oil which can be used for home heating, a shortage so extreme as to require "evacuation of people from cold homes to central refuges in which they would be kept warm."

There may well be such a shortage—though I have my doubts about whether it is a real or an artificial shortage. I wonder, though, why Mr. Nixon would resort to dirtier air, or to cold homes next winter instead of some gas rationing between now and then. The article makes the astounding comment that the President's advisers "are deeply opposed to rationing on the ground that the problem is not grave enough to warrant so drastic a remedy."

Presumably, they would not even consider cutting down on fuel for such essential activities as motor boating, snowmobiling, and private airplane flying. Could it be because—

Relaxation of the [pollution] standards would benefit major oil companies such as Exxon, Shell, Texaco and Amerada-Hess by enabling them to refine in the Caribbean and sell more high-sulphur crude oil.

I—and I hope, the press and public, too—shall keep a close watch on how Mr. Nixon deals with this situation. It will not do for him to slay pollution control on the altar of the energy crisis.

The full text of the article follows:

OFFICIALS SAY HEATING OIL SHORTAGE COULD BE SEVERE

(By Edward Cowan)

WASHINGTON.—Beyond the threat of a summer gasoline shortage, which is preoccupying Government energy planners, the oil industry and motorists, looms the prospect of a shortage of home heating oil next winter that could be worse than the one last winter.

To reduce the severity of a heating fuel shortage, the Nixon Administration's Oil Policy Committee has informally suggested

to the states that they temporarily relax air-pollution controls on sulphur emissions. However, the Environmental Protection Agency has not endorsed the suggestion, and what the states will do is unclear.

Administration officials and industry executives have acknowledged that a shortage is likely. It could be bad enough, officials have said privately, to require evacuation of people from cold homes to central refuges in which they would be kept warm.

GENERAL ENERGY SHORTAGE

The scarcity of petroleum products is part of a larger shortage of energy generally. The causes are multiple—high consumption, the Federal oil import restrictions that were dropped on May 1, low natural gas prices, delays in construction of nuclear reactors for power plants, environmental bars to burning high-sulphur coal and oil, production rationing in foreign oil countries, and transportation bottlenecks.

The extent of a shortage will depend on how cold it is, Government policy actions, the ability of refineries to produce steadily at capacity and supplies of crude oil. Refineries convert crude oil to motor fuel, heating oil, jet fuel and other products.

The Government could take a long step toward moderating or averting any shortage of heating oil by imposing mandatory gasoline rationing this summer. Reduced gasoline consumption would release some crude oil for conversion to heating oil instead of motor fuel.

However, President Nixon's most senior advisers are deeply opposed to rationing on the ground that the problem is not grave enough to warrant so drastic a remedy. Officials say rationing would require creation of a new bureaucracy and would ensnarl the Government in the complicated business of determining classes of motorists and how much gasoline each should be allowed per week or month.

The temporary modification or suspension of sulphur emission standards for electric utilities suggested by the policy committee would let the utilities burn heavy fuel oil whose sulphur content has not been reduced by the blending of lighter home-heating oil, which contains less sulphur. This would make more heating oil available for the residential market.

John H. Lichtblau, executive director of the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, said that relaxation of sulphur emission standards would also lead to an increase in the availability of other petroleum products.

Mr. Lichtblau said in a telephone interview from his New York office that European refineries would process more high-sulphur crude oil from the Middle East if they could export to the United States not only gasoline but also "the bottom of the barrel," the high-sulphur residual fuel oil burned by utilities and big apartment houses.

Mr. Lichtblau, whose organization is financed by large and small oil companies, acknowledged that relaxation of the standards would benefit major oil companies such as Exxon, Shell, Texaco and Amerada-Hess by enabling them to refine in the Caribbean and sell more high-sulphur crude oil. He noted that Venezuela has idle crude producing capacity.

Also in favor of the relaxation is the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association, which represents East Coast wholesalers of heating oil. "If they don't relax the sulphur standards, the utilities are going to blend or burn a tremendous amount of heating oil," said John H. Zentay, the association's Washington Representative.

On the other hand, John D. Simpson, a deputy environmental protection administrator in New York City, rejected relaxation as "disastrous for urban areas like New York where we're having trouble with sulphur dioxide emissions."

nology provided by the United States must stop.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Member of Congress.

Letters and expressions of outrage will not end U.S. involvement in this affair. I will soon introduce two pieces of legislation in the House of Representatives designed to do so.

The Herbicide Export Control Act of 1973 will halt all exportation of herbicides with little agricultural value, but much destructive potential.

The Chemical Warfare Prevention Act of 1973 will ban the exportation of all herbicides to South Africa and Portugal.

I welcome the cosponsorship of my colleagues in the House on these proposals.

SOKOL MILWAUKEE CELEBRATES ITS 105TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 19, 1973, the Sokol Milwaukee celebrated its 105th anniversary with a banquet and dance at the Milwaukee Inn Ballroom. Founded in 1868, the Sokol Milwaukee has truly lived up to its goal of physical fitness through gymnastics.

A large and enthusiastic audience took part in the celebration. A principal address was given by Joseph F. Drnec, of Illinois, president of the Central District of the American Sokol Organization. Excerpts from Mr. Drnec's address follow:

EXCERPTS FROM MR. DRNEC'S ADDRESS

Brother Chairman, distinguished guests, sisters and brothers and Sokol friends: All of us present should feel honored and privileged to participate in this 105th birthday of Sokol Milwaukee. To you Sokol Milwaukee our sincere thanks for your continued efforts in perpetuating Sokol.

Sokol ideals are now in their second century here in this great country of ours. Those of us witnessing the many examples of training produced in our Sokol gym units throughout the American Sokol organization should and must fill our hearts with justifiable pride that we are a part of this great movement.

The future of Sokol belongs to our Sokol youth boys and girls, young women and men attending gym classes and participating in competitions and exhibitions. This training reflects on better and more responsible citizenship for a better America.

Toady we salute Sokol Milwaukee who for 105 years have been carrying on these Sokol teachings right here in your beautiful city. We all hope that Sokol ideas will continue building a better world in peace and happiness for all people of the world.

Normally your public exhibition is the year's climax, but this year it is an anticlimax, for we will hold our 13th National Slet in Chicagoland June 21 to 24. I invite all of you to the slet to compete or view the efforts of Sokols from the entire country and Canada, also to attend the slet banquet on Thursday June 21st at the Lexington House in Hickory Hills, Illinois and the great manifestation of physical fitness on Sunday afternoon 2:00 p.m. at the Morton West stadium in Berwyn, Illinois.

The program of the 105th anniversary banquet and dance follows:

PROGRAM

Salute to American Flag.
National Anthems, Anthony Kopecky.
Welcome Address, Fred Stankovsky, M.C.
Address, Rudy Richter, President, Sokol Milwaukee.

Address, Lillian Funk, President, Sokolice Milwaukee.

Piano Selection, Scott Brahm.
Address Joseph Drnec, President, Central District.

Song Selections, Anthony Kopecky, accompanied by Scott Brahm.

Address, George Basta, Treasurer, American Sokol Organizations.

Piano Selection, Scott Brahm.

Address, Honorable Henry Reuss, Congressman, 5th District.

Song Selections, Anthony Kopecky, accompanied by Scott Brahm.

Closing Address, Fred Stankovsky, M.C.

WMAQ-TV EDITORIALS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, WMAQ-TV, Chicago, which is known for its very spirited and penetrating editorial policies under its editorial director, Mr. Dillon Smith, broadcast two editorials on May 11 and 12 which dealt with the subject of judicial processes in Cook County, Ill., and the relatively few criminal offenders who are brought to justice. The editorials speak for themselves, and I directed them to the attention of the Members who are genuinely interested in the rights of the victims as well as the perpetrators of crimes:

EDITORIAL, MAY 11

Today we want to talk about something called the "shrinkage of crime." What it means simply is that a lot of crimes are being committed in this area and very few people are being sent to prison.

In Cook County last year, more than 400,000 serious crimes were reported to police. Only 1,760 persons were sent to prison.

It is alarming to discover that only one person is imprisoned for every 230 crimes reported in this area. Obviously our system of criminal justice is not doing its job when so few criminals are apprehended, convicted and sentenced.

Let's use one category of serious crime as an example—armed robbery. Nearly 19,000 armed robberies were reported to police last year, yet only 319 persons were sent to jail for armed robbery.

Here's how 19,000 shrunk to 319. Thirty-six per cent of the reported armed robberies were quickly discounted by police for one reason or another. They were recorded as "unfounded"—so, officially, they never happened. This is sometimes called "killing crime with a pencil" and if a lot of reported crimes end up in the wastebasket, it can give the impression that a police commander is doing a good job of controlling crime in his district.

Only 18 per cent of the reported armed robberies resulted in anyone being arrested. What is worse is that there were indictments in only four per cent of reported armed robberies.

This indicates several problems: improper

arrests, a failure of police to obtain enough evidence to get indictments, a willingness of prosecutors to reduce serious charges to minor charges. If a charge of armed robbery is reduced to simple assault or burglary in return for a guilty plea, the prosecutor can count that as a conviction, but it can allow the offender to go free on probation.

And at the bottom line, only 1.7 per cent of reported armed robberies end up with someone going to prison, one out of 4,060 cases.

We have more serious crime in the Chicago area this year than we had last year. But persons accused of crime are not being brought to trial. For comparison, seven times the number of persons are brought to trial in Los Angeles as there are here.

When police officials doctor the statistics, when prosecutors reduce serious crimes to misdemeanors, they are taking the easy way out. Our system of criminal justice is not working, and it cannot work when elements within that system are not functioning properly.

Frankly, criminals will have the odds on their side until police and prosecutors do a better job of apprehending criminals, getting the evidence and prosecuting them for serious crimes.

Of course, judges have an important role to play in this process, and we'll talk about that in our next editorial.

EDITORIAL, MAY 12

If a person who was indicted a year ago for armed robbery has not yet been brought to trial, if his case has been delayed a dozen times, whose fault is that? The answer, we believe, is that it's the judges' fault.

Our system of criminal justice in Cook County moves excruciatingly slow. Many of our judges seem to forget that the United States Constitution guarantees a defendant the "right to a speedy trial." Justice is certainly not a speedy process here.

In 1972, for example, 735 persons were indicted for armed robbery in Cook County. Now, in May of 1973, only 223 of those cases have been completed while 512 of them are still pending, many of them well over a year old.

This is largely the fault of judges. Once a case is assigned to a judge, it is his responsibility to move it along and make sure it is adjudicated within a reasonable amount of time.

But, in fact, judges are letting cases drag on and on. Here's a statistic that might astound you: Cook County judges grant an average of 12 continuances in every armed robbery case.

Of course, there are valid reasons for postponing a trial. But anyone who accepts the axiom that "justice delayed is justice denied" has got to conclude that 12 continuances per armed robbery case is inexcusable.

Some judges believe that these delays help to avoid trials by encouraging deals between lawyers whereby defendants plead guilty to lesser charges and get a lighter sentence. But when a felony charge is knocked down to a misdemeanor, the guilty person gets off with probation or a few days in the County Jail.

Long delays also decrease the chance that a guilty person will be convicted if he ever is tried. Evidence is lost. Memories grow dim. Witnesses quit showing up in court, or they move away or they die.

It is time for our judges to change this pattern of procrastination. They must start demanding that lawyers show up in court ready for trial. They should establish some rules to specify acceptable reasons for granting continuances and to put a limit on the number of times that any one case will be delayed. If judges drove their cars the way they run their courtrooms, many of them would get tickets for obstructing traffic.

DELAWARE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SUPPORTS DU PONT LEGISLATION
CONCERNING THE ENERGY PROBLEM

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, I introduced H.R. 2920, to provide for a national energy council to coordinate our country's efforts to insure adequate energy supplies.

I was pleased to learn recently that the Delaware Legislature supports my legislation. I insert in the RECORD House Joint Resolution 2, passed by the Delaware General Assembly:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 2

An act memorializing the Delaware Congressional Delegation to support House Resolution 2920 sponsored by Representative P. S. du Pont IV, dealing with the coordination of agencies, departments, and environmental factors concerned with the energy problem

Whereas, the joint committees of Public Safety and Community Affairs and Economic

Development have studied the question of whether an immediate fuel crisis exists in Delaware; and

Whereas, hearings were held on January 18th and 24th in Dover and a meeting conducted with Getty Oil Company representatives on February 5th; and

Whereas, the committees have determined that there is no immediate fuel crisis and that the health and public safety of the citizens of Delaware will not be adversely affected; and

Whereas, it was pointed out that the reason there is not an immediate fuel crisis is due in part to the unusually mild winter on the east coast and the easing of the grain drying situation in the midwest; and

Whereas, it was concluded that Delaware and the United States do have a potential future energy crisis and steps must be taken now to cope with this possibility; and

Whereas, over the past ten years energy needs have been growing at an accelerated rate and demands for modern conveniences and the impact of environmental controls have combined to increase energy consumption; and

Whereas, many diverse opinions were expressed as to the cause of the potential energy crisis; and

Whereas, these explanations included the facts that government ceilings have been placed on the price of natural gas, diminish-

ing the number of exploration wells in the country; the cost of drilling has increased and the incentive for exploration has disappeared; and that oil companies have run their plants to meet increasing gasoline needs; and

Whereas, it was revealed that is estimated that the United States has enough on-shore oil for the next ten years, natural gas for eleven years, shale oil for 35 years to 120 years and coal for the next 500 years.

Now, therefore:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware, the Senate concurring therein, that the Delaware Congressional Delegation support Representative P. S. du Pont, IV's House Resolution 2920 which coordinates efforts at the Federal level, bringing together all agencies, departments and environmental factors into one strong unit, creating, in the Executive Office of the President, a Council on Energy.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the forty-nine state legislatures for their urgent consideration and support in an attempt to focus national attention on this potential fuel crisis.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator William V. Roth, Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr. and Rep. Pierre S. du Pont, IV, and that this resolution be incorporated into the Congressional Record.

SENATE—Tuesday, May 22, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. FLOYD K. HASKELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

PRAYER

The Reverend Monsignor E. Robert Arthur, pastor, St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God our Father: In You we live and move and have our being. Look with favor upon our Nation and its people. Show the light of Your truth to all who live in this favored land that we may be guided back to the path of justice from which we sometimes wander. Grant us the grace to love Your commandments. Make us see that our dedication to national ideals can find fulfillment only if we are no less dedicated to Your kingdom of justice, love, and peace.

Help, O Lord, with your gifts of knowledge, wisdom, and fortitude the Members of the Senate of the United States. The responsibility which they exercise in the service of their fellow citizens is not light. Give them, we pray You, a share of Your strength. Let their deliberations and their acts always be sanctified in the observance of Your law.

The kingdom, the power and the glory, O Lord, be ever Yours. 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 22, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. FLOYD K. HASKELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,

President pro tempore.

Mr. HASKELL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Brown of Ohio and Mr. BURKE of Florida as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, vice Mr. STEIGER of Arizona and Mr. STEELE, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6330. An act to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6628. An act to amend section 101(b) of the Micronesia Claims Act of 1971 to enlarge the class of persons eligible to receive benefits under the claims program established by that act;

H.R. 7139. An act authorizing the Secretary of Defense to utilize Department of Defense resources for the purpose of providing medical emergency helicopter transportation services to civilians, and limiting individual liability incident to providing such services, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 512. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 6330. An act to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6628. An act to amend section 101(b) of the Micronesia Claims Act of 1971 to enlarge the class of persons eligible to receive benefits under the claims program established by that act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7139. An act authorizing the Secretary of Defense to utilize Department of Defense resources for the purpose of providing medical emergency helicopter transportation services to civilians, and limiting individual liability incident to providing such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 512. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 21, 1973, be dispensed with.