

may have the benefit of the views of this important Kansas organization:

FORGOTTEN AMERICAN COMMITTEE
OF KANSAS, INC.,

Wichita, Kans., May 17, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER: As a POW/MIA organization and a MIA family member, we have been sincerely upset by the recent floor debates and voting to stop funds and totally sever all contact with the conflict in Laos and Cambodia. Dr. Roger Shields, of the Department of Defense POW/MIA Task Force, has told us that both the House and Senate have been informed that a Prisoner of War and Missing in Action situation still exist in Laos and Cambodia, and that pulling out now would mean the end of any chances to get back our American POW's and get an accounting of the Missing in these countries.

Immediately after the January '73 Cease-fire, the DOD listed 7 civilians and 6 military Prisoners in Laos, 311 military Missing in Laos, 5 journalists and 28 military Prisoners in Cambodia, 25 military Missing in Cambodia, and 81 known Prisoners still unaccounted for in Vietnam. Four of the Laos military POW's were released, 2 military men have been added to the MIA/Cambodia count since the Cease-fire, and some of the 81 unaccounted-for POW's have been reclassified to KIA as a result of POW debriefings.

However, in Laos and Cambodia, we are still talking about 4 civilian and 20 to 70 military American Prisoners in Laos, 311 military Missing in Laos, 5 journalist POW's in Cambodia, 25 military Missing there, and the very real probability of more than 60 prisoners from Vietnam having been moved into Laos or Cambodia. Gentlemen, we are talking about the lives and accounting of almost 500 Americans . . . These includes 12 Kansans and friend—2 Kansans are Prisoners in Laos, 8 are Missing there, 1 is a Prisoner in Cambodia, and 1 is Missing in Cambodia. Positive information has recently indicated that 2 of the 3 Kansas POW's are alive. We're certain that each of you could confer with the National League of Families representative from your state and find that you, too, have constituents who must *not* be forgotten . . .

Our POW/MIA negotiators for the ICOS and the JCRC supposedly have the support of a signed Cease-fire in Vietnam, yet they are having problems getting any cooperation from the Vietnamese concerning an accounting of the missing Prisoners and clarification on the MIAs. If you, as legislators, force a stoppage of all involvement in Lao and Cambodia, the Pathet Lao and Khmer Rouge will NOT be grateful—they will be powerful! Instead of daily negotiations for our POW/MIAs with their representatives in North

Vietnam, they will be in a position to charge us more than a mere bombing halt for the most meager information about our men. Who will be paying the price? You? Our government? Or the Prisoners not returned, the Missing not found, and their families?

We recently received a letter from the mother of a Kansas journalist who is *known* to be alive and POW in Cambodia as recently as April 1973—almost a year after capture. She voiced the fears that so many family members feel, so we quote—"We appreciate, so much, your concern. I'm beginning to feel like a few people in Washington don't think it is worth the effort and expense to get the rest of the men out of there. I can't help boiling inside when I hear one of them come up with such a statement."

We want her to be wrong, but only you can prove her wrong by your actions. Dr. Shields and Frank Seiverts assured us there would be no rug-sweeping of our men. We fear your solution will result in the sacrifice of our Prisoners, our Missing, and the right of their families to ever know the fate of their loved ones.

Sincerely,

ANN HOWES,
President.
MAUREEN SMITH,
Vice President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 24, 1973

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit ye like men, be strong.—I Corinthians 16: 13.

Almighty God, who guided our fathers to build on these shores a country of free people and who didst put into their minds a dream that this land may become one nation with liberty and justice for all, move Thou within our hearts that we may continue to fulfill this goal in our day.

We come again to our national day of remembrance when we call to mind those who have given their lives for our country. Inspired by their devotion and challenged by their dedication may we give ourselves afresh to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people may not perish from the earth.

Bless the family of our beloved colleague, WILLIAM O. MILLS, who so suddenly has left us. Comfort them with Thy spirit and strengthen them for the days that lie ahead.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 251. An act for the relief of Frank P. Muto, Alphonso A. Muto, Arthur E. Scott, and F. Clyde Wilkison;

S. 1384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer franchise fees received from certain concession operations at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, in the States of Arizona and Utah, and for other purposes;

S. 1808. An act to apportion funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and to authorize funds in accordance with title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "National Next Door Neighbor Day."

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, May 29, 1973, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until May 29, 1973, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday, May 30, 1973.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I am happy to respond to the minority leader.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of May 28, 1973, is as follows:

Monday is Memorial Day, and we will not be in session.

Tuesday there is scheduled for consideration H.R. 6912, Par Value Modification Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Wednesday there are scheduled:

H.R. 5857, National Visitors Center Amendment, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 5858, John F. Kennedy Center maintenance funds, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 6830, International Center for Foreign Chanceries, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Thursday and the balance of the week there are scheduled:

H. Res. 382, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2;

H.R. 77, jointly administered trust funds for legal services, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 6458, Emergency Medical Services Act, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 7724, biomedical research, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 7357, Railroad Retirement Act Technical Amendment, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 7806, health programs extension, subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

FIGHT TO CONTROL CRIME IS A MATTER OF CONCERN

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced H.R. 8021, a bill substantially revising the way in which the Federal Government supports State and local law enforcement efforts. The fight to control crime is a matter of concern to everyone in this country and I therefore respectfully draw the attention of my colleagues to this legislation.

My bill, the Crime Control Revenue Sharing Act of 1973, offers a fresh approach to the use of Federal crime fighting funds. First, it gets these Federal funds quickly to States and localities. By adopting a Federal revenue sharing approach for States and a limited revenue sharing approach between States and high crime localities, the bill eliminates the present bureaucratic log jam. Second, it encourages States and localities to plan, set priorities and develop effective means of controlling crime—from the apprehension of the suspect to the rehabilitation of the criminal. Third, it requires local and public participation in the development of crime control plans and insures careful evaluation of all plans and programs funded. Fourth, it targets Federal funding to the areas—whether urban, suburban or rural—that need it most. And, finally, it insures that in our effort to control

crime we do not abridge the fundamental rights of American citizens to privacy.

In 1968 the Federal Government made a major commitment to help finance improvements in local law enforcement and criminal justice. This legislation, title I of the Safe Streets Act, will expire on June 30, 1973. Although its intentions were commendable, the 1968 legislation and its subsequent modifications have proved in practice to be an administrative fiasco.

Federal funds are simply not being forwarded to the State and local governments quickly enough to be effective in the fight against crime. Tieups in funding are caused by the unwieldy administrative structures both at the Federal and State level. One large city has complained that it must go through at least 190 administrative steps for each of the 100 grants a year it receives from its State government. Most jurisdictions have complained that such redtape means that even the most deserving projects take from 6 to 12 months to be funded. As a result, in New York State alone, only 15 percent of the funds made available for fiscal year 1972 and only 56 percent of the funds for 1971 had been spent by the middle of 1972.

To cope with the redtape, States and localities are forced to invest 50 percent to 100 percent of the grants received to obtain and administer grant awards. The Office of Management and Budget has indicated that 5 percent to 10 percent investment is an appropriate figure.

Surely any legislation revising Federal support for State and local law enforcement efforts must attack this critical problem of administrative mire and delay.

Another difficulty with the existing legislation is that it fails to target crime fighting funds to high crime areas across the country. Instead, money is to be spent in the same proportion on areas without crime problems as those with such problems.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—the agency commissioned by the existing legislation to administer the disbursement of Federal law enforcement funds, has been subject to continuous and widespread criticism for its failure to monitor and evaluate law enforcement programs. Federal funds have been wasted by certain jurisdictions on needless "hardware" expenditures. The House Government Operations Committee has reported:

Tens of millions of block grant dollars have been spent on helicopters, airplanes, automobiles, firearms, ammunition, computer information systems, communication control centers, police radio equipment and a range of other hardware items, often without competitive bidding or prior evaluation.

This problem is aggravated by the procedural delays. It is much easier for a request for a tank, for example, to be processed through the administrative mire than a sophisticated proposal for court reform. Hence, there is an incentive to apply for the former rather than the latter.

Another major shortcoming of the existing legislation is that it has failed to provide sufficient safeguards for individ-

ual privacy. Thus, arrest records, surveillance reports, and other intelligence data have been collected, stored and disseminated by State and local law enforcement agencies with the help of Federal funds.

I would like to outline for the benefit of my colleagues the provisions of my legislation:

First. A State is automatically entitled to Federal funds if it files a comprehensive plan for the improvement of law enforcement and criminal justice.

Second. To qualify the plan must meet certain procedural requirements designed to: First, encourage the participation of local governments and the public in the formulation of the plan; second, insure monitoring and evaluation of program effectiveness; and third, prevent waste and mismanagement through public accountability and tight fiscal controls.

Third. Localities—counties, villages, towns and cities—apply for funding of crime control projects from the State. The State must act on all such applications within 60 days.

Fourth. High crime areas—rural, suburban or urban—are automatically entitled to yearly grants from the State if such areas prepare a comprehensive plan to control crime and meet procedural requirements similar to those applicable to the State.

Fifth. Funds are distributed under this act by the Federal Government to the States on a formula based one part on population and two parts on crime rates. High crime areas would also receive a larger share of State funds since States must distribute its funds to them on a similar formula.

This is a major advancement over existing legislation. Most of the money to fight crime should be spent where most of the crime occurs—whether it be in cities, rural areas, or suburbia.

Sixth. Fifteen percent of the funds allocated as special revenue-sharing payments may be spent by the Federal Government on a discretionary basis. Special preference, however, must be given to high crime areas that are in need of additional Federal money and have proven that they can implement effective law enforcement programs.

Seventh. The existing law enforcement education program is maintained in H.R. 8021 since this has been widely acclaimed as one of the most successful efforts developed under the Safe Streets Act legislation.

Eighth. Excessive expenditures on "hardware" are discouraged by limiting the amount of Federal funds to be expended on such purchases to 25 percent of their value unless the locality can demonstrate to the Federal Government that more money is justified. Competitive bidding is also mandated under my proposal.

Ninth. Finally, all levels of Government would be compelled to monitor and evaluate their programs carefully in order to continue to receive Federal moneys.

Tenth. A civil liberties provision is included that would prevent the use of Federal funds for the collection and dissemination of surveillance data that is

not already a matter of public record by law enforcement agencies. Violation of this section would subject the offending party to a civil penalty of up to \$20,000 payable to the individual whose right to privacy had been violated.

Eleventh. The Executive is specifically precluded from impounding law enforcement funds granted under this legislation.

RETIREMENT OF NEWSMAN DILLON GRAHAM

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise, and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on the 31st of May next, Mr. Dillon Graham, a reporter for the Associated Press, will retire after 25 years of service as a Capitol correspondent for the Associated Press and after 44 years of continuous service with AP. Dillon Graham has, during this time of his 44 years' service, worked in the Atlanta, New York, Charlotte, and Washington bureaus. He has covered Congress since 1948, and his presence has been a pleasant and an effective one in and around the House of Representatives and in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuing his reportorial duties and activities, he has always been comparatively quiet and unassuming. At the same time he has always been extremely effective, courteous, and accurate as he has performed the duties to which he has been assigned in covering the legislative branch of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Graham and his wife, Gigi, plan to retire and make their home at Myrtle Beach, S.C.

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate my friend, Dillon Graham, on his earned and well-deserved retirement. For 25 years he has been an outstanding member of the Fourth Estate in covering the House of Representatives and the entire Capitol. He has served his profession well; he has served the Congress well. We wish him good luck and God-speed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) for taking this time to pay a deserved tribute to Dillon Graham, one of the veterans of the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press, as he prepares to go into retirement.

I first met Dillon shortly after I came to Washington in 1949. He is an outstanding news reporter and a real credit to his profession.

I am sure I speak for many others when I say that he will be missed as a member of the Capitol Press Corps, and we all wish him many years of pleasant living in his retirement.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very real feeling of mixed emotions that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding newsman, Dillon

Graham. While I certainly wish him the best in his retirement, his excellent coverage of this body will be greatly missed.

Dillon Graham represents the highest standards of journalism—standing in vivid contrast to the journalistic practices which Vice President AGNEW and others have condemned.

Like so many men and women of the working press, he has rendered a service to truth and to the people which it is very difficult to measure.

I do not know whether the rewards for such accomplishments on Earth and in Heaven are very great, but his retirement years should be enriched by the knowledge of a difficult job well done through the years of reporting.

It seems to me that there ought to be some special corner of Heaven set aside for such good guys of the press as Dillon Graham.

I wish him well in his retirement, but he will certainly be missed in the House of Representatives.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the retirement of Mr. Dillon Graham.

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

There was no objection.

ARNOLD MILLER'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I present Arnold Miller's accounting of his stewardship of the United Mine Workers Union of America during his first 5 months as President of that great union:

STATEMENT OF UMWA PRESIDENT ARNOLD MILLER, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, MAY 4, 1973

A little over four months ago, an iron gate barred the main stairway in the UMWA's Washington headquarters. Today, that gate is gone. It is only one of many recent changes at the UMWA. But it symbolizes them all.

The obstacles that barred coal miners from their union have been removed. The United Mine Workers, today, belongs to the rank-and-file.

Probably the most far-reaching reform is the establishment of democracy in the union's districts. For the past 30 years, all but four of the UMWA's 24 districts were kept under trusteeships by the International Union, and rank-and-file mineworkers were denied the right to elect their district officials. The UMWA during this period was like a government of the United States in which the President appointed both Houses of Congress, the Governors of every state, and the officials who counted the ballots in Presidential elections. It was, in short, a dictatorship.

On our first day in office, Vice President Trbovich, Secretary-Treasurer Patrick and I submitted a resolution to the union's International Executive Board calling for democratic elections in every UMWA district. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Today, elections for the offices of District

President, Secretary-Treasurer, and International Executive Board Member are being held under independent supervision in 12 UMWA districts. The remaining districts are either going to be merged to save operating expenses or are under court jurisdiction. Elections in these districts will probably take place by the end of the year. Following its election, each district will hold a convention to draft a district constitution and make plans to hold elections for the posts of district representatives.

After years of struggle by rank-and-file miners, the district elections are a great victory for trade union democracy. More than any other reform, democracy represents the hope for revitalizing the United Mine Workers as a militant trade union and as a progressive political force.

For the district officers who will be chosen by the rank-and-file determine union policy in the coalfields.

District representatives provide help to rank-and-file miners who feel their contract rights to seniority, wages, job posting, and the like have been abridged and who file a grievance against the company involved. In the past, district representatives were largely appointments designed to buy off influential rank-and-filers or potential rebels. They owed nothing to the rank-and-file and rarely fought to protect its interests in grievance cases. As their contract rights were slowly whittled away coal miners resorted to the wildcat strikes as their only protection.

The need to stand for election will force district representatives to be accountable to the miners they are supposed to represent or risk being voted out of office. In the future, at every step of the grievance process, coal operators can expect to face rank-and-file miners supported by district representatives who fight for the man, not give in to the management.

District presidents are the union's leaders in the coalfields. But under previous administrations, appointed district presidents viewed independent political activity by coal miners as a threat to their control and used the union's resources to suppress it.

In 1969, West Virginia coal miners organized the Black Lung Association to educate their union brothers about the ravages of miners' lung diseases. Eventually, about 40,000 coal miners went on strike for three weeks to gain recognition of black lung as a compensable disease under state workmen's compensation. As a founder of the Black Lung Association, I was shocked when West Virginia's UMWA district presidents denounced our group as a dual union and tried to prevent any UMWA local union from donating to our cause.

The Black Lung movement succeeded despite the opposition of the former United Mine Workers leadership. But it will never be known how many other efforts by rank-and-filers to improve their living and working conditions died a-borning because of the hostility of UMWA officials. I am confident that once the leadership in the districts is elected by the rank-and-file there will be a resurgence of grass roots efforts by coal miners not only to improve their working conditions, but to elect progressive, pro-labor candidates to political office, and to win legislative improvements in workmen's compensation, minimum wage, and mine health and safety. This time the UMWA will be 100% behind them.

The International Executive Board (IEB) members who will be elected in each district are the chief governing body of the union according to the UMWA constitution. But under my predecessor, the appointed IEB members were little more than a rubber stamp in the hands of the officers. They approved the expenditure of millions of dollars in union dues money that was illegally used to finance the 1969 Boyle re-election effort and presided over a decade's misuse of funds so

flagrant it makes the Committee for the Re-election of the President look like a nickle-dime operation.

Few coal miners knew, for instance, that \$68,894 of their dues money paid for a two-room suite in the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel occupied by former Secretary-Treasurer John Owens between 1963 and 1968. But the former members of the IEB knew and okayed the expenditure.

Shortly after I took my oath of office, I pledged that "The days when UMW officers lived like kings at the expense of the membership are over." A democratically-elected International Executive Board, exercising its full constitutional authority to oversee the union's affairs, will be the surest guarantee against their return.

But no matter how democratic the union's governing body and how well-intentioned its officers, the danger persists that here in Washington the new administration will become isolated from the men who don their hard-hats and lamps every day and labor in the nation's coal mines to earn a living.

That is why it's so vital to strip away the special privileges, inflated salaries, and extra benefits that separated the former officers from the rank-and-file miner. Since taking office, we have slashed salaries of the International officers and staff by 20 percent and have eliminated special per diems, medical privileges, and full-salary pensions for the top three officers.

In the past, staff and officers enjoyed a minimum of four weeks vacation while working coal miners got only two weeks under the 1971 National Coal Wage Agreement. Under the new vacation plan recently adopted by the Executive Board, those who work at the International, including the International officers, will receive the same vacation benefits as the contract provides for our members. Finally, in a much publicized sale, the UMW disposed of the three Cadillac limousines used by its former officers and leased two Chevrolets instead.

These reforms save the union considerable sums of money. But, what's more important, they affirm that Mike Trbovich, Harry Patrick, and I are coal miners and union men who don't need the trappings of corporate executives to win respect for the offices we hold.

Secretary-Treasurer Patrick recently summed up the change at the UMW this way. "The UMW used to have Cadillacs driven by chauffeurs," he said. "Now we have Chevrolets and the rank-and-file is in the driver's seat."

One further democratic safeguard has been the creation of an independent UMW Journal open to all views and expressions of opinion. In the past, a change in UMW leadership was most apparent in the Journal's letters to the editor section. Letters that used to read, "God Bless John L. Lewis" were replaced by letters that read "God Bless Tony Boyle."

The new administration intends to go one step further. Whether a coal miner wants to write a letter to the editor that says "God Bless Arnold Miller" or a letter that says "God Save Us From Arnold Miller", the UMW Journal will provide him the space to print it.

We had hoped to give every candidate in the district elections space in the Journal to present his platform to the membership. Unfortunately, the Department of Labor was unable to supervise the allocation of Journal space to the candidates, as it did in the International election, and we could not risk the possibility of charges of partisanship and court challenges to the elections if we supervised it ourselves. At the upcoming union convention, I plan to ask the delegates to approve a constitutional amendment that will guarantee Journal space to candidates in future elections.

A free and independent UMW Journal, as recent events in Washington have demonstrated, will be an effective counter to the

isolation any administration can fall victim to. And it will save my press secretary the difficult task of trying to explain the meaning of "inoperative" to a skeptical coal miner.

Here in Washington, we have taken steps to revitalize the UMW-owned National Bank of Washington. Seven new board members were elected to the NBW Board of Directors in March from the ranks of Washington's business community and labor movement. As Washington's third largest banking facility, we are confident that the NBW will take an increasingly active role in the Washington community with particular emphasis on increasing its program of loans to minority business enterprises.

The UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund is also located in Washington. Though legally, it is a separate entity from the United Mine Workers, the union appoints one of its three governing trustees. When I came into office, the union-appointed trustee was Edward Carey, UMW General Counsel under Tony Boyle. I removed Carey from that position, an action he challenged in court, but which was subsequently upheld by a U.S. District Judge. I am presently serving as union trustee.

The problems facing the Fund are very great. A recent court ruling added approximately 17,000 additional miners and widows to the pension fund rolls. The ruling was a tremendous victory for thousands of mining families who had been illegally denied the pension benefits for which they worked all their lives. But it placed an additional burden on the Fund's assets, depleted by years of misuse. Last year, the Fund paid out \$34 million more than it took in. Yet, despite its financial problems, the Fund's present benefit program will have to be increased for it consigns coal miners to a future of pension poverty, rather than pension security. Soft coal miners, who are fortunate enough to qualify, retire on \$150 a month after 20 years work. Anthracite miners receive \$30 a month pensions. If a man is killed in the mines, his widow receives no pension benefits. A disabled miner loses his medical protection four years after he is injured.

Two things are predictable in the negotiations for the 1974 contract.

The coal industry will be asked to contribute more for the welfare of its employees. And the coal industry will claim it can't afford to. I was raised in the coalfields and have been a coal miner all my working life. But I have never heard a coal operator say he was making any money. To hear the operators tell it, the coal industry is the longest-running nonprofit organization in the nation, devoted solely to providing employment for miners.

Profit figures tell another story. The profits of Old Ben Coal Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil, rose 137 percent between 1968 and 1972 according to reports filed with the Security Exchange Commission. Peabody Coal, a subsidiary of Kennecott Copper Company, boasted an 84 percent rise in profits last year according to the same sources. Consolidation Coal Company, owned by Continental Oil, experienced a rise of 118 percent.

From 1969 to 1972, the combined profits of the following eight coal companies showed a net gain of 69.5 percent—North American Coal, Westmoreland Coal, Rochester and Pittsburgh Coal, Valley Camp Coal, Eastern Associated Coal, Zeigler Coal, Baukol-Noonan, and the Pittston Company's coal divisions.

The United Mine Workers will be responsible in its bargaining position. But the industry must recognize that coal miners are no longer willing to risk their lives and choke on coal dust eight hours a day, yet receive no pay when they are sick and retire after a lifetime of work on less than \$40 a week.

The pick and shovel days are over. Coal miners, today, are skilled industrial workers. Increasingly, they are younger men, many of them Vietnam veterans. All of them are unwilling to repeat the history of their fathers who worked their lives and health away and have nothing to show for it.

The energy industry has reaped tremendous profits and the nation's industrial expansion has been fueled by the labor of coal miners. Now miners are asking for a just return. The new leadership of the United Mine Workers is determined that they receive it.

Sick pay, aid to disabled miners and widows, and increased pensions can only be won in future contract negotiations. But there is one goal that coal miners are unwilling to postpone—safety in the mines.

Over 100,000 coal miners have been killed in the nation's coal mines in this century alone. Think about that for a moment. We're not talking about statistics, but men. Men like Roger Argabrite, a 26-year-old coal miner from Lynco, West Virginia, and father of two children, crushed by a roof fall April 26th in an Eastern Associated Coal Corporation mine. Or Kenneth Holland, a 21 year-old coal miner from Browder, Kentucky caught in a conveyor belt in a Peabody Coal Company mine on April 9th and run through its rollers. He left a wife and child.

The nation's coalfields are littered with the human debris of the mining industry—men with one arm, or two fingers on a hand, men whose backs were broken by tons of mine roof that fell silently, without warning. Widows who never had the comfort of growing old with their husbands and children who grew up with a memory instead of a father. And the walking dead—the victims of black lung—whose every step is a reminder that their lungs are little more than masses of black coal dust.

My friends, coal miners have had enough of dying. Coal miners' wives have had enough of widowhood. Coal miners' children have been dressed in mourning too long.

For years we've heard that miners die because coal mining is inherently dangerous. It's a myth. Last July, nine coal miners died in a fire at Consolidation Coal's Blacksville No. 1 mine near Fairmont, West Virginia. They didn't die because coal mining is dangerous work. They died because Consolidation Coal Company violated the law.

When a piece of mine machinery is moved in the narrow confines of an underground coal mine, there is always the possibility it will come in contact with overhead electrical cables and cause a fire. West Virginia mining law requires the removal of any miner who is working beyond the piece of machinery before it is moved. Then, if a fire breaks out, no one will be trapped within the mine cut off from the circulating air.

Consol simply ignored this law when moving a huge continuous mining machine on July 20 even though there were only inches of clearance between the mine roof and the machine and an energized trolley wire overhead. Nine men were kept working beyond the machinery while it was moved. A fire broke out. The men were trapped and suffocated within an hour.

In the seven months preceding the fire, Blacksville No. 1 mine had been cited for 485 violations of the federal coal mine health and safety act and 465 violations of state mining laws. Sections of the mine had been shut down on 19 separate occasions for conditions of imminent danger and the mine had been cited 24 times for accumulation of flammable materials. Two days before the fire, Bureau of Mines inspectors had issued a violation notice for "excessive accumulations of loose coarse coal, oil, and grease on and round" the machine which caused the fire.

It wasn't fate that killed nine men in Blacksville, but corporate irresponsibility and greed. Production time would have been

lost if the nine men had been removed from the mine. And time, we are told, is money.

The argument that coal mining is unavoidably dangerous work fails to explain why other nations boast safety records vastly superior to the United States or why some American companies have made real progress in reducing fatalities and injuries.

American coal mines kill six times as many miners per million man shifts as West German mines, four times as many as British mines, and three times as many as coal mines in Russia. For every million tons of coal mined by the Pittston Company in 1970, at least one coal miner was killed and more than 35 suffered serious injuries. At U.S. Steel, on the other hand, with a total production of 18.7 million tons of coal in 1970 only one miner was killed in all of the company's mines and a total of 35 injured.

During my campaign, I pledged to the membership that coal will be mined safely or not at all. It is a pledge I intend to keep. The UMW safety division is assembling a team made up of veteran coal miners skilled in all areas of mine safety, attorneys trained in mine safety legislation, and physicians knowledgeable about miners' health problems. This team will be equipped to make on-site inspections of coal mines and provide immediate support in local safety disputes.

Since we have been in office, the new UMW safety division has provided assistance to two coal miners fired for refusing to operate unsafe equipment in a U.S. Pipe and Foundry mine in Alabama; members of a local union who refused to drink water from unsanitary, rat-infested containers at an Island Creek Coal Company mine in West Virginia; and rank-and-filers demanding the removal of a new foreman who had ordered them to work in hazardous methane gas at a U.S. Steel mine in Pennsylvania.

With the safety division's support, the Alabama miners were re-hired, the West Virginia miners filed a grievance against their company, and U.S. Steel agreed to put the foreman challenged by Pennsylvania miners into a safety training program.

The primary union responsibility for enforcing mine safety rests with local UMW safety committees. Under the 1971 contract, committees elected from each local union have the power to inspect coal mines and shut down any section in which they find an imminent danger.

In the past, safety committeemen who pursued their responsibility vigorously were often transferred by management to a workplace filled with water, forced to work in low coal, or fired. The companies felt free to take such action because they knew the United Mine Workers leadership would not intervene. That situation has changed.

Any safety committee which shuts down a section or mine which in its judgment poses a threat to the lives or health of coal miners will get the complete support of the UMW today. Perhaps when certain coal operators discover that it is more costly to run their mines unsafely than to run them safely, they will also discover that coal mining is not inherently dangerous.

The failure of former UMW leaders to support local safety committees parallels the present problem with the safety effort at the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Officials at top levels of the Bureau are so industry-oriented that they continually undercut the efforts of mine safety inspectors in the field. Instead of a department staffed with experienced personnel, trained in mine safety, the upper reaches of the Bureau have become an oasis for political job seekers and public relations specialists.

In January 1971, the White House hired Edward Failor as a \$100 a day consultant at the Bureau of Mines. Failor's experience included political support for Barry Goldwater in 1964, work as a paid lobbyist for the Iowa Association of Coin Operated Laundries, and

service in the 1970 campaign of then-Republican Congressman Clark MacGregor against Senator Hubert Humphrey.

Mr. Failor had never been inside a coal mine, talked to a federal mine inspector, or read a copy of the coal mine health and safety act when he was hired by the Bureau. Nevertheless, a few weeks later, he was named by the White House as a \$35,000-a-year assistant to Bureau of Mines Director Elbert Orborn and asked to establish a Bureau procedure for assessing penalties for violations of the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

A federal judge threw out Failor's first collection scheme in March of 1970 because it did not comply with the law's requirements. Undaunted, Failor drew upon his experience as a municipal judge in Dubuque, Iowa, and prepared a new procedure. In April 1970 and again in February 1971, West Virginia Congressman Ken Hechler warned the Bureau that the new assessment procedure again failed to comply with the law. The Government Accounting Office and the Comptroller General sounded similar warnings. The warnings went unheeded.

On March 9, 1973 U.S. District Court Judge Aubrey E. Robinson ruled in response to a suit by the Independent Coal Operators that the Bureau's assessment procedure was unlawful. The ruling virtually invalidated \$24 million in penalties which had been assessed, but never collected, against coal companies.

There was no reaction from Ed Failor at the Bureau of Mines, however. He had already moved on to a job with the Committee for the Re-Election of the President. In late March, Failor was named to a high post in the Commerce Department.

Ed Failor's brief, inept reign at the Bureau of Mines might sound like the stuff of comedy. It isn't. During Failor's 18 months as head of the Bureau's assessment office, 271 men died violently in mine accidents, 40,000 miners were injured, and about 2,000 more were disabled for the rest of their lives.

Donald Schlick is Deputy Director for Health and Safety at the Bureau.

Last year, he amazed just about everyone by declaring that as a result of the Bureau's enforcement of dust control standards, black lung is a disease of the past. Not a single medical authority could be found to support this claim, nor had any independent study been made to verify that the sampling devices used by the Bureau accurately measure coal dust in a mine. Privately, Bureau officials concede that the sampling technique probably couldn't withstand a court challenge by coal operators. Coal miners, who continue to spit up mouthfuls of black coal dust after each shift, found Schlick's statement strangely reminiscent of the claims, made up until several years ago, that black lung does not exist.

Two months ago, Donald Schlick informed the world that, due to the Bureau's efforts, it is now safer to work in a coal mine than to drive a car on the nation's highway, a statement which prompted one coal miner to vow never to take a ride with Mr. Schlick at the wheel. Bureau Director Osborn was moved to point out that there had, in fact, been an increase in the over-all injury rate during 1972. And a dedicated information officer at the Bureau was courageous enough to say in response to reporters' inquiries, that "For anyone to make this kind of comparison would indicate he had no clear concept of the Bureau's mission."

More disturbing than Mr. Schlick's public relations gimmickry is his cozy relationship with the industry he is mandated to regulate. The Louisville Courier-Journal recently revealed that Schlick and two of his aides had accepted free transportation on a Food Machinery Corporation plane from Los Angeles to a company mine in Wyoming which the Bureau inspects. FMC has 5.9 million dollars in research contracts with the Bureau, and Department of Interior regulations pro-

hibit acceptance of gifts or favors from companies doing business with it.

In an interview with the UMW Journal, Schlick acknowledged that he had also accepted free transportation on a plane owned by Mine Safety Appliances, another company doing business with the Bureau. And the Courier-Journal discovered that Mr. Schlick had apparently violated departmental ethics once again. Last fall the Courier said, Schlick had accepted five free football tickets and a weekend holiday provided by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, which has had over \$250,000 in research contracts with the Bureau over the past five years.

The day before he and his family left for their football weekend, Schlick sent a strongly worded memo to the Bureau's deputy director for mineral resources stating he was "quite chagrined" to learn that a proposed \$585,000 contract between the Bureau and VPI had been disapproved. Schlick wrote that "I strongly suggest that you reconsider this project" and fund it in total. The next day he was off to the ballgame.

On April 1, Schlick received a reprimand from Acting Secretary of Interior John Whitaker for accepting the free transportation on the FMC plane. According to Whitaker any repetition of such conduct would result in Schlick's immediate suspension and possible dismissal.

Yet the letter made no mention at all of the other instance of travel on a company plane or the acceptance of gifts from VPI. A month has gone by and the Department has not commented on the incidents.

How can the nation's coal miners have any confidence in an official who continually violates regulations against acceptance of favors from companies he is supposed to regulate? In the face of the Department's silence on two apparent violations of its ethics, can the public be confident that there will be "no whitewash" at the Bureau of Mines?

If Mr. Schlick's actions were isolated indiscretions, they might be overlooked. Unfortunately, they are consistent with the Bureau's history of coziness with the coal industry. Too many fines have gone uncollected. Too many warnings that collection procedures will not withstand a court challenge have gone unheeded.

Until the Bureau of Mines cleans its house of self-serving political appointees and public relations artists; until the Bureau recognizes that its mission is to clean up the mines, not strike a balance between productivity and saving men's lives; and until the Bureau understands that its constituents are American coal miners, not coal company executives, it will remain an agency with little credibility in the nation's coalfields or at the United Mine Workers of America.

Before closing, I want to touch briefly on the UMW's role in the labor movement and our recent legislative efforts.

The United Mine Workers was once a leader in the labor movement and every coal miner can take pride that his union helped build the United Steelworkers of America, the United Auto Workers of America, and the CIO. The UMW, allied with other progressive trade unions, intends to be a vital force in the labor movement once again.

In the four months the new administration has been in office, the UMW has supported a successful strike by members of the National Union of Drug and Hospital Employees in Richlands, Virginia; a successful organizing effort by reporters and editors in Morgantown, West Virginia; a recognition strike by members of the Communication Workers of America at a Pikeville, Kentucky hospital; and the candidacy of James Morrissey, a rank-and-file reformer seeking the presidency of the National Maritime Union.

On the home front, we are getting ready to launch a major UMW organizing drive—the first in over a decade—aimed at the large surface mines opening up out west and

the hundreds of smaller non-union mines throughout the eastern coalfields. Close to 50,000 non-union coal miners in the United States produce over one hundred million tons of coal a year. Our organizing drive will end when every one of them is a United Mine Worker and a royalty is paid into the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund on every ton of coal they mine.

On the legislative front, UMW representatives testified recently on pension reform before the Special Pension Task Force of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In its testimony, the UMW supported the strongest possible provisions for early vesting, portability, standards for trustees, widows' benefits, and easy eligibility.

Our major legislative effort is to find congressional relief for the threat posed to coal miners because of industry's failure to develop sulphur control technology. As I pointed out in my recent statement on the energy crisis, present state regulations under the 1970 Clean Air Act will eliminate the jobs of 26,000 coal miners who mine coal too high in sulphur to burn under present pollution standards.

Coal miners remember when the mines automated in the 50's and hundreds of thousands of miners were thrown out of work. Automation of the mines was called progress, but its costs were borne only by the miners, not the industry or the public. Pollution control is also progress, but this time coal miners expect the nation and the industry to help bear its burdens as well as its rewards.

Despite threats of blackouts and brown-outs and the nation's increasing need for electrical power, the administration has cut by \$8 million funds mandated in the 1974 budget for sulphur control. We have asked the Congress to restore those funds and to institute a crash program to develop sulphur controls.

We had hoped that President Nixon's long-awaited energy message would commit the nation to development of its huge coal reserves as its most stable, long-term source of energy. Common sense and history both dictate such an approach. Coal represents 80 percent of our domestic energy supply. And in every political and economic crisis in recent times, the nation has turned to coal as the most reliable, abundant fuel here at home.

I could not help but note the irony when less than 24 hours after President Nixon announced elimination of oil import quotas, Saudi Arabia announced it would not expand its oil production unless the United States alters its political stance in the Middle East. It seems we cannot learn from the past. The President's new energy policy is based on the same heavy reliance on foreign supplies of energy that created the crisis we face today.

While we discuss band-aid solutions to the present fuel shortages such as recommendations that we tape our doors to prevent winter heat loss, over a trillion tons of coal lie untapped beneath our feet. Coal can guarantee the nation's energy needs for hundreds of years to come if we unchain our vast reserves. The alternative is political blackmail for decades to come. The key to self-sufficiency is coal.

Less than a year has passed since 400 rank-and-file coal miners braved threats of reprisals, blackball, and even murder to gather in Wheeling, West Virginia, to nominate their candidates for leadership of the United Mine Workers and to adopt a platform of goals for the future.

Many of the goals in that platform—sick pay, credit unions, a union headquarters in the coalfields, and safety in the mines—have not yet been fulfilled.

But rather than be discouraged, I am reminded of what a coal miner said at the Wheeling convention. This miner has been beaten bloody on the floor of the 1964 UMW

convention for trying to say what he believed.

In Wheeling, in 1972, at the Miners for Democracy convention, that same miner was chairing part of the proceedings. Several delegates from the floor complained to him that the convention was moving too slowly, and the miner acknowledged that it was true. But he didn't mind, he said, and gave the reason why.

"Democracy," the miner said, "always takes a little longer."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, without creating a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD today.

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

There was no objection.

I AM WHAT I AM

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there are those who have doubts about the present generation of young people, particularly the students in the schools. I believe that the present young generation is, on the whole, notwithstanding some who have fallen into drug use and into other grave abuses, the finest young generation we have ever had. They are generally stronger physically. They are generally keener intellectually, and, in general, I think they are more idealistic than their predecessor generation. A beautiful example of the finest qualities in a young student has been brought to my attention by my sister, Mrs. Sarah Pepper Willis, who teaches in the Fort Lauderdale Sunrise Junior High School, who has given me a poem entitled, "I Am What I Am," by a young English student in one of her classes, Jill Parker, age 13. I think this beautiful poem by this spiritual-minded and talented young lady will be of interest to my colleagues and our fellow countrymen and I include it in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

I AM WHAT I AM

(By Jill Parker)

Moses fell to his knees in the dirt and the dust,
"I must get my people from Egypt, I must!"
The flaming bush burned fiery red.
"Pharaoh shall know that my God is not dead."
"Moses go forth, be free of Pharaoh's hand,
"Follow your God to the Promised Land."
"But who shall I say is their Master on High?"
And God sat back and gave a small sigh,
"I am what I am. That is my Name."
And the bush burned brighter, extending its flame.
Moses led his people to the Promised Land,
And all was accomplished by God's mighty hand.

THREATENED PETROLEUM SHORTAGE

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we all know about the threatened petroleum shortage in this country. We are told that there is a possibility that gasoline rationing may be required. Such action would be a shock to the people of this country and would impose upon them immeasurable burden and inconvenience. The Florida Petroleum Marketers Association, with its principal office in Tallahassee, has submitted to me a series of resolutions which this knowledgeable group of independent distributors believe will relieve or do much to relieve the threatened shortage. Mr. Speaker, I include these resolutions in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas increased exploration, production, and refining capacity must be forthcoming at the earliest possible date if our nation is to avert a continuing energy crisis, and

Whereas incentives must be increased to encourage expenditure of capital to produce the petroleum energy to meet the increased consumer demand,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Florida Petroleum Marketers Association does hereby endorse and encourage Congress to restore the percentage depletion allowance to 27½% and provide additional investment credits for the increased refinery capacity necessary to avert a continuing energy crisis and provide the necessary petroleum products for the consuming public, and

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be supplied to the Florida Legislature and interested State Agencies of Florida.

Adopted this day, May 4, 1973, at the general meeting session of the Association at Tampa, Florida.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the world shortage of crude and refined products has caused the price of foreign products to be in excess of domestic crude and refined products, and

Whereas the Cost of Living Council has restricted the price increases of the 23 major petroleum supplying companies that can be passed on to no more than 1½%, and

Whereas the importation of foreign petroleum products would not be economically feasible under the Cost of Living guidelines, since such increased price could not be passed on,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Florida Petroleum Marketers Association does hereby endorse and encourage that the President of the United States immediately lift such Cost of Living restrictions on these 23 major supplying companies as a positive step towards increasing the supply of petroleum products in the United States, and

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be supplied to the Florida Legislature and interested State Agencies of Florida.

Adopted this day, May 4, 1973, at the general meeting session of the Association at Tampa, Florida.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the completion of the Alaskan Pipeline from Prudhoe Bay would do much towards eliminating the current energy crisis, and

Whereas the President has recommended that Congress pass the necessary legislation to increase the right-of-way through the Federally owned lands in Alaska that the oil companies need to construct the pipeline.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Florida Petroleum Marketers Association does hereby endorse and encourage Congress to pass this

legislation as early as possible as a priority matter, and

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be supplied to the Florida Legislature and interested State Agencies of Florida.

Adopted this day, May 4, 1973, at the general meeting session of the Association at Tampa, Florida.

RESOLUTION

Whereas much of the energy shortage has been brought about through restrictive E.P.A. Regulations in the use of certain petroleum products and coal, in the generation of electricity, and

Whereas much of the energy shortage is contributable to the restrictive standards placed upon automobile gasoline and emissions, and

Whereas the generation of electricity through the use of No. 2 heating oil has proven to be an uneconomical use of No. 2 heating oil, taking four gallons of oil to produce the equivalent amount of energy as one gallon of oil, and

Whereas the use of such No. 2 heating oil in generating electricity has severely increased the demand of such product and whereas utility companies are willing to pay excessive prices for such fuel oil products and thus further increase the shortage of heating oil for home and industrial consumption.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Florida Petroleum Marketers Association does hereby endorse and encourage Congress to pass such legislation that would increase the well head price of natural gas, and the temporary suspension of current restrictive E.P.A. Regulations on the use of petroleum products, and

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be supplied to the Florida Legislature and interested State Agencies of Florida.

Adopted this day, May 4, 1973, at the general meeting session of the Association at Tampa, Florida.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the independent branded jobber has traditionally paid a premium for his branded product because of brand identification, credit cards, national advertising and has, through the years represented his supplier's brand and image throughout his territory, and

Whereas the margins of profit of the independent branded jobbers have traditionally been based upon corresponding increases in the tankwagon price of petroleum products, when wholesale prices were increased, and

Whereas the independent jobber has traditionally received cash discounts upon payment of his product accounts within 10 days, and

Whereas the independent jobber has traditionally received hauling allowances based upon the published rates of the Public Service Commission, and

Whereas the independent jobbers have been placed upon product allocations that are based upon his 1972 sales due to the overall product shortage.

Therefore, be it resolved that the members of the Florida Petroleum Marketers Association do hereby urge that their respective supplying companies adhere to these long established policies of accompanying wholesale price increases with tankwagon price increases, the normal cash discounts and hauling allowances and just and equitable product allowances and just and equitable product allocation between jobber and direct company operations.

Adopted this day, May 4, 1973, at the general meeting session of the Association at Tampa, Florida.

REPRESENTATIVE PEPPER URGES RENT CONTROL FOR GREATER MIAMI AREA

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that under the legislation we recently extended the President has authority to impose rent controls where he feels the situation justifies it. In my district there is a severe need for such controls to be imposed. Ours is an area where there is less than 1-percent vacancy in available rental space. In my county of Dade, I am advised that 41 percent of the population overpays for rent. In some areas, particularly Miami Beach, it is my understanding that the ratio is even higher with over 50 percent of the population over 60 years of age overpaying for their housing as much as two-thirds of their income. I have written a letter to the President respectfully urging that he consider the problems in the Greater Miami area and take such action as will be necessary and effective to protect the people of that area, particularly people of low income, from paying excessive rent. My letter to the President follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1973.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President,
United States of America.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will please allow me to bring to your attention the fact that excessive increases in rent are plaguing many communities in our nation and victimizing, among others, thousands of elderly Americans who retired to live in these communities on fixed incomes.

South Florida leads the country in new housing construction, I understand. However, both Federal and state programs have failed to alleviate the less than 1% vacancy rate for available housing including substandard dwellings. I am informed the highest rents in the country are those in Broward County, Florida. In Dade County, 41% of the population overpays for rent (over-payment being defined as more than 25% of income for rent). In some areas in Dade County, including parts of Miami Beach, I am informed the figure is even higher, with more than 50% of the population over 60 years of age over-paying for their housing as much as two-thirds of their income. I am confident similar conditions prevail in other states, most particularly New York, California, Illinois and others that have a large concentration of elderly Americans. During Phase II, many on the front lines in the battle against inflation thought the rent stabilization guidelines to be a meager governmental effort, hardly meaningful. But with the coming of Phase III every tenant was to learn just how bad housing facilities could be. In Dade County, there has been a continuing rash of rent increases averaging over 30% for all types of accommodations. This has burdened low-income elderly, and even middle and upper income elderly!

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that you have the mandate from the Congress under the Economic Stabilization Act, to stop this tragic exploitation of our nation's elderly, and to authorize and direct the stabilization of rents at levels prevailing on January 10, 1973, in communities where a less than 1% vacancy rate is indicated.

I am hopeful that you will consider favorably my request and that we may recognize and assume Federal responsibility for the elderly as a target group under the Economic Stabilization Act.

Believe me.

Very sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

A SUMMARY—FOR NOW—OF THE QUESTION OF AMNESTY

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

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, if Congress were to discuss amnesty as objectively as some of my constituents, this country could quickly find its direction on the issue and move to a new reconciliation—what I would like to think of as a "new patriotism"—and build again on the social bonds which have united this country in the past.

Since I began speaking to the House on the subject of amnesty, in what has now stretched to a series of six weekly statements, I have received 31 constituent letters which directly comment on my remarks. Nineteen of those letters are in varying degrees complimentary to my comments, and 12 vary in the degree of their disapproval. I have included a few examples of these remarks in previous statements, and today I will insert a few more which indicate the kind of response I am getting.

A Broome County New Yorker writes:

As you have asked for peoples' views on amnesty, these are our personal feelings.

Think of the boys who went because of pride and courage and love of their country. Some of whom lost their lives, their limbs, their minds. In fact gave their all. Now some people want to let the cowards and conscientious objectors come crawling back to this country they wouldn't fight for.

We think this is a good way to promote a country of weaklings.

Why should anyone fight for their country if they know they will be protected and can come back when the war is over?

From the same county in New York:

Today's paper says you have received 20 letters on this subject [of amnesty].

To me, it is no less than shocking that you would espouse a cause of those who are devoid of any sense of national patriotism.

Although you have been honored by elevation to the 33° in Scottish Rite Masonry, it is obvious you have not learned (nor agreed with) the teaching that our nation is not to be betrayed nor deserted, as portrayed in the 20°.

Many of us subscribe to the form of patriotism that makes a man's decision to walk out on his country an act that deprives him of his citizenship, his pride in the honor of this flag—and makes him a man without a country.

What meaning can an oath of citizenship have to those adopting this great nation as theirs—if our natural born are allowed to desecrate our flag by deserting it?

Do you hear us?

That message I "heard," Mr. Speaker, but there were other voices as still another Broome County constituent writes to say:

I have been planning to write to you about the amnesty issue long before it was announced that you were placing the matter solidly before the U.S. Congress.

I have heartily agreed with our respected President as to the priority of returning our servicemen and prisoners of war before the amnesty question could be justly considered.

We solid supporters of President Nixon have always felt that the "planetary poker" game, in which he is engaged, has required tremendous courage as a necessity to project a firm and tough image to the world. We have always been warned by the occasions when he comes across the television media as a very sincere, God-fearing man who will eventually "bring us together."

When he reiterates his "no amnesty" position, we of the silent majority have been telling ourselves that it is just a matter of time until he reveals his true feelings.

Those young resisters who felt no more or less bitter about the previous Administration's involvement in this obviously useless war than he did, expressed themselves in the loudest and only effective way open to them. They couldn't even vote.

Didn't we parents cast the votes to give Mr. Nixon the authority to fulfill his promise to end our participation?

Now that he has done a superb job of getting our men out of Viet Nam, it seems unthinkable that he could turn his back on the resisters. They helped to awaken the nation to the true state of affairs, and no doubt had a great influence on the Presidential vote in his favor.

I believe that you share with us the strong conviction that the time for amnesty is now.

We can not judge those who would not violate their consciences, nor can we assess the guilt or honor of those who fought the fight willingly or unwillingly. Only God can preside over that "court."

But this Easter Day one might come closer to the right answer through the message that rings louder than ever. "Father forgive them."

This letter would be sent directly to President Nixon if I thought it possible to reach him with such a simple message. I am grateful to be able to write to you in confidence that you're still concerned, and will keep this matter before Congress until the less courageous Members express themselves in favor of this worthy cause.

And, from Tompkins County:

Our Ithaca news is to the effect that you have attempted to stimulate some thinking among your colleagues on the matter of draft dodgers and deserters. The report is that Congress is not much interested at this time. But you have the initiative and I say good for you.

From meager details I infer your point is that draft dodgers and deserters should not be welcomed back as heroes of free thinking and conscience, neither forever banished. DD and D's may be dishonored, disgraced and deplored, but not despised, detested, and disenfranchised. When they pay their reasonable debt, as law breakers must, in recognition of those who gave time, life, and limb in patriotic service, we can then accept them again into our society as we do others who decide in some incident to live outside the mores of our people.

I interpret the news as saying your position is for justice but not revenge. I applaud your stand.

It has not been exactly by choice that I have emerged as a Congressional "litmus test"—as some Members of Congress and others watch for any form of reaction to my speeches—yet, so be it. For those who may be interested in more

closely defining the parameters of the test, it may be appropriate to mention that the above letters came from a Congressional District in which 53 percent of the population is classified as urban, 2.6 percent as rural farm residents and the remaining 44.4 percent as rural non-farm residents. The median age is 28.1, and the per capita income \$3,026. During the last congressional election, I received approximately 62 percent of the vote and my Democratic opponent drew 29 percent, with two other candidates splitting the remainder.

With no recent registration figures available, I would characterize party affiliation in my district as a mix between an active liberal Democratic minority, approximating 30-33 percent of registered voters, with the majority, about 60-63 percent being moderate to conservative Republicans. The remaining voters are registered as conservatives, liberals and independents.

Out of that group comes a small but lively, and often profound, discussion of amnesty, generated by the weekly news reports of the statements I have made here. It may be presumptuous to suggest that any of my colleagues could expect the same, yet I wonder if many of those who have been reluctant to speak up this far are not misguessing the reaction their statements will receive at home. I would ask those of my colleagues who can make a singular contribution to the future concord and vitality of America to look more closely at my own experience, if they wish; or, at least, to look a little more closely to their own area. They may well find what I have: That most of their constituents have not made up their minds about amnesty, that these people are looking for some direction from the Congress, and that they will receive, in a mature manner, an objective and responsible discussion of amnesty from their Congressman.

Congress may not find a neat legislative solution to so complex a question, but individual Members of Congress can plumb the best thinking and the best instincts of their constituents in a way that could set the early foundations for a new unity in America. As my past statements have suggested, one way to do this is to review the history of amnesty in this country. Such hindsight is immensely instructive both for the examples it offers, and for those insights it suggests when one asks why Congress or the President have initiated clemencies in the past and, in some instances, why they have not. The most recent, and probably the most pertinent, of these examples, that of President Truman, elicits several necessary questions about the advisability of amnesty for the post-Vietnam period.

Mr. Speaker, during his administration, President Truman issued four amnesties—known as the Christmas amnesties. In his first clemency, announced on the morning of December 24, 1945, Mr. Truman granted full pardon for all non-military crimes to those convicted men who had served during World War II and had received honorable discharges.

This amnesty was President Truman's gesture of gratitude to those released convicts who had performed faithful military service during World War II.

At the time of his first proclamation, the President let it be known that he was considering a general amnesty for draft resisters and deserters. Shortly thereafter, a "Committee for Amnesty" was formed to consider the possibility and to make recommendations to the President. The committee's membership, which joined some of the most prominent and respected personalities of the day, included Henry Luce, Pearl Buck, Thomas Mann, A. J. Muste, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Thornton Wilder, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Thurgood Marshall, and Frank Graham. The Amnesty Committee's preparatory work culminated in recommendations which became the substance of President Truman's Executive Order 9814 of December 23, 1946, which established the President's Amnesty Board. This three man body, headed by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, was empowered to "examine and consider the cases of all persons convicted of violation of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940." Together with Roberts, the Board included Mr. Willis Smith, former President of the American Bar Association, and Mr. James F. O'Neill, former police chief of Manchester, N.H.

The Amnesty Board was a new approach to the granting of clemency in the United States. Recognizing the diversity of the individuals involved, and the variety of the emotional and rational commitment which led them to resist the draft or desert the armed forces, this Presidential act provided for a case-by-case deliberation by the Board. There were 15,805 individual cases referred to the Board, and each was treated as a separate problem.

It is noted in one commentary on the Board's activity that the members had considered the grant of a general amnesty at the outset, but they subsequently decided not to make such a recommendation, because their Presidential mandate strongly inferred that cases be dealt with individually.

To provide such attention to each case, the Board had the assistance of 16 attorneys who gathered data on the family history, school and work records, criminal records, and selective service history of each violator. In accordance with the Executive order, the Amnesty Board could, when it chose, "make a report to the Attorney General which shall include its findings and its recommendations as to whether Executive clemency should be granted or denied, and in any case in which it recommends clemency, its recommendations with respect to the form that such clemency should take."

Using the data available to it, the Board took all mitigating circumstances into consideration, including ill health in the family, other family problems, illiteracy, or lack of understanding of obligations under the Selective Service Act. Each individual considered by the Board had the opportunity to file a brief or appear at a hearing to state his case. In addition, testimony was heard from rep-

representatives of various religious organizations, citizen groups, veterans organizations, and from officials of the U.S. Army, Navy, and National Selective Headquarters.

During 1972 hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, Mr. James F. O'Neill, the only surviving member of the Truman Amnesty Review Board described the operation of the Board and included in the record of the hearings the "Report of the President's Amnesty Board." Since that report provides a succinct description of the operation and the conclusions of the Amnesty Board, I will insert it in the RECORD at this point:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S AMNESTY BOARD

The President's Amnesty Board, established by Executive Order of December 23, 1946, to review convictions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1920, has completed its task and submits this, its first and final report.

Before adopting any general policies, the Board heard representatives of interested parties and groups. It heard representatives of historic peace churches, of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, leaders of the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society (whose followers are known as Jehovah's Witnesses), officials of the U.S. Army and Navy, and the National Headquarters of Selective Service, representatives of citizen's groups, veterans' organizations and pacifist organizations, some of the violators themselves, formerly inmates of penal institutions, appeared, either in person or by representatives and were heard.

In perhaps one half of the cases considered, the files reflected a prior record of one or more serious criminal offenses. The Board would have failed in its duty to society and to the memory of the men who fought and died to protect it, had amnesty been recommended in these cases. Nor could the Board have justified its existence, had a policy been adopted of refusing pardon to all.

In establishing policies, therefore, we were called upon to reconcile divergencies, and to adopt a course which would, on the one hand, be humane and in accordance with the tradition of the United States, and yet, on the other hand, would uphold the spirit of the law.

Examination of the large number of cases at the outset convinced us that to do justice to each individual as well as to the nation, it would be necessary to review each case upon its merit with the view of recommending individual pardons, and that no group would be granted amnesty as such.

Adequate review of the 15,805 cases brought to our attention would have been impossible had it not been for the cooperation of government departments and agencies, such as the Office of the Attorney General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Prisons, the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, the U.S. Probation Officers, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, U.S. Attorneys throughout the country, the Armed Forces of the U.S., and the Headquarters of Selective Service. The records of these offices were made available, and those in charge furnished requested information.

The information derived from all sources was briefed by a corps of trained reviewers. It included such essential data as family history, school and work records, prior criminal record, if any, religious affiliations and practices, Selective Service history, nature and circumstances of offenses, punishment imposed, time actually served in confinement, custodial records, probation reports, and conduct in society after release. In addition, the Board heard in most instances psychiatric reports for one or more voluntary statements

by the offender concerning the circumstances of the offense.

When the Board organized in January 1946, about 1,200 of 15,805 violators of Selective Service were in penal institutions, the number diminished daily. At the present time there are 626 in custody; 550 of these have been committed since the constitution of this Board. The work of the Board was directed chiefly to examining the propriety of recommending restoration of civil rights to those who have been returned to their homes.

In analyzing the cases we found that they fell into classes, but that in each class there were exceptional cases which took the offender out of the class and entitled him to special consideration. The main divisions into which the cases fell were: (1) those in violation due to a wilful intent to evade service; and (2) those resulting from beliefs derived from religious training or other convictions.

At least two thirds of the cases considered were those of wilful violations, not based on religious scruples. These varied greatly in the light of all the relevant facts disclosed in each case. It became necessary to consider not only the circumstances leading to the offense, but the subject's background, education and environment. In some instances what appeared a wilful violation was in fact due to ignorance, illiteracy, honest misunderstanding or carelessness not rising to the level of criminal negligence. In other cases the record showed a desire to remedy the fault by enlistment in the Armed Forces.

Many of the wilful violators were men with criminal records; many whose record included murder, rape, burglary, larceny, robbery, larceny of Government property, fraudulent enlistment, conspiracy to rob, arson, violations of the narcotics law, violations of the immigration laws, counterfeiting, desertion from the U.S. Armed Forces, embezzlement, breaking and entering, bigamy, drinking benzadrine to deceive medical examiners, felonious assault, violations of National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, extortion, blackmail, impersonation, insurance frauds, bribery, black market operations and other offenses of equally serious nature; men who were seeking to escape detection for crimes committed; fugitives from justice; wife deserters; and others who had ulterior motives for escaping the draft. Those who for these or similar reasons exhibited a deliberate evasion of the law, indicating no respect for the law or the civil rights to which they might have been restored, are not, in our judgment, deserving of a restoration of their civil rights, and we have not recommended them for pardon.

Among the violators, quite a number are now mental cases. We have made no attempt to deal with them, since most of them remain in mental institutions with little or no chance of recovery. Until they recover mental health, their loss of civil rights imposes no undue burden.

The Board has made no recommendation respecting another class of violators. These are the men who qualify for automatic pardon pursuant to Presidential Proclamation No. 2676, dated December 24, 1946. They are the violators who, after conviction, volunteered for service in the Armed Forces prior to December 24, 1946, have received honorable discharges following one year or more of duty. Most of those who, prior to the last-mentioned date and subsequent to that date, entered the Army and received honorable discharges with less than a year of service have been recommended for pardon. These men have brought themselves within the equity of Presidential Proclamation No. 2676.

The second class of violators consists of those who refused to comply with the law because of their religious training, or their religious, political or sociological beliefs. We have classified them, generally, as conscientious objectors. It is of interest that less than six

percent of those convicted of violating the act asserted conscientious conviction as the basis of their action. This percentage excludes Jehovah's Witnesses, whose cases were dealt with hereafter. Although the percentage was small, these cases presented difficult problems.

The Selective Service Boards faced a very difficult task in administering the provisions concerning religious conscientious objection. Generally speaking, they construed the exemption liberally. Naturally, however, Boards in different localities differed somewhat in their application of the exemption. In recommending pardons, we have been conscious of hardships resulting from the factor of error.

Many of the Selective Service Boards did not consider membership in an historic peace church as a condition to exemption to those asserting religious conscientious objection to military service. Nor have our recommendations as to those who were members of no sect or religious group, if the subject's record and all the circumstances indicated that he was motivated by a sincere religious belief. We have found some violators who acted upon an essentially religious belief, but were unable properly to present their claims for exemption. We have recommended them for pardon.

We found that some who sought exemption as conscientious objectors were not such within the purview of the Act. These are men who asserted no religious training or belief but founded their objections on intellectual political or sociological convictions resulting from the individual's reasoning and personal economic or political philosophy. We have not felt justified in recommending those who thus have set themselves up as wise and more competent than society to determine their duty to come to the defense of the nation.

Some of those who asserted conscientious objection were found to have been moved in fact by fear, the desire to evade military service, or the wish to remain as long as possible in highly paid employment.

Under the law, the man who received a IV-E classification as a conscientious objector, instead of being inducted into the Armed Forces, was assigned to a Civilian Public Service Camp. The National Headquarters of Selective Service estimates that about 12,000 men received this classification, entered camps and performed the duties assigned them. Certain conscientious objectors refused to go to such camps, refused to comply with regulations and violated the rules of the camps in various ways as a protest against what they thought unconstitutional or unfair administration of the camps. Some deserted the camps for similar reasons. We may concede their good faith. But they refused to submit to the provisions of the Selective Service Act, and were convicted for their intentional violation of the law. There was a method to test the legality of their detention in the courts. A few of them resorted to that method. Where other circumstances warranted we have recommended them for pardon. But most of them simply asserted their superiority to the law and determined to follow their own wish and defy the law. We think that this attitude should not be condoned, and we have refrained from recommending such persons for favorable consideration, unless there were extenuating circumstances.

Closely analogous to conscientious objectors, and yet not within the fair interpretation of the phrase, were a smaller, though not inconsequential number of American citizens of Japanese ancestry who were removed in the early stages of the war, under military authority, from their homes in definite coastal areas and placed in war relocation centers. Although we recognize the urgent necessities of military defense, we fully appreciate the nature of their feelings and their reactions to orders from local Selec-

tive Service Boards. Prior to their removal from their homes, they had been law-abiding and loyal citizens. They deeply resented classification as undesirables. Most of them remained loyal to the U.S. and indicated a desire to remain in this country and to fight in its defense, provided their rights of citizenship were recognized. For these we have recommended pardon, in the belief that they will justify our confidence in their loyalty.

Some 4,300 cases were those of Jehovah's Witnesses, whose difficulties arose over their insistence that each of them should be accorded a ministerial status and consequent complete exemption from military service, or Civilian Public Service Camp duty. The organization of the sect is dissimilar to that of the ordinary denomination. It is difficult to find a standard by which to classify a member of the sect as a minister in the usual meaning of that term. It is interesting to note that no representations were made to Congress when the Selective Service Act was under consideration with respect to the ministerial status of the members of this group. Some time after the Selective Service Act became law, and after many had been accorded the conscientious objector status, the leaders of the sect asserted that all of its members were ministers. Many Selective Service Boards classified Jehovah's Witnesses as conscientious objectors, and consequently assigned them to Civilian Public Service Camps. A few at first accepted this classification, but after the policy of claiming ministerial status had been adopted, they changed their claims and they and other members of the sect insisted upon complete exemption as ministers. The Headquarters of the Selective Service, after some consideration, ruled that those who devoted practically their entire time to "witnessing," should be classified as ministers. The Watchtower Society made lists available to Selective Service. It is claimed that these lists were incomplete. The Selective Service Boards' problem was a difficult one. We have found that the action of the Boards was not wholly consistent in attributing ministerial status to Jehovah's Witnesses, and we have endeavored to correct any discrepancy by recommending pardon to those we think should have been classified.

The sect has many classes of persons who appear to be awarded their official titles by its headquarters, such as company servants, company publishers, advertising servants, etc. In the cases of almost all these persons, the member is employed full time in a gainful occupation in the secular world. He "witnesses," as it is said, by distributing leaflets, playing phonographs, calling at homes, selling literature, conducting meetings, etc. in his spare time, and on Sundays and holidays. He may devote a number of hours per month to these activities, but he is in no sense a "minister" as the phrase is commonly understood. We have not recommended for pardon any of these secular workers who have witnessed in their spare or non-working time. Many of them perhaps would have been granted classifications other than I-A had they applied for them. They persistently refused to accept any classification except that of IV-D, representing ministerial, and therefore, complete exemption. Most of their offenses embraced refusal to register, refusal to submit to physical examination, and refusal to report for induction. They went to jail because of these refusals. Many, however, were awarded a IV-E classification as conscientious objectors, notwithstanding their protestation that they did not want it. These, when ordered to report to Civilian Public Service Camp, refused to do so and suffered conviction and imprisonment rather than comply. While few of these offenders had theretofore been violators of the law, we cannot condone their selective service offenses, nor recommend them for pardons. To do so would be to sanction an assertion by a citizen that he is above the law; that he

makes his own law; and that he refused to yield his opinion to that of organized society on the question of his country's need for service.

In summary we may state that there were 15,805 Selective Service violation cases inducted. In this total there were approximately 10,000 willful violators, 4,300 Jehovah's witnesses, 1,000 religious conscientious objectors and 500 other types. Of this total 612 were granted Presidential pardons because of a year or more service with honorable discharges from the Armed Forces. An additional approximate 900 entered the Armed Forces and may become eligible for pardon upon the completion of their service. When the Board was created, there were 1,200 offenders in custody. Since that date an additional 550 have been institutionalized. At the present time, there are 626 in confinement, only 76 of whom were in custody in January 6, 1947.

Tabulation

Convictions under Selective Service Act considered.....		15,805
Willful violators (nonconscientious objectors) (approximately).....		10,000
Jehovah's Witnesses (approximately).....		4,300
Conscientious objectors (approximately).....		1,000
Other types of violators.....		500
Those who have received Presidential pardons under Presidential Proclamation 2676, dated Dec. 24, 1945 (approximately).....		618
Those who entered the Armed Forces and may be receiving pardon (approximately).....		900
Total.....		1,518
Recommended by this Board.....		1,523
Total recommended for pardon and who may earn pardon through service in the Armed Forces.....		3,041

The Board recommends that Executive Clemency be extended to the 1,523 individuals whose names appear on the attached list, attested as to its correctness by the Executive Secretary of the Board, and that each person named receive a pardon for his violation of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended.

Almost a year after its inception, on December 23, 1947, the Amnesty Board's recommendations to the President were finalized in a grant of amnesty to 1,523 individuals—about 1 in 10 of the 15,805 considered.

Several newspapers of the day editorialized for amnesty after the final decision of the Amnesty Board. One, the Washington Post, stated in its Christmas issue:

Such persons broke the law not for personal gain, not because they sought some special advantage over their fellow citizens, but because, however mistakenly, they believed they could not in good conscience obey the law. Some of these, to whom pardons were denied, were described by the board as persons whose objections to military service were based on "intellectual, political or sociological convictions resulting from the individual's reasoning and personal economic and political philosophy." These men have been punished—severely punished. They have served terms in prison. Amnesty would operate only to restore their civil rights. Now that the war is over, we cannot see that the security of the Nation, or even the welfare of society would be endangered by generosity in dealing with their offense, essentially political in character. Certainly in time of peace these men cannot be deemed anti-

social. The United States can afford the luxury of treating them magnanimously.

President Truman chose to refrain from further discussions on amnesty until the latter days of his final administration. This was despite the efforts of several private organizations working for further clemency. On December 24, 1952, Mr. Truman issued two proclamations regarding clemency. The first, Proclamation 300, pardoned all former convicts who had served in the Armed Forces for at least 1 year after June 25, 1950, and Proclamation 3001 pardoned all deserters after World War II and before the Korean war—August 15, 1945, through June 25, 1950—and restored all their rights. Unlike the final gestures following the Whisky Rebellion and the Civil War, there was no Presidential action for an unqualified clemency to draft resisters and the deserters of the Armed Forces after World War II.

Mr. Speaker, my six statements to the House do not exhaust the topic of amnesty, but they have provided a generous opportunity to get my point across. I had intended at the outset of these presentations that there should be a limit to them and, though I was not sure of the response, I had hopes of sparking some form of expanded discussion on the possibilities for at least a limited amnesty. Following the divisiveness which the Indochinese war has brought to this country, it seemed that a resolve of Congress to bring us together again might be one redeeming outcome of so many disturbing years.

I began these statements with the contention that I was uncertain about the President's true position on amnesty. Much like the third constituent quoted above, I have been waiting for Mr. Nixon to speak his true feelings—the kind he indicated to TV interviewer Dan Rather several months ago. I also said then that, if the President's more recent statements mean that he is against blanket amnesty, then our viewpoints are joined. But, if he meant, on the other hand, that he is forever opposed to considering each individual case for amnesty on its own merits—on some sort of conditional basis yet to be worked out—then there are differences between us.

Time has not changed my view, nor has it clarified the President's. In Congress, discussion of the issue has not commenced to the degree necessary to affect large numbers of citizens; and I must accept that silence as the only available and practical course this Congress, in its collective judgment is willing to take at this point in time regarding such a highly-charged public issue.

If my speeches have produced any happy result, it is the hard soul-searching and wisdom which has come from some of my own constituents, as they have considered and responded to my remarks. In concluding these statements today, I cannot be gratified by the response in Congress, but I am immensely proud to represent the citizens of the 27th District of New York.

I have not stirred many of them—only a handful, really—sufficiently to lead them to sit down and write me their thoughts for or against amnesty which,

coming as it does from the Greek word for a "forgetting," does not imply the condoning of an act but simply the desire to allow for a fresh start by wiping error from the record. But I suspect—indeed, I hope, Mr. Speaker—that I have gotten a goodly number of those others who have not written to me to think about the issues involved in a broader way than might otherwise have been the case had I not spoken out; to think about what the term "peace with honor" means in its own broader contexts, to consider the historical record of past amnesties in this Nation, to consider the related implications of our own Government's willingness to consider at some future time some form of reconstruction aid to our former enemies in North Vietnam, and to appreciate the fact that some of our young people who were not draft-dodgers had college deferments from which safe distance they condemned possibly better men than they who were dying to give them that privilege.

To my constituents who have thought about these things—even to those who blasted me in no uncertain terms for suggesting them—my thanks.

To my colleagues who, in moderate voices, might also wish to speak out along the same lines—my hopes that they eventually will, reassured by my own example that one can do so and come out of the experience more or less whole, politically speaking.

And now, I confess, Mr. Speaker, I am no surer of the right and wrong side of the amnesty issue than when I began this effort. But that I am more confident than before that a nation which is as big as ours in so many ways—big enough, indeed, to rebuild enemy lands and to restore comforts to a people once alienated as we have done in the past and probably will do again—is also big enough to embrace its own children with forgiveness and write a better page in history than the last decade would indicate it might.

HON. JEANNETTE RANKIN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness mixed with profound appreciation for a life well lived that I take note of the passing of the first woman elected to this House—the Honorable Jeannette Rankin, of Montana.

Representative Rankin followed her convictions to the fullest each day.

She opposed war. She did not equivocate on that score. She always voted her conscience even though it meant taking a stand all alone.

In addition, as one of the earliest leaders of the women's suffrage movement, she succeeded in pushing for passage in her home State of Montana the women's right to vote 6 years before the ratification of the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In Congress, she authored the first bill seeking Government-spon-

sored hygiene programs for maternity and infancy. Throughout her long and active life, she worked tirelessly for causes in the field of women's rights, election reform, and peace.

The example she set for women legislators—and for all legislators—in fighting for and sticking to firmly held moral and humane beliefs will live as a continuing memorial to this outstanding American.

FUEL SHORTAGE

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, demands for crude oil in America are outstripping the supply and, as a result, we are beginning to feel the first effects of the warnings given many months ago of the oncoming energy crisis in this country.

The current shortage of fuel throughout the Nation can be traced in part to the heavy demand earlier this year which prevented the oil industry from building inventories for the coming heavy summer months.

The nationwide demand for gasoline this summer is expected to increase by 7 percent over last year.

The fact is that domestic crude supplies are short and they are growing shorter. Foreign crude availability is becoming more expensive and less dependable.

And so, some American oil companies have started to place a check on the amount of fuel allocated to their distributors and stations.

Economists are saying that the energy crisis is due to an unchecked rise in consumption of not only gas and oil, but electricity and coal and other forms of energy. Sociologists, however, put the blame on too many people using too much electricity and driving too many automobiles.

Businessmen blame the ecologists whom they accuse of wanting to turn their backs on technology. Conservationists, on the other hand, believe the cause is rooted in business irresponsibilities like major oil spills, placing sulfur in the cities' air, and the mass misuse of the countryside.

The truth, I believe, is that the rising energy problem in the United States has been brought on by all of these things coming together at the same time.

I believe the shortage in supply we are now experiencing emphasizes that fact that we are going to have to face the question of offshore oil drilling, and Congress is going to have to act on the Alaskan pipeline question.

Some critics have complained that there is energy waste at present, because there is no energy policy, no single Federal agency riding herd on energy supply, demand, use, and consumption.

I dislike Federal controls as much as anybody, but I think this avenue should be investigated. Numerous Federal agen-

cies already have piecemeal control. I have introduced a bill that would bring together all the Federal activities concerning energy under one Energy Policy Council so that a better watch can be maintained on the entire picture.

President Nixon has outlined a detailed program to Congress which he feels will provide long-range solutions.

Government and industry are taking steps to help lessen the immediate problem and they need help, the help of each individual citizen.

By cutting down on our consumption, we can all help the overall situation tremendously. Actually, we are told that if every driver in America used one less gallon of gasoline per week, there would be no shortage.

We can keep our cars tuned and well serviced. We can slow down. We can be conservative in our use of electricity and other energy sources. We have a lot to gain by doing so.

PRICE FIXING IN THE STOCK MARKET

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, there is a curious contradiction that exists in one of our great industries—the securities industry—an industry that has done an outstanding job of raising capital for American businesses throughout the country. This industry, which contributes so greatly to the capitalist system in our country, is itself afraid to be a part of that system. Rather, the securities industry exists in the world of the cartel, a world consisting of, among other things, the fixing of prices.

When a customer goes into a stockbroker's office to buy or sell stock, his broker is required by rules of the New York Stock Exchange to charge him no less than a certain price, which the broker calls a commission, for handling the transaction.

This system, which is known as the fixed minimum commission rate system, is nothing more or less than price fixing. Stockbrokers attempt to justify this practice on the grounds that it is necessary to maintain the stock market as we know it today. But the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, which I have the privilege to chair, conducted an in-depth study of this price-fixing mechanism during the 92d Congress, and unanimously concluded that fixed commissions in the securities industry were not in the public interest and should be abolished. Legislation to accomplish this has been introduced.

As might be expected, the stockbrokers are vigorously opposing this legislation. One of their arguments has been that under a system where rates were set by the forces of competition, rather than fixed by the New York Stock Exchange, many brokers would, in fact, raise them. Fixed rates, the stockbrokers argued, were therefore to the public's advantage.

Recently, however, the brokers dramatically switched their position, and asked the Securities and Exchange Commission to approve a 10- to 15-percent increase in the fixed fees they charge their customers.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to this request. While it may be necessary for some stockbrokers to raise their prices to meet the rising costs that all businesses are now experiencing, that decision should be made by each individual broker, based on his individual cost and competitive situation. That decision should not be made by the New York Stock Exchange, or by the SEC, to be imposed upon all stockbrokers.

If the decision were left to each individual broker, as it would be if fixed commissions were eliminated, efficient brokers might choose not to raise their charges at all, or to raise them less than other, inefficient brokers. Under the fixed rate system, however, all brokers must charge the higher rate. Thus, it is the inefficient broker that determines the fixed rate which, of course, increases the cost of the investment to the customer.

Moreover, if brokers were allowed to set their own prices, they might offer different packages of services to their customers, at different price levels. Customers would be able to purchase and pay for only those services they desired. Under the inflexible fixed rate system, however, customers are denied this right.

Mr. Speaker, the SEC has stated that it will hold public hearings on this request for a 10- to 15-percent increase in the fixed fees now charged by stockbrokers. I hope that the public will make itself heard, and that the agency will listen. I am convinced of the correctness of the unanimous conclusion of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance that fixed fees charged by stockbrokers are not in the public interest. I trust that the SEC will not lend its support to this practice by approving an increase in these fixed prices.

THE WHOLE TRUTH IS YET TO COME

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's extraordinary 4,000-word statement May 22 presenting still another version of his role in the Watergate scandal provides us with a tantalizing glimpse into the secret police state operating out of the White House.

By the President's own admission, he sanctioned plans for such illegal actions as "surreptitious entry"—breaking and entering, in effect—"on specified categories of targets in specified situations relating to national security." The plan involved the FBI, CIA, Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency.

According to Mr. Nixon, approval of that particular plan was rescinded—he does not say by whom—after FBI Direc-

tor J. Edgar Hoover refused to go along with it for reasons that he does not explain. This secret, expanded lawbreaking "intelligence" operation was under active consideration in the White House in June and July 1970.

In December 1970, the President tells us, he proceeded to create an Intelligence Evaluation Committee, including representatives of the White House, CIA, FBI, National Security Agency, the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Defense, and the Secret Service.

The President indicates that he created this overall agency to oversee "domestic intelligence," because of his concern over FBI Director Hoover's severing of liaison with the CIA and all other agencies except the White House. Here, too, we are offered just a glimpse into the rivalry among the various intelligence groups and the special status enjoyed by Mr. Hoover, who felt free to act as he pleased regardless of the President's wishes.

As a longtime critic of the FBI who never shared in the adulation of the late Mr. Hoover, I would say at this point that the unusual power held by Mr. Hoover rested in his control of secret files his agency gathered containing information on hundreds of thousands of Americans, including Government officials, and Members of Congress and many prominent leaders.

According to former FBI Assistant Director William C. Sullivan, as quoted in the New York Post May 15, 1973, Mr. Hoover "was a master blackmailer and he did it with considerable finesse despite the deterioration of his mind."

Mr. Sullivan reported that secret wiretap FBI files, including wiretap records relating to the case of Daniel Ellsberg, were turned over by him to Assistant Attorney General Robert Mardian. They eventually wound up in a White House safe. According to the New York Post story, the secret files were moved to the White House because it was feared that Hoover might use them "in some manner" against President Nixon and Attorney General John Mitchell.

In his belated report on the superspy Intelligence Evaluation Committee which he created, Mr. Nixon again strains credulity by saying that if this committee "went beyond its charter and did engage in any illegal activities, it was totally without my knowledge or authority." In view of the fact that Mr. Nixon earlier in 1970 had authorized illegal activities, including "breaking and entering," by these same espionage agencies, why should they have suddenly expected him to have any qualms about breaking the law?

In his May 23 statement the President also admits that in June 1971, a week after publication of the Pentagon papers, he approved the creation of the White House special investigations unit, the group that later became known as "the plumbers," to stop so called national security leaks. This is the group, led by Watergate Conspirators Howard Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy, that burglarized

the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Mr. Nixon also belatedly confesses that he did attempt to restrict the FBI's investigation of Watergate, allegedly because he felt it would expose CIA and other national security operations which he thought were involved in the case. Here, too, Mr. Nixon would have us think that he was trying to keep the CIA out of the Watergate scandal at the very time that his closest associates in the White House were trying to make the CIA take the rap for it, according to evidence presented to the Senate investigating committee. If Mr. Nixon was worried that the CIA was involved, why did he not just call in CIA Director Richard Helms to find out. Mr. Helms says the President never asked him about this.

By May 22, Mr. Nixon is admitting that he left vital information about his Watergate role out of his April 30 nationwide television address in which he assured us that there would be no "white-wash" and that the integrity of the White House "must be real, not transparent." He simply neglected to inform the American people in a speech which was widely portrayed as the definitive story that he had indeed attempted to cover up some aspects of Watergate. Presidential Counsel Leonard Garment on May 22 attempted to reconcile the differences between the President's latest Watergate statements and his earlier ones by saying that Mr. Nixon now has a clearer recollection of the events surrounding the burglary. Are we expected to believe that the President simply forgot that he had told the FBI to limit its investigation?

Mr. Nixon's rationale for the covert operations that led to the commission of felonies against private citizens and one of our two major political parties is his concern for national security. And once again, as he did in his April 30 speech, he invokes allusions to national security and patriotism in an effort to cut off any further investigation of his role in Watergate and associated illegal activities.

Like King Louis XIV, who said "L'etat c'est moi," Mr. Nixon equates national security with his own preservation and his own policies. This President, who rode to national prominence as one of the chief witch-hunters during the McCarthy period of the 1950's, conjures up a hysterical vision of the summer of 1969 and 1970, referring to a wave of bombings and explosions on college campuses, guerrilla-style warfare, and demonstrations. He even hints darkly that "some of the disruptive activities were receiving foreign support."

What actually was happening at that time? Mr. Nixon was concerned with "security leaks" which revealed that the United States was conducting illegal bombing operations and "incursions" of American ground troops in Cambodia. The Cambodians knew they were being bombed. The North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese Governments knew

Cambodia was being bombed. The only ones who were not supposed to know, under Mr. Nixon's definition of national security, were the American people.

In response to Nixon's invasion of Cambodia, thousands of Americans, not only on campuses but in cities all over the Nation, joined in demonstrations to protest the widening of the war which the President had said he would stop when elected. That controversy and debate extended into the Congress and indeed, there was a conflict involving national security. Opponents of the war, whose patriotism I will match with the President's any day, maintained that the administration's continuation of the war in Southeast Asia was directly contrary to the best interests of the American people.

Yet, Mr. Nixon admittedly used these legitimate protests and demonstrations which are protected by the first amendment to the Constitution as an excuse to set up his clandestine Intelligence Evaluation Committee to spy on antiwar groups, minority, and radical groups. The New York Times reported May 21 that the unit is now clandestinely operated out of the Justice Department's Internal Security Division. According to the Times, Government investigators are "now attempting to determine whether some of the intelligence committee's highly classified reports may have been used by other Justice Department agencies and the White House to justify undercover and double agent activities against suspected opposition groups, including Democrats opposed to the Nixon administration."

Mr. Speaker, two recent cases—the Berrigan trial in Harrisburg, Pa., and the Camden trial—have presented shocking evidence of how FBI provocateurs were used to entrap antiwar groups and attempt to lead them into illegal actions. In the Camden case, 17 of the so-called "Camden 28" were acquitted several days ago by a jury which was appalled at disclosures that a paid informer for the FBI had in fact provided the tools and the training for the defendants who broke into a Federal building to destroy draft records. The evidence revealed that the informer actually reactivated the illegal foray after the protestors had all but abandoned it.

As the New York Times noted editorially May 23:

The government's game plan could only be interpreted as a deliberate political maneuver to use the protesters as dupes in the Administration's design to discredit foes of its Vietnam policy.

We have also heard reports of espionage and double agent provocations in legitimate political activities by American citizens; we have heard of fake prowar advertisements and inspired telegrams campaigns; we have heard of agents being flown to Washington to disrupt demonstrations; we have even heard of Government provocateurs who were used in an attempt to attack Daniel Ellsberg physically as he addressed a peace rally in the Capital.

These are activities that one associates with a police state, and these are

the kinds of illegal activities inspired and condoned by the President of the United States. We saw the culmination of lawlessness and disorder on the part of the Nixon administration in the illegal dragnet arrests of thousands of peace demonstrators ordered by Attorney General Mitchell in Washington over a period of several days in May 1971.

In his most recent statement in which he attempts to bring down a "national security" curtain to conceal his illegal activities, the President refers to "the tragedies at Kent State and Jackson State" universities. Shortly before these young students were massacred, the President had referred to student peace demonstrators as "bums." Yet despite an FBI report confirming that the National Guardsmen's shooting down of four students at Kent State on May 4, 1970, was "unnecessary, unwarranted, and inexcusable," Attorney General Mitchell refused to submit the issue to a Federal grand jury. The killers of four innocent young boys and girls remain at large, despite a petition addressed to the Justice Department by 50,000 Americans asking for a Federal review of the case and due process of law. This is the tragedy.

Mr. Mitchell, apparently viewed his accession to control of the Justice Department as a blank check for illegal activities, whether in behalf of Mr. Nixon as President or as a political candidate for reelection. According to testimony by James McCord before the Senate investigating committee, Mr. Mitchell authorized G. Gordon Liddy, counsel for CREEP and also one of the so-called "plumbers," to break into the offices of the Las Vegas Sun last summer to steal "blackmail type information involving a Democratic candidate for President." Hank Greenspun, editor and publisher of the newspaper, is quoted in the New York Times May 23 as charging that the real purpose of the burglary attempt was to acquire signed memoranda by Howard Hughes, the industrialist, a major contributor to Mr. Nixon's reelection campaign.

Perhaps the most curious aspect of Mr. Nixon's April 30 and May 22 statements lies in what he has not said.

He has not yet commented on the fact that while he was at his home in San Clemente he met with the judge in the Ellsberg case who was reportedly offered the FBI directorship by Presidential Assistant John Ehrlichman.

He has not commented on the extraordinary financial arrangements of CREEP under the direction of Mitchell and Maurice Stans, in which corporations and wealthy businessmen virtually stood in line to stuff millions of dollars, reported and unreported, into CREEP's floating treasury and safes as a quid pro quo for administration favors.

He has not commented on the unsavory GOP convention arrangements with ITT, on the Vesco deal, the wheat deal, the milk price deal.

He has not explained satisfactorily how he could have been so oblivious to and

unknowing of activities pursued by his closest appointed advisers and friends.

He has not explained how he can accept responsibility for some of these "excesses," as he calls them, while at the same time seeking to avoid any of the consequences of these illegal acts.

In his April 30 TV address, Mr. Nixon said he found it necessary in order to restore confidence to remove from office Attorney General Kleindienst, although he had "no personal involvement whatever in this matter," because he "has been a close personal and professional associate of some of those who are involved in this case."

Exactly the same words could be applied to the President himself. He was not only the personal and professional associate of Messrs. Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Dean, Mitchell, Stans, Magruder, et cetera, he was their employer.

As Prof. Arthur Bestor has said in an open letter addressed to the President calling on him to resign—the New Republic, May 26, 1973:

The various activities that are now becoming known—ranging from the forgery of documents of "sensitive" files, from the "washing" of money (thieves' argot) to the rifling of a psychiatrist's office—were carried out for your benefit, by persons well known to you, working in White House offices over which no one but you could or did exercise supervision and control.

It is exceedingly difficult to believe that all this was done, over periods measured in months and even years, without the slightest inkling reaching you. It is exceedingly difficult to believe that the whole tone of the administration was set by subordinates, acting directly contrary to your wishes. It is exceedingly difficult to believe that the readiness of your henchmen to violate the law time after time was the result of their own innate criminal propensities, and not the result of an understanding or belief on their part that you, as the ultimate beneficiary, would approve, albeit in silence and secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a serious miscarriage of justice to assume that the question of Mr. Nixon's innocence of any wrongdoing hinges on whether he had prior knowledge of the Watergate burglary of the Democratic National Committee headquarters or the subsequent coverup. At question is his entire conduct in office, his entire reelection campaign, his invasion of the constitutional rights of American citizens, the violation of his oath of office "to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution," his attempt to undermine the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, and his continuing unconstitutional actions in Cambodia.

This is the larger context in which the President's conduct must be examined.

We are all aware of rising demands that the President resign from office to save the country from months of agonizing investigation of all the facets of this disgraceful and unprecedented situation in the history of our Nation.

I believe, however, that it is important for the American people to learn the whole truth about how this administration has operated and to learn how close they came to living in a police state. Whether James McCord or any of the other Watergate participants go to jail

is not the major issue. Whether Halde- man, Ehrlichman, Dean, Mitchell, Stans, and the others are found guilty of breaking the law and are punished is not the major issue, either, though I believe they must pay the penalty if they are convicted of wrongdoing. The issue is the role of the President himself in all these matters. Under our Constitution it is the function of the House of Representatives to determine whether the President's conduct has been such as to warrant his impeachment.

I believe this is a duty the House owes to the Constitution and to the American people.

Following is a commentary by Nicholas von Hoffman with some pungent reflections on the process of impeachment:

A SELF-IMPEACHMENT LESSON

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

On March 3, 1868, the House of Representatives voted articles of impeachment against President Andrew Johnson. Most of us have been taught that this first and only trial of a President was the work of a House of Representatives controlled by a mad-dog majority who come down to us through history under the name of Radical Republicans.

A second look shows that was not the case. The House was not the property of the Radicals who were a decided numerical minority. That the 17th President of the United States came within one vote of the two-thirds needed in the Senate to throw him out was owing to the conservatives who turned against him.

They did so very reluctantly, with the same misgivings that conservative members of Congress a century later have about convicting Richard Nixon. Thus we find Sen. James W. Grimes of Iowa writing in March, 1867, that, "... we had better submit to two years of misrule ... than to subject the country, its institutions and its credit, to the shock of an impeachment. I have always thought so, and everybody is now apparently coming to my conclusion." (This quote is lifted from a nifty, new book titled "The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson," by Michael Lee Benedict, W. W. Norton, New York, 1973, \$6.95.)

What happened in the time between Grimes' letter and a year later when opinion had completely reversed itself and the House voted to put the President on trial? The answer is that in the intervening time Johnson drove Congress to do what it never wanted to do. He impeached himself. Again and again, he refused to carry out the laws Congress passed for the reconstruction of the South.

Each time he evaded congressional intent and new laws were passed to hem him in tighter, he would burst through them. At the same time he began making moves that suggested to some people in Congress he was also preparing a military coup. That he actually was is extremely doubtful; and even if he had such an act against the Republic in mind, it could never have been brought off. Our two greatest generals, Grant and Sherman, knew they served under an oath of allegiance, not to the President but to the Constitution.

What is important to understand about the impeachment proceedings against Johnson was that Congress never wanted it and sought every way over a period of three years to avoid it. It did so not only because of the conservative sentiments of men like Grimes, but also because, then like now, our Congresses are amorphous, criss-crossed bodies which cannot strongly coalesce on a single, uncompromised position without enormous

outside pressure. Johnson applied that pressure. He pushed them to it by repeated and dangerous violations of the laws they passed.

Yet none of his conduct was criminal. The crimes his enemies accused him of were not indictable offenses. He was charged with using the constitutional power of his office against the constitutionally passed laws of the nation. These are not crimes in the ordinary sense of the word. They may be the gravest kind of political or even constitutional offenses but they are in no way akin to mugging.

This brings us to Richard Nixon. He is most widely suspected in the Watergate disgrace of having committed ordinary, indictable offenses. Presumably, if a prima facie case can be made, and a grand jury with the guts to do it could be assembled, he would be indicted in the same fashion that two of his former Cabinet members already have. You don't have to impeach him for that.

Richard Nixon will have to make Congress impeach him. He may do it. If it should come to that, impeachment won't be detonated by strong indications that he had prior knowledge of Watergate, but by the lengths he had gone to conceal and protect his agents. That's what's getting him in trouble, and there is no sign even now that he and his people have stopped manufacturing false trails, prejudices, lies and evasions.

His prideful going on and on and on has converted what might have been but another sordid episode in a not so elevated career into such a defiance of Congress that it may be forced to take up the challenge against the will of even the Democrats who certainly don't want this man tossed out now, thereby giving Agnew time to build an election in his own right.

Yet Richard Nixon is encouraged to make his own disaster by the loyalty and obedience of his subordinates, both in the White House and the upper echelons of career government service, military and civilian. They're smitten with a kind of a Kiserism, an unthinking worshipful subservience to the man and the office, which compels them to carry out every command.

When President Andrew Johnson tried to use William Tecumseh Sherman in this way by promoting him to the rank of full general, that conservative military man urged the Senate to vote against his own promotion. Gen. Alexander Haig, whose chief accomplishment, it now appears, is the ability to order phones tapped in 10 languages, plays the good servant and accepts all his master's hands him.

Given his inflexibility of purpose born of pride, conviction, fear and guilt, surrounded by Hunish subordinates who respond "jawohl" to every order, this man could drive Congress to do it. The issue may be the concealments of Watergate or even Cambodia, but if it comes to the sticking point it will be Richard Nixon who will have forced his own impeachment.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, by request, to provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting, to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and for other purposes.

The draft legislation was received by the House from the Department of State

on May 21, 1973, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place at this point in the RECORD the letter from the Department of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is enclosed for the consideration of the Congress draft legislation to provide for establishment of a Board for International Broadcasting and to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe (RFE) and Radio Liberty (RL).

On May 7, 1973, the President made public the report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting and announced his intention to submit legislation to the Congress in accordance with its recommendations. These are reflected in the enclosed bill. It would declare that open communication of information and ideas among people, particularly as transmitted by RFE and RL to the peoples of Eastern Europe and the USSR, contributes to international peace and serves the interest of the United States. It would authorize the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Board for International Broadcasting to make grants in support of broadcasting by RFE and RL. In addition to assuming financial accountability for grant funds, the Board would review and evaluate the mission and operations of the stations, assess the quality, effectiveness and professional integrity of their broadcasts within the context of the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States, and foster efficiency and economy in station operations.

The Department has been informed by the Office of Management and Budget that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Acting Assistant Secretary,
for Congressional Relations.

DRAFT BILL

To provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting, to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, 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 "Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares:

(1) That it is the policy of the United States to promote the right of freedom of opinion and expression, including the freedom "to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers," in accordance with Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(2) That open communication of information and ideas among the peoples of the world contributes to international peace and stability, and that the promotion of such communication is in the interests of the United States;

(3) That Free Europe, Inc., and the Radio Liberty Committee, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty), have demonstrated their effectiveness in furthering the open communication of information and ideas in Eastern Europe and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

(4) That the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as independent broadcast media, operating in a manner not inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States and in accordance with high professional standards, is in the national interest; and

(5) That in order to provide an effective instrumentality for the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to encourage a constructive dialog with the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Eastern Europe, it is desirable to establish a Board for International Broadcasting.

ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANIZATION

SEC. 3. (a) There is established a Board for International Broadcasting (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) (1) COMPOSITION OF BOARD.—The Board shall consist of seven members, two of whom shall be ex officio members. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, five voting members, one of whom he shall designate as Chairman. Not more than three of the members of the Board appointed by the President shall be of the same political party. The chief operating executive of Radio Free Europe and the chief operating executive of Radio Liberty shall be ex officio members of the Board and shall participate in the activities of the Board, but shall not vote in the determinations of the Board.

(2) Selection.—Members of the Board appointed by the President shall be citizens of the United States who are not concurrently regular fulltime employees of the United States Government. Such members shall be selected by the President from among Americans distinguished in the fields of foreign policy or mass communications.

(3) Term of Office of Presidentially-appointed Members.—In appointing the initial voting members of the Board, the President shall designate three of the members appointed by him to serve for a term of three years and two members to serve for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of office of each member of the Board so appointed shall be three years. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, members to fill vacancies occurring prior to the expiration of a term, in which case the members so appointed shall serve for the remainder of such term. Any member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

(4) Term of Office of *Ex Officio* Members.—*Ex Officio* members of the Board shall serve on the Board during their terms of service as chief operating executives of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

(5) Compensation.—Members of the Board appointed by the President shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this section, including travel time, be entitled to receive compensation equal to the daily equivalent of the compensation prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under Section 5316 of Title 5, United States Code. While away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. *Ex Officio* members of the Board shall not be entitled to any compensation under this act, but may be allowed travel expenses as provided in the preceding sentence.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized:

(1) To make grants to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty in order to carry out the purposes set forth in Section 2 of this Act;

(2) To review and evaluate the mission

and operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to assess the quality, effectiveness and professional integrity of their broadcasting within the context of the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States;

(3) To encourage the most efficient utilization of available resources by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to undertake, or request that Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty undertake, such studies as may be necessary to identify areas in which the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty may be made more efficient and economical;

(4) To develop and apply such financial procedures, and to make such audits of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as the Board may determine are necessary, to assure that grants are applied in accordance with the purposes for which such grants are made;

(5) To develop and apply such evaluative procedures as the Board may determine are necessary to assure that grants are applied in a manner not inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States Government;

(6) To appoint such staff personnel as may be necessary, subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates;

(7) A. To procure temporary and intermittent personal services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate provided for GS-18; and

B. To allow those providing such services, while away from their homes or their regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by Section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed;

(8) To report annually to the President and the Congress on or before the 30th day of October, summarizing the activities of the Board during the year ending the preceding June 30, and reviewing and evaluating the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty during such year; and

(9) To prescribe such regulations as the Board deems necessary to govern the manner in which its functions shall be carried out.

(b) In carrying out the foregoing functions, the Board shall bear in mind the necessity of maintaining the professional independence and integrity of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall require that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty keep records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of assistance provided under this Act, the total cost of the undertakings or programs in connection with which such assistance is given or used, that portion of the cost of the undertakings or programs supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Board and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty which in the opinion of the Board or the Comptroller General may be related or pertinent to the assistance provided under this Act.

ROLE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 6. To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, the Secretary of State shall

provide the Board with such information regarding the foreign policy of the United States as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

PUBLIC SUPPORT

SEC. 7. The Board is authorized to receive donations, bequests, devices, gifts and other forms of contributions of cash, services, and other property, from persons, corporations, foundations, and all other groups and entities, both within the United States and abroad, and, pursuant to the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the carrying out of its functions. For the purposes of sections 170, 2055, and 2522 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C. 170, 2055, or 2522), the Board shall be deemed to be a corporation described in section 170 (c) (2), 2055(a) (2), or 2522(a) (2) of the code, as the case may be.

FINANCING

SEC. 8. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, \$50,300,000 for fiscal year 1975 to carry out the purposes of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law and for other nondiscretionary costs.

IMPLEMENTATION

(b) To allow for the orderly implementation of this Act, the Secretary of State is authorized to make grants to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate for their continued operation until a majority of the voting members of the Board have been appointed and qualified, and until funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act are available to the Board.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of our colleague, WILLIAM MILLS of the First District of Maryland. At a later date I will request that a date be set for a eulogy in his memory.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House stand in recess until 12:30 in honor of and respect to the memory of BILL MILLS.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 382 UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have permission to file a report on House Resolution 382 until midnight tomorrow night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 38, AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ACCELERATION ACT OF 1973

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 38) to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, to increase the U.S. share of allowable project costs under such act, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-225)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 38) to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, to increase the U.S. share of allowable project costs under such Act, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Airport Development Acceleration Act of 1973".

Sec. 2. Section 11(2) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 1711) is amended by inserting immediately after "Federal Aviation Act of 1958," the following: "and security equipment required of the sponsor by the Secretary by rule or regulation for the safety and security of persons and property on the airport."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 14(a) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 1714(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "1975" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "1973, and \$275,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975"; and

(2) by striking out "1975" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "1973, and \$35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975".

(b) Section 14(b) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 1714(b)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$840,000,000" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,460,000,000";

(2) by striking out "extend beyond" in the second sentence thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof "be incurred after"; and

(3) by striking out "and" in the last sentence thereof and inserting immediately before the period "an aggregate amount exceeding \$1,150,000,000 prior to June 30, 1974, and an aggregate amount exceeding \$1,460,000,000 prior to June 30, 1975".

Sec. 4. Section 16(c)(1) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 1716(c)) is amended by inserting in the last sentence thereof "or the United States or an agency thereof" after "public agency".

Sec. 5. Section 17 of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 1717) relating to United States share of project costs, is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) GENERAL PROVISION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the United States share of allowable project costs payable on account of any approved airport development project submitted under section 16 of this part may not exceed—

"(1) 50 per centum for sponsors whose airports enplane not less than 1 per centum of the total annual passengers enplaned by air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

"(2) 75 per centum for sponsors whose airports enplane less than 1 per centum of the total annual passengers enplaned by air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board and for sponsors of general aviation or reliever airports."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) SAFETY CERTIFICATION AND SECURITY EQUIPMENT.—

"(1) To the extent that the project cost of an approved project for airport development represents the cost of safety equipment required by rule or regulation for certification of an airport under section 612 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 the United States share may not exceed 82 per centum of the allowable cost thereof with respect to airport development project grant agreements entered into after May 10, 1971.

"(2) To the extent that the project cost of an approved project for airport development represents the cost of security equipment required by the Secretary by rule or regulation, the United States share may not exceed 82 per centum of the allowable cost thereof with respect to airport development project grant agreements entered into after September 28, 1971."

Sec. 6. The first sentence of section 12(a) of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 1712(a)) is amended by striking out "two years" and inserting in lieu thereof "three years".

Sec. 7. (a) Title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STATE TAXATION OF AIR COMMERCE

"SEC. 1113. (a) No State (or political subdivision thereof, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the District of Columbia, the territories or possessions of the United States or political agencies of two or more States) shall levy or collect a tax, fee, head charge, or other charge, directly or indirectly, on persons traveling in air commerce or on the carriage of persons traveling in air commerce or on the sale of air transportation or on the gross receipts derived therefrom; except that any State (or political subdivision thereof, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the District of Columbia, the territories or possessions of the United States or political agencies of two or more States) which levied a tax, fee, head charge, or other charge, directly or indirectly, on persons traveling in air commerce or on the carriage of persons traveling in air commerce or on the sale of air transportation or on the gross receipts derived therefrom prior to May 21, 1970, shall be exempt from the provisions of this subsection until December 31, 1973.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State (or political subdivision thereof, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the District of Columbia, the territories or possessions of the United States or political agencies of two or more States) from the levy or collection of taxes other than those enumerated in subsection (a) of this section, including property taxes, net income taxes, franchise taxes, and sales or use taxes on the sale of goods or services; and nothing in this section shall prohibit a State (or political subdivision thereof, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands,

Guam, the District of Columbia, the territories or possessions of the United States or political agencies of two or more States) owning or operating an airport from levying or collecting reasonable rental charges, landing fees, and other service charges from aircraft operators for the use of airport facilities.

"(c) In the case of any airport operating authority which—

"(1) has an outstanding obligation to repay a loan or loans of amounts borrowed and expended for airport improvements;

"(2) is collecting without air carrier assistance, a head tax on passengers in air transportation for the use of its facilities; and

"(3) has no authority to collect any other type of tax to repay such loan or loans, the provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to such authority until December 31, 1973."

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of such Act which appears under the center heading

"TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS"

is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1113. State taxation of air commerce."

And the House agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JARMAN,
BROCK ADAMS,
DAN KUYKENDALL,
DICK SHOUP,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
PHILIP A. HART,
NORRIS COTTON,
JAMES B. PEARSON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 38 to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, to increase the United States share of allowable project costs under such Act, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and the Senate disagreed to the House amendment.

The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The differences between the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below.

Unless otherwise indicated, references to provisions of "existing law" contained in this joint statement refer to provisions of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970.

STATE TAXATION OF AIR COMMERCE Senate Bill

Section 7 of the Senate bill provided for a permanent prohibition against the levy or collection of a tax or other charge on persons traveling in air commerce, or on the carriage of persons so traveling, or on the sale of air transportation or on the gross receipts derived therefrom, by any State or political subdivision thereof (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the District of Columbia, the territories or possessions of the United States, or political

agencies of two or more States). There were two exemptions from this prohibition.

First, any State which levied such charges before May 21, 1970, would be exempt from the prohibition until July 1, 1973.

Second, any airport operating authority which (1) has an outstanding obligation to repay money borrowed and expended for airport improvements, (2) has collected a head tax on air passengers, without carrier assistance, for the use of its facilities, and (3) has no authority to collect any other type of tax to repay the loan, would be exempt from the prohibition until July 1, 1973.

The Senate bill also provided that the prohibition would not extend to the levy or collection of other taxes, such as property taxes, net income taxes, franchise taxes, and sales or use taxes, nor to the levy or collection of other charges such as reasonable rental charges, landing fees, and other service charges from aircraft operators for the use of airport facilities.

House Amendment

The House amendment was substantially the same as the Senate bill, except that the exemptions from the prohibition against the levy and collection of the so-called airline passenger head taxes was extended from July 1, 1973, to December 31, 1973, and the exemption with respect to jurisdictions which impose such charges before May 21, 1970, was limited to those which levied and collected such charges rather than those which merely levied such charges.

Conference Substitute

The conference substitute follows the House amendment in extending to December 31, 1973, the exemptions from the prohibition against the levy and collection of the so-called airline passenger head taxes, and follows the Senate bill in extending the exemptions to jurisdictions which levied such taxes before May 21, 1970, rather than limiting the exemptions to those which levied and collected such taxes before such date.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Annual authorizations for airport development grants

Senate Bill

Section 3(a) of the Senate bill amended section 14(a) of existing law—

(1) to increase the minimum annual authorization for airport development grants to air carrier and reliever airports from \$250 million per year to \$375 million per year for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975; and

(2) to increase the minimum annual authorization for airport development grants to general aviation airports from \$30 million per year to \$45 million per year for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

House Amendment

No provision. Existing law contains minimum annual authorizations for each fiscal year 1974 and 1975 of \$250 million per year for air carrier and reliever airports and \$30 million per year for general aviation airports.

Conference Substitute

The conference substitute follows the Senate bill except that—

(1) the minimum annual authorization for airport development grants to air carrier and reliever airports is increased from \$250 million per year to \$275 million per year for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975; and

(2) the minimum annual authorization for airport development grants to general aviation airports is increased from \$30 million per year to \$35 million per year for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Obligational authority for airport development grants

Senate Bill

Section 3(b) of the Senate bill amended section 14(b) of existing law—

(1) to increase from \$840 million to \$1.68

billion the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to incur obligations to make airport development grants;

(2) to provide a corresponding increase from \$840 million to \$1.68 billion in the authority of the Secretary to liquidate such obligations and provide that not more than \$1.26 billion in such obligations could be liquidated before June 30, 1974, and not more than \$1.68 billion in such obligations could be liquidated before June 30, 1975; and

(3) to extend from June 30, 1975, to June 30, 1978, the authority of the Secretary to liquidate obligations incurred before July 1, 1975.

House Amendment

The House amendment was substantially the same as the Senate bill, except that—

(1) the authority of the Secretary to incur obligations was increased from \$840 million to \$1.4 billion;

(2) the authority to liquidate obligations was increased by a similar amount, from \$840 million to \$1.4 billion, with the limitation that not more than \$1.12 billion in such obligations could be liquidated before June 30, 1974, and not more than \$1.4 billion in such obligations could be liquidated before June 30, 1975; and

(3) there was no extension of authority to liquidate obligations after June 30, 1975.

Conference Substitute

The conference substitute amends section 14(b) of existing law—

(1) to increase from \$840 million to \$1.46 billion the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to incur obligations to make airport development grants;

(2) to provide a corresponding increase from \$840 million to \$1.46 billion in the authority of the Secretary to liquidate such obligations and provide that not more than \$1.15 billion in such obligations can be liquidated before June 30, 1974, and not more than \$1.46 billion in such obligations can be liquidated before June 30, 1975; and

(3) to extend from June 30, 1975, to June 30, 1978, the authority of the Secretary to liquidate obligations incurred before July 1, 1975.

UNITED STATES SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS

In general

Senate Bill

Paragraph (1) of section 5 of the Senate bill amended section 17(a) of existing law to provide that the United States share of allowable project costs of any approved project shall be—

(1) 50 percent for sponsors whose airports enplane not less than one percent of the annual total of passengers enplaned by all certificated air carriers (large hubs); and

(2) 75 percent for sponsors whose airports enplane less than one percent of the annual total of passengers enplaned by all certificated air carriers (medium hubs, small hubs, non-hubs, and general aviation airports).

Under existing law, the United States share may not exceed 50 percent, regardless of the passenger enplanements.

House Amendment

Section 5 of the House amendment was substantially the same as the Senate bill except that—

(1) the Federal share may not exceed 50 percent with respect to airports classified as large hubs and may not exceed 75 percent for smaller airports, and

(2) the language relating to the Federal share allowable on account of any approved airport development project was modified to make it clear that the amount allowable for a project would be determined by the number of passengers enplaned at the airport with respect to which the grant is made.

Under the Senate bill, the Federal share

would be determined by the total number of passengers enplaned for all airports operated by the same sponsor.

Conference Substitute

The conference substitute follows the House amendment in providing that the Federal share of allowable project costs may not exceed 50 or 75 percent, as the case may be with respect to any given airport development grant.

The conference substitute follows the Senate bill in providing that the Federal share will be determined by the total number of passengers enplaned for all airports operated by the same sponsor, except that the language of the Senate bill was modified to make it clear that the Federal share allowable for a project would be determined by the total number of passengers enplaned for all air carrier airports operated by the same sponsor and that sponsors of general aviation or reliever airports (which have no passenger enplanements by certificated air carriers) will be eligible to receive a Federal share of 75 percent without regard to the number of such passenger enplanements at air carrier airports operated by the same sponsor.

EQUIPMENT FOR SAFETY CERTIFICATION AND SECURITY EQUIPMENT

Senate Bill

Paragraph (2) of section 5 of the Senate bill added a new subsection (e) to section 17 of existing law to provide that the United States share of allowable project costs of an approved project shall be—

(1) 82 percent of that portion which represents the cost of safety equipment required for airport certification under section 612 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and incurred under a grant agreement entered into after May 10, 1971; and

(2) 82 percent of that portion which represents the cost of security equipment required by rule or regulation of the Secretary of Transportation and incurred under a grant agreement entered into after September 28, 1971.

Under existing law, such costs would be governed by the general provision that the United States share may not exceed 50 percent.

Section 2 of the Senate bill also amended section 11(2) of existing law, relating to the definition of "airport development", to specify that required security equipment is a part of airport development.

House Amendment

The House amendment was the same as the Senate bill except that it provided that the Federal share may not exceed 82 percent of the allowable costs of safety equipment required for airport certification and 82 percent of the costs of security equipment.

Conference Substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

TERMINAL FACILITIES

Senate Bill

The Senate bill contained three provisions designed to make airport terminal facilities eligible for Federal financial assistance. These provisions amended section 11 (2) of existing law (relating to the definition of "airport development"), section 17 (relating to United States share of project costs), and section 20(b) (relating to costs not allowed).

Under these provisions, airport development would include the construction, alteration, repair, or acquisition of airport passenger terminal buildings or facilities directly related to the handling of passengers or their baggage at the airport and the United States share would be 50 percent of the allowable cost thereof.

Under existing law such facilities are not eligible for Federal financial assistance.

House Amendment

No provision.

Conference Substitute

The provisions of the Senate bill relating to terminal facilities are omitted from the conference substitute.

AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Senate Bill

Section 2 of the Senate bill amended the definition of the term "airport development" contained in section 11(2) of existing law to include language relating to the construction of terminal facilities and to security equipment required by rule or regulation for the safety and security of persons and property on the airport, discussed above in this joint statement.

It also added language providing that the acquisition, removal, improvement, or repair of navigation facilities at airports would be a part of "airport development" and thus eligible for Federal aid.

In addition, this section revised the language of the definition to make several technical changes designed to clarify existing law consistent with current practices under the airport development program. In doing so, however, the Senate bill inadvertently omitted language contained in existing law under which the United States could furnish financial assistance for the acquisition of land for future airport development.

House Amendment

The only change in the definition of "airport development" contained in existing law made by the House amendment was to add language relating to security equipment required by rule or regulation for the safety and security of persons and property on the airport.

Conference Substitute

The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

Senate Bill

Section 9 of the Senate bill stated the sense of the Congress that no funds authorized to be appropriated for expenditure under this legislation should be subject to impoundment by any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government. This section further provided that, for purposes of this legislation, impoundment included withholding or delaying the expenditure or obligation of funds and any type of executive action which would preclude the obligation or expenditure of funds.

House Amendment

No provision.

Conference Substitute

The provisions of the Senate bill relating to the impoundment of funds are omitted from the conference substitute.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JARMAN,
BROCK ADAMS,
DAN KUYKENDALL,
DICK SHOUP,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
PHILIP A. HART,
NORRIS COTTON,
JAMES B. PEARSON,

Managers of the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COM- MERCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7806 UNTIL MIDNIGHT SAT- URDAY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 7806.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Wednesday, March 7, 1973, the Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair to receive the former Members of the House of Representatives.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the Chair and the Chamber, I consider it a high honor and a distinct personal privilege to have the opportunity of welcoming so many of our former Members and colleagues as may be present here for this occasion. We all pause to welcome them.

This is a bipartisan affair, and in that spirit the Chair is going to recognize the floor leaders of both parties.

The Chair now recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, may I say to our former colleagues how pleased we all are to see you back here in Washington.

I know, that for all of you who have served as a Member of Congress this is truly your first love, because having served in this great body, you know there is no other body in the world like it, where there is open and free debate under the parliamentary system that we use. It is just a delight to see you back here.

I recall last year so many came to the microphone and so many spoke that it was really a thing of joy to those of us who have served around here for the last 20 years. What a joy it is to talk to those of you who have left through the years and have come back today.

It was great last year. I remember last year, and the year before last, listening to the gentleman who was somewhere around 100 years old, and I remember the great speech he made. I recall the frolicking and the fun and the enjoyment.

I know that it does your hearts good to get back to Washington, as it does our hearts good to see you back here. So I say, on behalf of the majority party, "Welcome."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to make a few remarks, particularly to welcome all of the alumni, so to speak, who are here.

We look forward to this annual occasion. I hope and trust that all of you feel, as we do, that this is a great insti-

tution and one that will survive, one that will continue to play a vital role in the months and years ahead.

Let me say that in the interim between last year and this year we have had several innovations as to how we operate the House. Under the circumstances I do not know how we can demonstrate our new mechanical equipment. Certainly it would be interesting to you. Perhaps either later today or on some other occasion you can see the computer equipment, the voting equipment, which, despite the apprehension of some, including myself, in my opinion is a great improvement. On occasion it has not worked, but other than that, it has been a very fine addition to the setup here in the House of Representatives.

Let me conclude simply by saying that this is your day, not ours, so I shall terminate. I welcome you and wish you the very best today, and until a year from now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. JUDD).

Mr. JUDD. Thank you very much, indeed, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the sitting Members as well as the former Members who are here today.

First, let me express in behalf of the Former Members of Congress our appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the leadership of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. O'NEILL, and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for your giving us this opportunity to come back to our alma mater for 1 hour to celebrate a sort of homecoming with you who are Members now, and to renew the warm relationships established by us former Members when we were here as active Members.

Perhaps there are some of you who do not know of this organization, Former Members of Congress. So I would like to tell you something about it.

It came into being because we former Members wanted to preserve the very close friendships we had while we were here—across the aisle, as well as on each side of the aisle—whether we were here for 1 term or 20 terms.

This organization enables us, like the alumni of a college, to maintain those treasured associations and friendships. We come back twice a year for general meetings, and once a year the Speaker graciously invites us to come to this Chamber for a reunion. That was the first reason for Former Members of Congress.

The second was that perhaps we could keep a bit closer to affairs of state. We are not now responsible for law-making. But, we are no less interested in the well-being of our country. Legislative bodies are under assault today here in our country and being questioned around the world.

All of us believe that our forefathers were wise when they established the Congress in article I of the Constitution. Article I is not the executive or the judiciary. It is the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government where the basic laws under which we live are determined by men and women who are

chosen by the people, are responsible to the people, and replaceable by the people every 2 years or 6 years; rather than by appointees whose identities, backgrounds, views, habits, and character the public does not know anything about—until the facts about their qualifications and character become known when sometimes it is too late.

In addition to maintaining our friendships and as former Members, and to enabling us to keep a little closer to affairs of state, we hoped we might be able to help the people of our country to have a better understanding and appreciation of the work and importance of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

Those of us who visit the colleges today know there is very little understanding of how a democratically controlled legislative body operates. Many of the professors of political science, economics, and international relations have knowledge based largely on reading each other's books. They and their students could learn a lot from the experience of persons who are no longer in public office but who have been in prior to 1973.

So many things that are done here may look to the outsider as if we are selling out our principles or are making improper compromises. Every one of us knows that those who are in the minority are U.S. citizens as well as those in the majority and that the give and take is what protects their rights while enabling our country and our Government to go ahead on a fairly even keel despite the ups and downs that inevitably occur now and then.

One major objective of Former Members of Congress is to record oral histories of our legislators, particularly those who have been involved in what has happened in this country in the last eventful and history-making 50 years; to get it down on tape and made available to the historians and scholars and students of government.

It is already too late to get some of these. Sam Rayburn is gone; and not much happened in his almost 50 years in Congress that he was not a part of. Carl Hayden of Arizona and Joe Martin of Massachusetts are gone. We cannot get their recollections. But there are many still living who served from 10 to 50 years in these bodies. Emanuel Celler of New York planned to be here and speak today but he had to send word at the last minute that he is not well and could not make it. Howard Smith of Virginia wanted to come today but he said he is 90 years old and if the weather is bad, as it is today, he cannot come. But we need to get his recollections on the record.

It will be too bad for the future of our country if we fail to get on the record the knowledge of our system of government and its operations which is in the minds of these and many other distinguished former Members. For example, our beloved former Speaker John McCormack of Massachusetts.

These are some of the things which Former Members of Congress—FMC—as we call it, was organized to do. We are 3 years old. We have about \$11,000 in our treasury. We have 393 members as of today; 434 former Members of the

House and Senate have joined, but in these years 34 have passed on.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I should like to read the names of the 17 who have passed away since we were here a year ago. We stood in honor of their memory in our business meeting earlier today.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota may place the names in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I begin, of course, with a former distinguished Member of both this body and the other body, and who went on to become the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I checked in the Library of Congress and found that of the 37 men who became President of the United States, 22 had served in one House or the other, and 9 of them had served in both Houses, including, for example, Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson. Three of those nine were our last three Presidents, President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon.

Those of our Members who have passed away in the last year are:

Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas.

William H. Benton of Connecticut.

Oliver P. Bolton of Ohio, whose mother and father, as the Members know, were both Members of this House. His mother, Mrs. Bolton, planned to be here today, but illness in her family prevented her coming.

Senator Prescott S. Bush of Connecticut.

Henderson H. Carson of Ohio.

Senator Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa, a former Member both of the House and of the Senate.

Karl M. LeCompte, of Iowa.

Franklin H. Lichtenwalter of Pennsylvania.

Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri.

Thomas W. Miller of Delaware.

Philip J. Philbin of Massachusetts.

Robert Ramspeck of Georgia. He was an original member of FMC board of directors. He introduced the Democratic Members at our reunion here last year. When he passed away last September, a member of his family told me he had considered it one of the greatest satisfactions of his life to be in charge on the Democratic side of this House on that occasion.

Jeannette Rankin of Montana.

George Sarbacher, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Ralph T. Smith, of Illinois, a former Senator.

Thomas Stewart, of Tennessee, a former Senator.

Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, the gentleman who spoke to us last year at the age of 102.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll of Members at this time.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey.

Walter Baring, Nevada.

Robert R. Barry, New York.

Ross Bass, Tennessee.

Catherine May Bedell, Washington.

Page Belcher, Oklahoma.

J. Floyd Breeding, Kansas.

John W. Bricker, Ohio.

Lawrence Burton, Utah.

John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin.

Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania.

Joseph E. Casey, Massachusetts.

Frank L. Chelf, Sr., Kentucky.

W. Sterling Cole, New York.

Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina.

William C. Cramer, Florida.

Francis E. Dorn, New York.

Clyde T. Ellis, Arkansas.

Homer Ferguson, Michigan.

John Foley, Maryland.

J. Allen Frear, Jr., Delaware.

Nick Galifianakis, North Carolina.

Edward E. Garmatz, Maryland.

G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia.

Robert Hale, Maine.

John R. Hansen, Iowa.

William Henry Harrison, Wyoming.

Brooks Hays, Arkansas.

Don Hayworth, Michigan.

Pat Hillings, California.

Earl Hogan, Indiana.

Evan Howell, Illinois.

Allan O. Hunter, California.

W. Pat Jennings, Virginia.

August E. Johansen, Michigan.

Calvin D. Johnson, Illinois.

Jed Johnson, Jr., Oklahoma.

Walter H. Judd, Minnesota.

Frank M. Karsten, Missouri.

James Kee, West Virginia.

Hastings Keith, Massachusetts.

Frank Kowalski, Connecticut.

Christopher C. McGrath, New York.

Clifford D. McIntire, Maine.

Hervy G. Machen, Maryland.

George Meader, Michigan.

Chester L. Mize, Kansas.

Walter H. Moeller, Ohio.

John S. Monagan, Connecticut.

Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico.

Abraham J. Multer, New York.

F. Jay Nimitz, Indiana.

Maston E. O'Neal, Georgia.

Frank C. Osmer, Jr., New Jersey.

William T. Pfeiffer, New York.

Howard W. Pollock, Alaska.

David M. Potts, New York.

Stanley A. Prokop, Pennsylvania.

Charlotte T. Reid, Illinois.

R. Walter Riehlman, New York.

Kenneth Roberts, Alabama.

John M. Robsion, Jr., Kentucky.

Byron Rogers, Colorado.

Harold Ryan, Michigan.

Byron N. Scott, California.

Fred Schwengel, Iowa.

Amistead I. Selden, Jr., Alabama.

Carlton Sickles, Maryland.

Alfred D. Sieminski, New Jersey.

William L. Springer, Illinois.

W. Walter Stauffer, Pennsylvania.

Lera Thomas, Texas.

Clark W. Thompson, Texas.

James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania.

Albert L. Vreeland, New Jersey.

George Wallhauser, New Jersey.

Fred Wampler, Indiana.

Phillip Weaver, Nebraska.

J. Irving Whalley, Pennsylvania.

Basil Lee Whitener, North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Eighty Members have answered to their names.

The gentleman from Minnesota yields to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it was only 2 years ago that we held our first reunion in this Chamber. I recall at that time that the Speaker is greeting us very graciously and hopefully predicted that it would become an annual custom, and since this is the third year in which the ceremony has been observed, it appears that it will become permanent. For that, speaking for all the Members on both sides of the aisle, I am sure I can say that this comes with a great spirit of gratitude on our part.

I want also to say a word in praise of Congressman Judd, my longtime friend and colleague, for the gracious way in which he has worked with me. I was chosen as the first president after a year of co-chairmanship with him. He has done a remarkable job in the 14 months that he has served as our President.

Mr. Speaker, there are two sources of embarrassment for me. One is that I have not been recognized by some of my colleagues, and I must make them feel easier about it. I do not want any embarrassment on that point. I have grown some new hair. It is a hair piece, and what God hath not wrought I went out and bought.

The other source of embarrassment is something that disturbed Lew Deschler, and he is seldom up against a tough question. He generally knows the answers. I could say he is an expert, except that I am not in awe of experts after the dinner conversation in which Mrs. Emily Post was seated next to a man, her dinner partner who had just met her. He said, "You are Mrs. Post?" She said, "Yes." He said, "Mrs. Emily Post?" She said, "Yes." He said, "Well, Mrs. Post, you are eating my salad."

I would say in support of Lew Deschler's status, that he comes as close to being an expert as anyone I know, but he was troubled about whether to list me from Arkansas or from North Carolina, and that is understandable. I served 16 happy years in the House from the State of Arkansas. North Carolinians, and my present home is in North Carolina, are accustomed to hearing my reference to Arkansas as my beloved native State. The Arkansians are interested always in my reference to North Carolina as my beloved adopted State. But as I told my fellow Tarheels not long ago, it is very easy for me to feel at home in North Carolina, having come from Arkansas, for the gentle Ozark hills slope so gracefully eastward toward the Mississippi as our mighty mountains descend so gradually to the sea.

Ain't that pretty?

I do not use that any more because I ran across a line, and many have heard me say this, from Walter Hines Page's writing. He said:

Next to fried foods the South has suffered most from oratory.

I do however acknowledge my residence in North Carolina because of my pride in the State I have come to love after 5 years teaching at Wake Forest University.

I would like to add, in addition to my acknowledgment of thanks to the Speaker, a reminder that 2 years ago we

were greeted by the distinguished minority leader (Mr. Ford) who is still with us, and there is a certain symbolism here because on the same occasion our beloved friend Hale Boggs, whose tragic death we will always mourn, made a prediction similar to that which the Speaker offered.

I do not intend to dwell upon the past, but you are entitled to know something about a movement we believe is historic. We are taking a quick backward glance at what we have done in the 2 years. Oliver Wendell Holmes was right that "the continuity of history is not only a duty; it is a necessity."

We can take pride in some of the things we have done, and we propose to do more in the future, to acquaint the people of this Nation with the significance of the service of their Congress.

There will always be a Congress, but there are occasions when faith in our institutions falters. We are determined to do our part to guard well the great resources, intellectual and moral resources, which have been accumulated over the years. That is one reason why former Members of Congress are in business.

Since our time is limited, I move now to the great pleasure of presenting our first speaker from the Democratic side, one of the Members who served in the House and also in the Senate. He comes from a State which was also once my home. For 2 years I served as one of the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It is easy for me to be bipartisan, because President Eisenhower wanted me to have that assignment, and I accepted it, and I then spent 2 happy years in Knoxville.

I did tell President Eisenhower about a little lady who voted in 1956. She was asked, "How did you vote?" She said, "I voted for Ike and Brooks. I never split a ticket." I asked him which one of us had confused her.

This, I think, illustrates the fact that we are trying very much to be bipartisan.

Ross Bass is my friend. He happens to be Methodist; and he is always asking me for a Baptist story. I do not know why he would ask for any other kind; he will get a Baptist story, of course.

The only thing I can offer now is of a Mississippi editor who said, when Mr. Eisenhower appointed me:

We do not know how much Mr. Hays knows about navigation or flood control or hydroelectric power production, but we will say this, that the Baptists now have access to the largest baptismal pool in all the world.

These are happy recollections for me. I am glad that Ross Bass is here. He served as a private in the infantry in World War II. He was born during the month I was being recruited for service in the First World War.

I salute the man who became a captain in the Air Force, transferring to that service, and won the Air Medal and the Oak Leaf Cluster.

He came to the Congress in 1955 with these high honors in military service, and he served for almost 10 years in this body. He succeeded Estes Kefauver in the other body.

So I present to you one who has served in both Houses in a very distinguished way, the able and popular Ross Bass of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROSS BASS. Mr. Speaker, when my friend the gentleman from North Carolina was here in the House, from Arkansas, we called him the "Pope of the Baptist Church." We weighed him in in watermelons.

Gentlemen and ladies of the House, former Members and present Members, it is a real pleasure for me to be back to address you.

I was given an impossible assignment. I was assigned the task of speaking on behalf of the Democrats from the Senate. I can guarantee you that is impossible, first of all because my time is limited and second because every Senator that I have ever known wishes to speak for himself and usually does at some length.

Anyway, it is a real pleasure for me to come back to this great Chamber to visit with my former colleagues and with the present Members of the House. I do not think there is any higher honor that can come to any man than to serve in these hallowed Halls and to have the privilege of this great forum and the privilege of serving the Speaker.

Now, for fear of dating myself or for fear of being classified as an older gentleman, I would like to reminisce for just a moment and recall one or two of the funny experiences I had here or I heard here, and maybe one or two of the tragic ones.

I was reminded today when I saw a gentleman come into the Former Members' meeting of this, which is one of the funniest speeches I ever heard on the floor of the House, but one which is very true.

It was during debate on a veterans' bill, and, of course, it was sort of sacred that when a veterans' bill came up, you voted for it. This gentleman got up in opposition to the veterans' bill, and he said, "I know it is going to shock you, but I am against this because it is a veterans' benefit." He said, "I am a veteran, and," he said, "when I was inducted into World War II, I lost my job, I lost my home, and I lost my wife." But, he said, "I now have a better house, a better job, and a better wife, and none of them were veterans' benefits."

So these are some of the things we remember.

I think one of the most tragic ones I heard points up to me the value of a Member of Congress and the value of his ability and the respect with which he is held by his colleagues.

I remember a very able Member of this body was explaining his bill one day—he was the chairman of a subcommittee—and during the course of the debate another Member got up and asked him a question, and then the chairman of the subcommittee answered the question and answered it correctly.

The gentleman who was asking the question said, "How do I know that I can believe this man?" He said, "After all, he is not a lawyer. I understand

that before he came to Congress he was just a bricklayer."

I have never known such a quiet to come over the body as it did that day.

What I am saying to you is this: That there have been bricklayers, there have been plumbers, there may have been janitors. There have been men and women from every walk of life in this great Nation of ours, but I have never known a man who has been in this body who did not have some qualification and something to contribute. As a result of that service, my life has been richer for having served here.

I remember one of the shocks that I got while I was here. After the House voted itself an increase in salary—I believe it was early in 1955, perhaps in March—I walked back into the cloakroom and sat down, and in a moment WILBUR MILLS came back and he pointed me out, and in a kidding tone he said, "If there ever was a one-term, Ross Bass is a one-term."

He said, "He comes to Congress, and the first thing he does is to vote to give the President the authority to declare war; the second thing he does he votes for giving the authority to draft the men to fight the war; and then, because he thinks he has done such a good job, he votes himself an increase in salary." He says, "There is no way he can survive."

You know, I almost thought he was right. But anyway I survived, and then one day I decided that I would cross over to the other body, if possible.

I was then reminded of a statement that Speaker Rayburn made to me one time, sitting out here where many of us have talked. We were talking about a colleague of ours who had decided to run for the Senate, and Speaker Rayburn said to me—I will never forget it—"Ross, that is the longest 528 feet in the world."

Anyway I made that trek, and I want to tell you I learned that there is no similarity in the two bodies except the salary, which is identical. And I soon learned that what I had learned in the House served me not at all in the Senate. I had to forget that there was such a thing as the kind of rules that Lew Deschler interprets for us and that the Speaker interprets. Over there the rules are rather loose, and we are allowed a little more flexibility for talking and saying what we want to.

However, I am going to try to abide by House rules today and limit my remarks and be as brief as I can.

I want to say to you the minute you get over there, there is some kind of thing that happens. I do not know what it is, but I guess you become more important to yourself and certainly you become more important to your constituents and personal friends and people you have known before. When you met them on the street they used to call you Ross, but now they call you Senator. You may have been on a first-name basis with your staff, but immediately you become Senator. Good or bad it happens.

The first time I realized it was one night when I was in a restaurant near Capitol Hill. It was on New Year's Eve.

We had ordered dinner, and with it my party ordered a little delicacy that was in shortage, I guess, at this restaurant. The maitre d' greeted me with Senator this and Senator that but before that I had to stand in line to get a table. I was served this delicacy, and in a few moments one of my colleagues from the House came up and spoke to me and saw what we were eating. He said, "How did you get that?" He had been there before I was, and he said, "I ordered it and they told me they were out of it." I said, "Captain, can you get my friend the Congressman some of this delicacy?" "Oh, yes, Senator. If you wish it, we will get it for you."

Well, what I am trying to say to you is this: We are the same person, and so forth, and we get the same salary and we do the same job, but I was impressed not because I wanted to be but because of the fact that there are sometimes veiled differences that should not exist between the Members of one body and the other.

The other thing we miss most when we leave here—and some of you will be realizing this soon and some of you sooner than you think—is the fact of a flat forum from which to express our opinions on the various issues of the day. It is very difficult for us to refrain from expressing our attitudes about current events. I certainly do not intend to do this today.

However, I do want briefly to make this observation about the Congress of the United States during this period in our history. I want to commend the leadership of the House and the Senate, the responsible leaders, for the way that they are handling the situation existing in our country today. I want to commend them for the rationale with which they have handled themselves and the sensibility of their statements and the nonpartisan attitude adopted by the Congress in providing leadership in these serious times.

I have one other comment. I think one of the disappointments I have had recently since I left here was reading in the press that the prestige of the Congress or the influence of the Congress versus the other branches was declining. I do not buy that and I am glad to see that the Congress is asserting itself and continuing the leadership necessary in the affairs of our country.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your generosity and the generosity of this body in allowing us the privilege of coming back here and visiting once again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair advise the former members that the Chair had set aside this time in the middle of a legislative day. The Chair on his own initiative is going to extend that time to 1:45. He cannot extend it further and would appreciate the cooperation of those in charge of the time.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the Speaker for this additional time, and I am sure our speakers will adhere to that time limitation.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my great privilege to introduce to speak for former

Republican Senators the Honorable John Bricker of Ohio.

Senator Bricker served in World War I. He is a graduate of Ohio State University, both from its liberal arts college and its law school. He was attorney general of the State of Ohio, Governor of the State of Ohio, Republican candidate for Vice President in 1944, and a U.S. Senator for two terms, from 1947 to 1959.

Senator Bricker.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BRICKER. Thank you very much, Dr. Judd.

For the first time I have the privilege of speaking from this floor. It is a rare opportunity that I have, and one that I never thought would occur. However, it is a delight to be here, Mr. Speaker, in your midst, and reminisce a little bit and perhaps make a suggestion or two that I may have.

As a former Member of the Congress, I recall one time in 1917 when I drove former President Taft over to Camp Sherman where he was speaking to the various regiments assembled there, and we were talking about various things, and he said that a former President of the United States has no more power or authority than the King of England, and a former Member of the Congress has even less than that.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to study and develop some ways in which we could be of service because of our experience. I only want to mention one or two things.

First of all, all of the papers that were in my office, uncensored, were filed in the Historical Society Museum in my home State, and there is not a day that passes that I do not receive a request that someone might examine those papers, particularly two or three, and I have always been glad to grant these requests. The papers have been used rather extensively.

I am happy to say that one of the requests was from a president of a university in my State.

In the second place, our experiences can be valuable to young people who are the hope of tomorrow. About twice in each quarter at Ohio State University, where I was for a long time a member of the board of trustees, I appear before a joint class in political science, and one in American history. It has been a great privilege to me. I have gotten more out of it than they have. I talk for about 15 minutes, and then open up the meeting for questions from the members of those classes. And for one hour we have an experience that is really and truly a thrilling one.

I hope that in doing so it contributes something, and I offer it as a suggestion only to those who join with me.

I shall never forget a prayer that Peter Marshall, a great man of God, offered in the Senate. He said, "God, give us a mandate a little higher than a ballot box."

Many of us have experienced that, and have followed his suggestion, but we are glad to be here. I think if ever there was

a time in the history of our country when we should forget the ballot box and think of the interests of our country as a whole it is at the present time."

So, Mr. Speaker, I make these suggestions only as a man who comes from the western part of the East, and the eastern part of the West, out in the great State of Ohio. I see many of the Members of Congress who are here from my State. My only suggestion is that the greatest problem facing us is, in spite of the headlines and in spite of attempts on the part of groups here and there apparently to gain attention for themselves, as we see each day in the press and see it on television, and hear it over the radio, in spite of that, the most serious problem we have in this country is an economic problem, and that is true not only here in the United States but throughout the world. We are facing inflation, and we are facing a depression, and it is going to take careful and skillful management on the part of the Congress and the administration to solve that in the interest of the people.

I might say further that inflation is the most insidious of all the taxes that we can levy upon the people of our country.

Not only that, but it destroys the very foundation of the structure of government.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to have been with the Speaker and to have seen so many of my former colleagues who are listed on this nostalgic paper that I hold here in my hand. I wish much success to the Speaker and to the Members of Congress in the coming days.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to present the second speaker, and the concluding speaker, for our side of the aisle.

I am grateful to Ross Bass for his reference to me. Before I finish, on this matter of partisanship, I think, instead of revising and extending my remarks, I will just say that I am really like the old man down in Arkansas on his death bed who was told he was going to die. He looked up and said, "Well, if there is anything wrong with the Baptist Church or the Democratic Party, I want to die without finding out about it."

Then, too, if I may say to my colleagues, since I have alluded to the request now and then for a Baptist story, I do not want my Baptist friends to feel that I am flippant in this regard. They know how much I love them.

I now present a distinguished judge. I used to stand in awe of judges. I am not in awe of this man. He is a gentle judge, a very learned judge. I served on the Committee on Banking and Currency with him for a number of years.

The first judge I ever faced was somewhat like Abraham Multer of New York. This man had the interesting name of Marcellus Lycurgus Davis. I lost the case. I began losing early. He wrote me the next day and said,

DEAR BROOKS: What you did yesterday was refreshingly boyish, but be a boy as long as you can, for the blood of youth is the wine of life, and while age leaves me but an empty cup I love its lingering fragrance still.

We of the later generation feel a keen interest in younger men who fill the places we once occupied.

I believe it was Walter Lippmann who said:

The invisible city is composed of young men who died for their country's sake and old men who plant trees they will never sit under.

We are planting trees you will sit under.

This man who still remains with us, a great judge, Abraham Multer, who served 20 years in this House from the 80th Congress through the 89th Congress—20 years—I am very happy to present to speak to the House.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when I was told a little earlier today I would be called upon to talk on behalf of the Democrats formerly of the House and to limit my remarks to 5 minutes, I said that after 20 years in this House, having learned to make a one-minute speech, I would find it difficult to speak for 5 minutes.

I appreciate the privilege that has been accorded to me, because actually the gentleman who should be talking to you now on behalf of the former Democrats of the House is my long-time friend—and the long-time friend of all our Members—Manny Celler. Congressman Celler is well, but, unfortunately, he could not be here to fulfill this commitment.

Compared to the 50 years that he served in this House, my mere 20 years in it hardly entitles me to speak for you. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express on behalf of all of our former Members on this side of the aisle how pleased we are to be back with you even for a brief time. I remember that when I came here in the 80th Congress I learned from our then beloved Speaker Joe Martin that we pronounced the word "pursuant" as "pursawayant."

I had the privilege, as many of us did, of also serving under the late and most revered Sam Rayburn, and later under the gentle John McCormack. Although I did not have the privilege of having served under the Speakership of the distinguished and able Carl Albert, I did serve with him while he was majority leader of this House.

I always repeat what Mr. Sam said so fervently so many times: "I love this House." I am sure that is why we all have come back here, because we all love this House. As a matter of fact, we had to suspend last year 11 of our Members of the former Members of Congress Association, because they loved it so much they wanted to come back as duly elected members. I regret that only one of them made it, even though we then got 10 more former Members back into our organization.

It has been good to be with you. I hope we can be with you for many more years to come and always return to this place which has been prettied up so nicely. It has been prettied up in more ways than one. I am sure all who served here appreciate it.

More than that, we all appreciate the fact that we were given in this land of opportunity the privilege to serve here.

I am sure those who are now serving will value this privilege as much as we do.

I wish for all of us that we may return here, year after year, in good health to renew and extend old friendships in the service of our country.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to speak for former Republican Members of the House, the Honorable Howard W. Pollock of Alaska. He was educated in the schools of Mississippi, California, Texas, and Massachusetts—MIT. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1941 to 1946, being discharged as a lieutenant commander. He was also head of several Alaska industrial projects involving gold and oil and seafood, which includes most of Alaska's main products. He served in the territorial legislature of Alaska before it became a State, and then in the Alaska State Senate. He served in this House from 1967 to 1971. He is now the Deputy Administrator of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration in the Department of Commerce.

Former Congressman Pollock.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friends, it is a warm pleasure to be here. I wanted to come down once again to the well for feelings of nostalgia.

It is a very great pleasure to join my colleagues, past and present. Because I have the privilege of being in Washington I do have the opportunity frequently of associating with Members of Congress who are on active duty here, as it were. I continually have the opportunity of joining the Prayer Breakfast group on the House side, which is one of the very precious things in my continuing life.

As a matter of fact, we heard a marvelous beatitude this morning from Dan, and I see him sitting in the back. It is: Blessed are the brief for they shall again be invited.

I shall react to that by talking briefly.

I do have the opportunity and privilege and pleasure of serving with some of the men we have heard this morning on the board of directors of the FMC. As we have gone through our efforts throughout the year working toward this opportunity today, I cannot help but think of some of our colleagues who are no longer with us. Out of the 90th club group I think Bill Cowger is the only one who has passed on. He was a wonderful Congressman and a wonderful man. I would like on this occasion here today to record our memory of him. Of course there are ever so many others.

My friends, as I sit in these hallowed Halls I think about how very much history has been written here in this, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

I know I speak for all my colleagues who are Former Members of Congress, when I say that anyone who has ever been a part of this body will always be a part of it. To those of you who are still actively engaged in the work of the Congress I want to extend on my own personal behalf and certainly on behalf of all members of FMC our warmest best wishes for you, and good luck in all your endeavors. If it should come to pass that one day you are no longer in the Congress and you are sufficiently blessed to still be alive we would warmly welcome

you into the Former Members of Congress.

We think it is a great institution. We want you to stay where you are now, but one day come and join us.

God love you and keep you.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned earlier, the bylaws of Former Members of Congress require that the organization not be used for any political partisan purpose, or to support or oppose any particular legislation or any candidate. As a citizen every Member is, of course, free to do as he wishes.

The bylaws require also that if any of our Members runs for office his membership is automatically suspended and, if elected, it is terminated. There were 11, as was said, who ran for office in 1972 and their membership was suspended. One of them, Gillis Long of Louisiana, was elected. The other 10 were not and have been reinstated.

I report this only to reassure the sitting Members that they are apparently not in too great danger from the former Members.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I should like to place in the RECORD the names of those who took the trouble to send their regrets that they could not come to this reunion today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The information is as follows:

**FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SENDING REGRETS AT NOT BEING ABLE TO BE PRESENT
MAY 24, 1973**

Homer Abele, Ohio.
Miles Allgood, Alabama.
Elizabeth Andrews, Alabama.
O. K. Armstrong, Missouri.
Joseph W. Barr, Indiana.
A. David Baumhart, Ohio.
Augustus Bennet, New York.
Jackson Betts, Ohio.
Iris F. Blitch, Georgia.
Frances P. Bolton, Ohio.
Edward J. Bonin, Pennsylvania.
Reva Beck Bosone, Utah.
Clarence Burton, Virginia.
John M. Butler, Maryland.
Louis J. Capozzoli, New York.
Frank Carlson, Kansas.
J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado.
Chester Chesney, Illinois.
Victor Christgau, Minnesota.
Ranulf Compton, Connecticut.
N. Neiman Craley, Jr., Pennsylvania.
Albert W. Cretella, Connecticut.
Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri.
Irwin D. Davidson, New York.
Vincent J. Dellay, New Jersey.
Robert V. Denney, Nebraska.
David S. Dennison, Ohio.
Helen Cahagan Douglas, California.
Carl T. Durham, North Carolina.
Ken Dyal, California.
Henry Ellenbogen, Pennsylvania.
Charles H. Elston, Ohio.
Leonard Farbstein, New York.
Elizabeth Farrington, Hawaii.
Michael A. Feighan, Ohio.
Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania.
Gerald T. Flynn, Wisconsin.
Ellsworth B. Foote, Connecticut.
James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee.
Hedwen C. Fuller, New York.
E. C. Gathings, Arkansas.
Newell A. George, Kansas.
Percy W. Griffiths, Ohio.
Ralph Harvey, Indiana.
Louis B. Heller, New York.

Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa.
Carl H. Hoffman, Pennsylvania.
J. Oliva Huot, New Hampshire.
Lawrence E. Imhoff, Ohio.
Glen D. Johnson, Oklahoma.
B. Everett Jordan, North Carolina.
Raymond W. Karst, Missouri.
Bernard W. Kearney, New York.
Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia.
Edna F. Kelly, New York.
Eugene J. Keogh, New York.
Thomas S. Kleppe, North Dakota.
William F. Knowland, California.
Thomas H. Kuchel, California.
Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts.
Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts.
J. Carlton Loser, Tennessee.
John W. McCormack, Massachusetts.
William D. McFarlane.
Walter L. McVey, Jr.
Donald H. Magnuson, Washington.
D. R. "Billy" Matthews, Florida.
George P. Miller, California.
William E. Miller, New York.
Tom V. Moorehead, Ohio.
Bradford Morse, Massachusetts.
Catherine D. Norrell, Arkansas.
Charles G. Oakman, Michigan.
James C. Oliver, Maine.
Harold C. Ostertag, New York.
Thomas M. Pelly, Washington.
N. Blaine Peterson, Utah.
Alexander Pirnie, New York.
Ben Relfel, South Dakota.
James Roosevelt, California.
Howard W. Smith, Virginia.
Gale H. Stalker, New York.
John H. Terry, New York.
William M. Tuck, Virginia.
Joseph D. Tydings, Maryland.
Harold H. Velds, Illinois.
E. S. Johnny Walker, New Mexico.
James D. Weaver, Pennsylvania.
J. Ernest Wharton, New York.
John S. Wold, Wyoming.
Eugene Worley, Texas.
Samuel W. Yorty, California.

Mr. JUDD. There are two or three other former Members who wish to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman that these requests can be made but will have to be executed in the House, and permission will be asked.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce, for our final piece of business, the Honorable George Meader, the chairman of the nominating committee, to report on the election of members to FMC Board of Directors and of its officers for the next year.

Mr. GEORGE MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the former Members of Congress, in their business meeting this morning, elected four Members for a 3-year term on the Board of Directors, as follows:

Jeffery Cohelan of California.

Walter H. Moeller of Ohio.

J. Caleb Boggs of Delaware.

John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

They elected for 2-year terms on the Board of Directors the following:

Senator B. Everett Jordan of North Carolina.

Fred Schwengel of Iowa.

The organization also elected as honorary directors without term the co-founders of our organization, the Honorable Brooks Hays of Arkansas and the Honorable Walter Judd of Minnesota.

The Members elected as their President for the coming year Senator B.

Everett Jordan of North Carolina, and as Vice President George Meader of Michigan.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, unless there is someone who has an irresistible urge to ask permission to make some additional comments we wish to close.

I thank you again, Mr. Speaker, and the House leadership, for your graciousness and courtesy in giving us this hour on this very specially busy day before the Memorial Day weekend, and despite the sad death of one of the House Members. All of us appreciate so deeply your granting us this greatly enjoyable, from our point of view, reunion in the House Chamber of Former Members of the House and Senate.

I believe this organization can do a lot of good in helping get a wider and deeper understanding throughout our country of our Congress—the role it has to play and how it actually functions in seeking to promote our Nation's vital interests and to safeguard our people's liberties.

Mr. BROOKS HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Judd, yield for a question?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. BROOKS HAYS. Will the gentleman announce the time of the reception to be held?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, thank you. We extend to all sitting Members as well as former Members an invitation to join us at a reception at 5 o'clock in the caucus room, room 345, of the Cannon Office Building. We hope you will bring your wives, too.

Perhaps I should add that the wives and widows of former Members have organized an FMC auxiliary, and about 175 have joined. They are busy with functions of their own this day, and will be joining us at 5 o'clock at the reception.

Mr. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, who I am pleased to greet as a fellow alumnus of the University of Oklahoma, ladies and gentlemen of the 93d Congress and my colleagues of former Congresses:

When I lived in the super-great State of Texas the righteous people hunted us Republicans with coon dogs. In fact it was necessary for me to outrun a posse in order to get out of my old home town of Amarillo. Then 17 months after arriving in New York City, unheralded and unsung, I was elected to the Congress. Thus it is obvious that the righteous people of New York also lost little time in getting me out of town. It was the custom of Speaker Sam Rayburn to gleefully refer to my New York City Congressional District as "the 255th County of Texas."

Essaying the roles of ombudsman, father confessor and mother hen to 400,000 of my fellow citizens during my tenure as a Congressman was a rewarding and enlightening experience. It would be a salutary arrangement if the vociferous critics of the Congress could each serve just 1 month as a Member of this body. Their carping voices, which proclaim that Congressmen and Congresswomen are idlers, riders of the gravy train and unresponsive to public needs, would be stilled. They would gain first hand knowledge of the unremitting behind-the-scenes toil of the average Member in behalf of his or her constituents and

their burning of the midnight oil in a ceaseless quest for the right answers.

While a Member of the Congress is not required to sacrifice his or her life on the altar of our country yet that sacrifice was made by a quiet and self-effacing Member, whose voice was seldom heard in debate on the floor or in committee on the fateful day of June 4, 1941. He stood here and poured out his heart and soul in refutation of a canard uttered a few minutes previously by one of his colleagues, which did violence to his innermost ideals and convictions. He spoke with an eloquence which none of us knew he possessed. He was so immersed in his discourse that he did not heed the twice repeated admonition of Speaker Rayburn that "the time of the gentleman has expired".

Well the time of the gentleman had indeed expired because as the Speaker's gavel sounded for the last time this noble man fell dead at the base of this hallowed lectern. It was perhaps the most dramatic and tragic incident that ever occurred in this Chamber.

I am profoundly grateful to you ladies and gentlemen of the 93d Congress for according me the privilege of reliving for a moment those exacting but golden days of yore.

Mr. SIEMINSKI of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of being referred to as, "of N.J." I am now, and have been for the past 13 years a resident of Virginia.

Mindful of Virginia's enormous contribution to the strength of our legislative process—Peyton Randolph, President of the First Continental Congress, was of Virginia.

If appropriate, I would like to suggest that we consider the following: "To be displayed, in the Capitol, pictures or portraits of suitable size, of every speaker or President of the Congress."

Surely, the second and third ranking citizens of the land, in succession to the Presidency, are worthy of such commemoration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to thank the former Members for attending and addressing us in the House today.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

ROLLCALL OF HEROES—POLICEMEN SLAIN IN LINE OF DUTY, 1971-73

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I listed the names of law enforcement officers who had given their lives in the performance of duty, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That list covered a period of just over 2 years, and it included the names of 101 policemen. Tragically, in the 2-year period subsequent to this list—a period that included the unfortunate Supreme Court ruling on capital punishment—over 200 more police

officers have been killed in the line of duty.

Just recently, we observed Police Memorial Week to pay tribute to the memory of courageous law enforcement officers who paid the ultimate price for protecting our rights as free citizens. It is distressing to note that very little public attention was paid to this observance.

Yet for the loved ones left behind, the week had great significance. It should have a great significance for all of us who value our freedom.

One reason for the lack of interest in honoring the memory of slain policemen is the overwhelming concern on the part of many, for the so-called "rights" of the criminal.

These "rights" are taken at the expense of the rights of policemen, and the ordinary citizen who is victimized by crime.

As one Washington, D.C., policeman said recently, all the worst criminal needs to do is point a finger at a policeman and yell "police brutality," and right away public attention through some elements of our society is focused on sympathy for the criminal.

I am fearful that unless the misguided psychology that applies to "rights" of hardened criminals is reversed, we face dark days ahead.

After all, in any society, especially one that embraces democracy, there is a very thin line between peace and anarchy.

The person that maintains the line in favor of peace is the policeman. I, for one, am thankful that the policeman is present to protect me.

I have not talked to anyone who would rather meet a criminal on a dark and lonely street instead of a policeman.

Mr. Speaker, a policeman, just like a soldier, realizes that when he takes the oath of office and puts on the uniform, his life is in constant danger.

Perhaps a few policemen can adopt a casual attitude toward death, but I seriously doubt if the majority feel this way.

I am sure that most of them are like Patrolman Louis Vasger of the Philadelphia Police Department.

Patrolman Vasger is dead. He was gunned down in cold blood just 5 weeks ago during a routine inspection on his patrol beat.

Interestingly enough, but not surprising, the accused killer was out on bail awaiting trial for armed robbery committed a year and a half ago.

Patrolman Vasger left behind a young wife and three small boys. This needless tragedy is repeated over and over again.

Yet, statistics tell the story. Only one conviction now results for every 28 reported felonies.

Mr. Speaker, reading the names of slain policemen is something I do not relish, but I think it must be done as a testament to these courageous men and their families as well as symbolically reminding everyone that they have a moral obligation to respect and to obey the law.

Unless each and every one of us rededicates ourselves to supporting law enforcement officials in the performance of their appointed duties, crime will continue to be a horrible way of life for too many Americans, and brave officers like

Patrolman Vasger will continue to pay—with their lives.

The names that I will read include State, National and local lawmen.

Death respects no rank, as the men who fell ranged from cadets to top supervisors.

They served small towns, boroughs, county, State and national agencies, as well as the large cities.

Actually, the list is not complete.

My good friend, Virgil Penn, the national chaplain of the Fraternal Order of Police, who furnished me with a list of names, said that many police departments did not respond to his request for the names of slain policemen.

Therefore, this list contains 135 names representing 73 law agencies, but from reports compiled by the FBI, and other law enforcement agencies, the actual total is 125 killed in 1971, and 112 in 1972.

With deep reverence and profound sorrow I read the names of those who gave their lives to save our lives.

It is truly a roll call of heroes:

ALABAMA

Algie Long, of Hurtsboro.

ARIZONA

Paul Marston.
Gilbert Guthrie.

CALIFORNIA

Sgt. John V. Young, of San Francisco.
Phillip J. Riley, of Los Angeles.
Kenneth E. Walters, of Los Angeles.

CONNECTICUT

Kenneth Moraska, of Norwalk.
Sgt. Nicholas Pera, of Norwalk.

DELAWARE

David Yarrington, of the State Police.
Donald L. Carey, of the State Police.
George W. Emory, of the State Police.

FLORIDA

J. H. Moon, of Jacksonville.
Robert DeKarte, of Coral Gables.
Henry T. Minard, of Hollywood.

GEORGIA

Harlow Douglas Meers, of Rome.
Billy M. Kaylor, of Atlanta.
James R. Green, of Atlanta.

HAWAII

Benjamin Keeloha, of Honolulu.
David Huber, of Honolulu.
Deputy Sheriff Donal P. Jensen, of Honolulu.

IDAHO

Ross Flavel, of Lewiston.

ILLINOIS

Peter E. Laskey, of the Illinois Bureau of Information.
Frank Dunbar, of Chicago.

KANSAS

Kenneth M. Kennedy, of Hutchinson.

LOUISIANA

Ralph DeWayne Wilder, Deputy Sheriff of East Baton Rouge.
Ralph G. Hancock, Deputy Sheriff of East Baton Rouge.
Leroy Odom, of Farmersville.
Clyde Pearson, of Bossier City.
Edwin C. Hosi, Sr., of New Orleans.
Deputy Superintendent Louis Sirgo, of New Orleans.
Paul Persigo, of New Orleans.
Phillip J. Coleman, of New Orleans.
Alfred Harrell, Cadet, of New Orleans.

MARYLAND

Carl Peterson, of Baltimore.
Donald A. Robertson, Lieutenant, of Montgomery County.
Phillip Lee Russ, of the State Police.
Thomas Noyle, of the State Police.

Lorenzo Gray, of Baltimore.
Norman Buckmann, of Baltimore.

MICHIGAN

Charles B. Stark, of the State Police.
Steven DeVires, of the State Police.
Gary T. Rampy, of the State Police.
Leroy Imus, of Sterling Heights.
William Schmedding, Jr., of Detroit.
Gilbert Stocker, of Detroit.
Gerald Riley, of Detroit.
Robert Bradford, Jr., of Detroit.
Harold E. Carlson, of Detroit.

OHIO

Richard T. Miller, of East Cleveland.
Curtis Stanton, of Columbus.
Joseph Edwards, of Canton.

OKLAHOMA

Robert Eugene Aka, of State Highway Patrol.
Thomas Isbell, of State Highway Patrol.
Wesley Cole, of Tulsa.
Carl Hart, of Bokehito City.
Melvin Minor, of Norman.
Michael Ratikan, of Oklahoma City.
Thomas Spybuck, of Tulsa.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert Hagenburg, of Plymouth Township.
Robert Lapp, of State Police Headquarters.
John S. Valent, of State Police Headquarters.

William Davis, Kennet Square.
Richard Posey, of Kennet Square.
Robert Seymore, of Bellefonte.
Albert Devlin, of McCandless.
George Stuckey, of Bristol Township.
William Schrott, of Penn Hills.
Bartley Connolly, of Penn Hills.
Henry Clinton Schaad, of York.
Douglas J. Alexander, of Philadelphia.
Leo VanWinkle, Jr., of Philadelphia.
James Duffin, Jr., of Philadelphia.
Louis Vasger, of Philadelphia.
William White, of Philadelphia.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray Caffee, of the State Highway Patrol.

TENNESSEE

Jesse Buttram, of Lenoir City.

TEXAS

Samuel Infante, of Dallas.
W. Don Reese, of Dallas.
A. J. Robertson, of Dallas.
E. M. Belcher, of Fort Worth.
Johnnie Hartwell, of Dallas.
Levy McQuiter, of Dallas.
Carl J. Cooke, of Dallas.
Allen Perry Camp, of Dallas.
Antonio T. Canales, of San Antonio.
Vincent Jerry Walker, of San Antonio.
Joshua Rodrigues, of Houston.

MINNESOTA

Howard L. Johnson, of Roseville.
Joseph Pudlick, of Minneapolis.
Inno H. Suek (Lt.), of Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI

William J. Skinner (Lt.), of Jackson.

MISSOURI

Donald L. Marler, of Harrisonville.
Francis E. Wirt, of Harrisonville.
Homer E. Fry (Marshall), of Mansfield.

NEW JERSEY

Frank Papianni, of Edison.
Marlenus J. Sigeren, of State Police.
Werner Foerster, of State Police.
Frank Irvin, of Newark.

NEW MEXICO

Robert Rosenbloom, of State Police.

NEW YORK

William F. Holbert, Jr., of Binghamton.
Trooper White, of State Police.
Robert M. Semrov, of State Police.
Ivan G. Lorenzo, of New York City.
Earl Thompson, of New York City.
Waverly Jones, of New York City.
Joseph Plagentine, of New York City.

Robert Denton, of New York City.
Kenneth Nugent, of New York City.
Joseph V. Morabito, of New York City.
Rocco Lauri, of New York City.
Gregory P. Foster, of New York City.
Elijah Stroud, of New York City.
William Capers, of New York City.
Phillip W. Cardillo, of New York City.
Stephen R. Gilroy, of New York City.
Irving Wright, of New York City.

NORTH CAROLINA

Milford Mack Hardwick, of Columbus.
Dewey Henson McCall, of Wildlife Agent.
William Thomas Land, of Durham Co.
James Robert Lamb, of Wallace.

Alfred Baird.
Michael Patrick Jenkins, of Bessemer City.
Robert Jackson Eury, of Cabarrus Co.
Clyde Stephen Perry, of State Police.
Joe Griffin White, of State Police.
M. J. Bell, of Elizabethtown.
Charles H. Lee, of Clayton.
L. T. Walton, of State Police.
Joseph Hobgood, of Fountain.
Robert Randall East, of State Police.
Leonard Meeks, Jr., of State Police.
Gregory W. Spinelli (F.B.I.), of Charlotte.

UTAH

Deputy Sheriff Donald P. Jensen, of Farmington.

VERMONT

Dana Lee Thompson, of Manchester Center.

VIRGINIA

Carroll David Garrison, of Fairfax.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Norman E. Sheriff, U.S. Marshall.
William L. Sigmon, of Metro Police.
Jerard E. Young, of Metro Police.

WASHINGTON

Fred D. Carr, of Seattle.
Charles F. Noble, of the Highway Patrol.

WISCONSIN

Donald C. Peterson, of the Highway Patrol.

WYOMING

Boyd L. Hall, of Teton County.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I wish to compliment my colleague from California for his continuing effort to make sure that those of us in the House who have had a real interest in this whole area of law enforcement give proper recognition to those men who have died in the line of duty. We must never forget what they have done.

The gentleman from California has been a burr under the saddle of this House in an effort to make sure we do not forget and to see that we do take some kind of constructive action to give awards of merit to so many of these men who maintain peace in the streets and provide for a proper atmosphere of law and order in this country.

I know that my colleague from California has made a persistent effort to bring these issues to the attention of our whole House. I am grateful that the gentleman has not been tempted to set aside his organized effort during the rush of other important issues that come before the House. He has attempted to keep it in front of the entire body. I know he has been the author of several bills in this important area. I wish to compliment him for his effort.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my colleague from California for his remarks and his demonstration of concern which

he has always shown. I must concur with him that too often we take for granted the great job our law enforcement officials perform. It is with that purpose in mind that I took this special order to pay tribute to those who died in the line of duty and, as I said, it is with profound sorrow that I read the names of those who gave their lives.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the RECORD, and that the former Members of the Congress may be allowed to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

THE JAVITS WAR POWERS ACT—A LIBERAL DISSENT

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have supported a concept which I first heard advocated by the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, to limit the power of the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States in absence of a declared war by Congress. This bill was reintroduced by Mr. JAVITS on January 18 of this year in the U.S. Senate (S. 440). At last count, 60 Senators have cosponsored the Javits bill, and it will, I understand, soon pass the Senate, having been reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously.

One month ago I received a letter prepared by Dr. Francis D. Wormuth, professor of political science at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, and cosigned by 12 of his faculty colleagues strongly criticizing the Javits' approach. Dr. Wormuth is one of the great civil libertarians in this country and has been, since the beginning, strongly opposed to U.S. involvement in Indochina. So I was at first surprised that he opposed this bill to limit Presidential warmaking powers.

Upon analysis, I find he makes a thoughtful, impressive argument. These men argue that although the bill supposedly limits the President in initiating new wars that, in fact, it would enlarge the President's power beyond existing law and constitutional limits and would, in fact, authorize the President to initiate new wars.

I strongly recommend that Members read Dr. Wormuth's thoughtful analysis. For that purpose, I am inserting into the RECORD at this point the Javits bill, the text of the letter I received from Dr. Wormuth and his colleagues, and the letter written by Dr. Wormuth to Senator JAVITS, analyzing the Javits bill.

I understand that the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security, Policy, and Scientific Develop-

ment is now involved in marking up House Joint Resolution 542 which is apparently similar to Senator Javits' bill. I hope that the arguments made by these distinguished scholars can be heard by members of that subcommittee and by all Members before we vote on this landmark measure. The bill follows:

S. 440

A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "War Powers Act".

PURPOSE AND POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and insure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces in hostilities or in such situations after they have been introduced in hostilities or in such situations. Under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, it is specifically provided that the Congress shall have the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution, not only its own powers but also all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. At the same time, this Act is not intended to encroach upon the recognized powers of the President, as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, to conduct hostilities authorized by the Congress, to respond to attacks or the imminent threat of attacks upon the United States, including its territories and possessions, to repel attacks or forestall the imminent threat of attacks against the Armed Forces of the United States, and, under proper circumstances, to rescue endangered citizens and nationals of the United States located in foreign countries.

EMERGENCY USE OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 3. In the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress, the Armed Forces of the United States may be introduced in hostilities, or in situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, only—

(1) to repel an armed attack upon the United States, its territories and possessions; to take necessary and appropriate retaliatory actions in the event of such an attack; and to forestall the direct and imminent threat of such an attack;

(2) to repel an armed attack against the Armed Forces of the United States located outside of the United States, its territories and possessions, and to forestall the direct and imminent threat of such an attack;

(3) to protect while evacuating citizens and nationals of the United States, as rapidly as possible, from (A) any situation on the high seas involving a direct and imminent threat to the lives of such citizens and nationals, or (B) any country in which such citizens and nationals are present with the express or tacit consent of the government of such country and are being subjected to a direct and imminent threat to their lives, either sponsored by such government or beyond the power of such government to control; but the President shall make every effort to terminate such a threat without using the Armed Forces of the United States, and shall, where possible, obtain the consent of the government of such country before using

the Armed Forces of the United States to protect citizens and nationals of the United States being evacuated from such country; or

(4) pursuant to specific statutory authorization, but authority to introduce the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities or in any such situation shall not be inferred (A) from any provision of law hereafter enacted, including any provision contained in any appropriation Act, unless such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of such Armed Forces in hostilities or in such situation and specifically exempts the introduction of such Armed Forces from compliance with the provisions of this Act, or (B) from any treaty hereafter ratified unless such treaty is implemented by legislation specifically authorizing the introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities or in such situation and specifically exempting the introduction of such Armed Forces from compliance with the provisions of this Act. Specific statutory authorization is required for the assignment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such Armed Forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities. No treaty in force at the time of the enactment of this Act shall be construed as specific statutory authorization for, or a specific exemption permitting, the introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities or in any such situation, within the meaning of this clause (4); and no provision of law in force at the time of the enactment of this Act shall be so construed unless such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of such Armed Forces in hostilities or in any such situation.

REPORTS

SEC. 4. The introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act shall be reported promptly in writing by the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, together with a full account of the circumstances under which such Armed Forces were introduced in such hostilities or in such situation, the estimated scope of such hostilities or situation, and the consistency of the introduction of such forces in such hostilities or situation with the provisions of section 3 of this Act. Whenever Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in hostilities or in any such situation outside of the United States, its territories and possessions, the President shall, so long as such Armed Forces continue to be engaged in such hostilities or in such situation, report to the Congress periodically on the status of such hostilities or situation as well as the scope and expected duration of such hostilities or situation, but in no event shall he report to the Congress less often than every six months.

THIRTY-DAY AUTHORIZATION PERIOD

SEC. 5. The use of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act shall not be sustained beyond thirty days from the date of the introduction of such Armed Forces in hostilities or in any such situation unless (1) the President determines and certifies to the Congress in writing that unavoidable military necessity respecting the safety of Armed Forces of the United States engaged pursuant to section 3(1) or 3(2) of this

Act requires the continued use of such Armed Forces in the course of bringing about a prompt disengagement from such hostilities; or (2) Congress is physically unable to meet as a result of an armed attack upon the United States; or (3) the continued use of such Armed Forces in such hostilities or in such situation has been authorized in specific legislation enacted for that purpose by the Congress and pursuant to the provisions thereof.

TERMINATION WITHIN THIRTY-DAY PERIOD

SEC. 6. The use of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act may be terminated prior to the thirty-day period specified in section 5 of this Act by an Act or joint resolution of Congress, except in a case where the President has determined and certified to the Congress in writing that unavoidable military necessity respecting the safety of Armed Forces of the United States engaged pursuant to section 3(1) or 3(2) of this Act requires the continued use of such Armed Forces in the course of bringing about a prompt disengagement from such hostilities.

CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITY PROVISIONS

SEC. 7.(a) Any bill or joint resolution authorizing a continuation of the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, or in any situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, under any of the conditions described in section 3 of this Act, or any bill or joint resolution terminating the use of Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities, as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall, if sponsored or cosponsored by one-third of the Members of the House of Congress in which it is introduced, be considered reported to the floor of such House no later than one day following its introduction unless the Members of such House otherwise determine by yeas and nays. Any such bill or joint resolution after having been passed by the House of Congress in which it originated, shall be considered reported to the floor of the other House of Congress within one day after it has been passed by the House in which it originated and sent to the other House, unless the Members of the other House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

(b) Any bill or joint resolution reported to the floor pursuant to subsection (a) or when placed directly on the calendar shall immediately become the pending business of the House in which such bill or joint resolution is reported or placed directly on the calendar, and shall be voted upon within three days after it has been reported or placed directly on the calendar, as the case may be, unless such House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 8. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment but shall not apply to hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States are involved on the effective date of this Act. Nothing in section 3(4) of this Act shall be construed to require any further specific statutory authorization to permit members of the Armed Forces of the United States to participate jointly with members of the armed forces of one or more foreign countries in the headquarters operations of high-level military commands which were established prior to the date of

enactment of this Act and pursuant to the United Nations Charter or any treaty ratified by the United States prior to such date.

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH,
Salt Lake City, Utah, April 16, 1973.

HON. WAYNE OWENS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OWENS: The undersigned members of the Political Science Department, as constituents and not as spokesmen for the University of Utah, urge you to vote against the Javits War Powers Bill. Although this bill is supposed to limit the President in initiating war, in fact it undertakes to enlarge his power beyond existing law and beyond the limits of the Constitution. It would authorize the President to initiate a war:

(1) Whenever he alleged that American citizens were maltreated by a foreign government (this is the pretext upon which Hitler invaded Poland and began World War II);

(2) Whenever he alleged that a treaty the implementation of which by force Congress had approved permitted him to initiate war, even though the treaty had been negotiated a hundred years earlier.

The bill is a shocking attempt to cause Congress to abdicate its power to declare war in advance of any issue, in total ignorance of future issues and with no opportunity to evaluate the contemporary circumstances under which the President would actually initiate war. Dr. Wormuth's legal analysis of the bill in response to an inquiry from Senator Javits is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. Williams, Roger Rieber, Donald W. Hanson, Kent Main, Clark D. Mueller, Bruce E. Bailey, D. F. Eamless, Francis D. Wormuth, Lorenzo F. Kimball, Edward C. Epstein, Slava J. Lubomundior, Helmut J. Callis, Robert P. Huefner.

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 6, 1973.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for sending me a copy of your War Powers Bill. When I wrote to the Council for a Livable World protesting against indorsement of the bill I had read it and did not write, as you suppose, out of misapprehension. This letter is in response to your request for an amplification of my criticism of the bill.

I think your general purpose is laudable and you certainly have the right enemies. However, the effect of the bill, if it were constitutional, would be to change existing law by enlarging the power of the President to engage in foreign adventures. And it is also objectionable because it defeats the purpose recited in Section 2, "to insure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of the Armed Forces. . . ." The bill will give the President in advance—perhaps years in advance—the option of taking a decision for war when certain events occur, or when he alleges that such events have occurred. Under the Constitution, the decision of Congress to initiate war must be contemporaneous with the initiation of war and must be made in the light of existing circumstances. A post-dated declaration of war, such as your bill contemplates, leaves the evaluation of the circumstances on some future occasion to the President. He alone takes the decision for war or peace. A request by President Jackson for a considerably more modest authorization of future acts of war was unanimously rejected by the Senate on the basis of a report by Henry Clay which asserted that Congress cannot delegate the war power, and seven requests of President Buchanan for contingent authority such as is included in your

bill were rejected by the Senate for the same reason. See my "The Vietnam War: The President versus the Constitution," in Richard A. Falk, ed., *The Vietnam War and International Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), Vol. 2, pp. 736, 782-88.

The heart of the bill is Section 3. Sec. 3(1) authorizes the President to repeal an armed attack. This is merely declaratory and I do not object to it. I am troubled by Sec. 3(2) because it seems to legitimize involvement in war when American troops are attacked abroad without inquiring how they got there. Suppose they have entered neutral territory illegally, as occurred when President Nixon sent troops into Cambodia. In *The Exchange v. McFadden*, 7 Cr. 116, 140-41 (1812), Chief Justice Marshall said, in effect, that such action is an act of war. In 1848 the House of Representatives voted that President Polk, by sending troops into territory disputed with Mexico and then defending them, had unconstitutionally initiated war. I fear this subsection might legalize a war initiated by a Congressionally unauthorized commitment of troops abroad.

I am very unhappy about Sec. 3(3), which permits the President to send troops into a foreign country to protect citizens, either against rioters or against the government itself. The latter is clearly the initiation of war. The present law is much more restrictive but has proved to be adequate.

Page 2, line 9 of the bill seems to concede that the President has a constitutional power to protect citizens abroad. He has no such power. Dicta in three Supreme Court decisions—*Murray v. The Charming Betsy*, 2 Cr. 64, 120 (1804); *The Slaughter-House Cases*, 16 Wall. 36, 79 (1872); *In re Neagle*, 135 U.S. 1, 64 (1889)—say that a citizen has a right to protection abroad. But the protection of the rights of citizens belongs to Congress, not the President. *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 16 Pet. 539 (1842). Only one of the cases cited above, *In re Neagle*, suggests that the President has such power. This was said in order to support the indefensible decision in that case. The dictum in *In re Neagle* relies on the rescue of Martin Koszta by a naval captain (see my "Vietnam War," p. 756). But the rescue was an unauthorized action by Captain Ingraham and not the President's; and Koszta was an alien, not a citizen. The action was not judicially approved.

It is true that one circuit court opinion by Justice Nelson of the Supreme Court, *Durand v. Hollins*, 8 Fed. Cas. 111 (1860), argues at length that the President may employ force abroad to rescue citizens; but what was involved in that case was not the rescue of citizens but reprisal, which is generally understood to be an act of war belonging only to Congress. Whoever accepts Nelson's language in *Durand v. Hollins* should be prepared to accept his dissenting opinion in *The Prize Cases*, 2 Black. 635, 682 (1863), in which he argued that the President has no constitutional powers to repel a sudden attack. Justice Nelson was a strongly partisan Democrat who in *Durand v. Hollins* defended the action of Democratic President Pierce and in the *Prize Cases* condemned the action of Republican President Lincoln.

At present the President is authorized to seek the release of citizens unjustly imprisoned abroad by means "not amounting to acts of war." 22 U.S.C. § 1732 (1964); originally 15 Stat. 223 (1868). The Secretary of the Navy has had power to make rules since 1862. The present *Naval Regulations*, from which I enclose a copy of the pertinent rules, give a naval officer on the spot a carefully circumscribed right to rescue citizens. The rules in this form date back to 1893; in another form, to 1865. In one of your speeches you speak of the "gunboat diplomacy" of the nineteenth century. All but thirteen of the naval landings in the nineteenth century were undertaken under naval regulations

promulgated by statutory authority. It is in the twentieth century that Presidential excesses have occurred.

It seems to me better to have the decision taken by a naval officer who will not have long-range political motives than by a President who may use the pretext of rescuing citizens to launch a war. The German White Paper issued at the beginning of World War II alleged that the invasion of Poland was undertaken for the protection of *Volksgerassen* from maltreatment by the Poles.

I note that you deplore President Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic. He alleged that he was protecting citizens. Section 3(3) would legalize all such interventions. The words of caution and admonition in your bill would have no more effect on the conduct of a President than the Ten Commandments.

In short, the President has no constitutional power to use the armed forces for the rescue of citizens and at present has no statutory power. It is not the case that as commander-in-chief he has the right to use the armed forces for any purpose not authorized by Congress except to repel sudden attack. Our statutes have always specified when he is empowered to use the armed forces, and the present law forbids the use of the Army or Air Force to execute the laws without specific authority from the Constitution or Congress, 22 U.S.C. § 1732 (1964), derived from 20 Stat. 152 (1878). It is illegal for the President to attempt to execute any law except by the officers appointed by statute for that purpose. *Gelston v. Hoyt*, 3 Wheat. 245, 330-32 (1818); *Hendricks v. Gonzalez*, 67 F. 351 (2d cir. 1895).

Moreover, Sec. 3(3) constitutes an attempt to delegate the war power, which is unconstitutional. When Chief Justice Marshall laid down the law of delegation in *Wayman v. Southard*, 10 Wheat. 1, 43 (1825), he denied that Congress might delegate "powers which are strictly and exclusively legislative"; on subjects "of less interest, a general provision may be made and power given to those who are to act under such general provisions to fill up the details." The debates in the Constitutional Convention and the ratifying conventions and the discussions in the *Federalist* make it clear that the power to go to war is "strictly and exclusively legislative." As I pointed out above, the Senate unanimously by resolution concurred in the report of Henry Clay that the war power cannot be delegated. Sec. 3(3) would not only transfer the power of war or peace to the President, which is outright abdication; it would do so for the indefinite future, in situations which Congress cannot foresee and evaluate at the present time.

I object to the central feature of Sec. 3(4) for the same reason. If the President and the Senate make a treaty which contemplates acts of war, and Congress passes the enabling legislation authorized by the bill, there is delegated to the President for the indefinite future a power to go to war whenever he alleges that the conditions in the treaty call for it. Under settled law, his allegation to this effect is not subject to review by any other authority; the cases begin with *Martin v. Mott*, 12 Wheat. 19 (1827). Once again, this is delegation *in futuro*, to apply in concrete cases which Congress cannot possibly envision when it legislates. The subsection would authorize the President alone to take the decision for war and peace, and it falls under Henry Clay's condemnation of the declaration of futures as opposed to contemporaneous wars.

However, I approve of page 4, line 19, which requires statutory authorization for the sending of military advisors. But perhaps you are not aware that such statutory authorization already exists, 10 U.S.C. § 712 (1959). It would be useful to repeal this provision.

I do not think that reporting to Congress or consulting Congress after the fact will be

effective. As William Howard Taft observed in his book *Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers*, once the President has involved the country in a war, rightly or wrongly, the whole nation will rally behind him.

Although the bill speaks of "Emergency Use of the Armed Forces," none of the powers granted is conditioned on the existence of an emergency which makes it impracticable to consult Congress at the time the power is invoked. In most of the situations covered by the bill it would be possible, I should suppose, to submit the issue to Congress, which would be able to make a judgment on the particular case in the light of existing circumstances, as the framers intended.

The question remains as to how one is to provide for genuine emergencies which cannot wait for Congressional action. The answer is that it is not possible for any legal order, even a despotism, to make legal provision for all emergencies. The values of a legal order lie in its regularized structure. It is inevitable that values extraneous to the legal order will now and again be jeopardized by that structure; and in some cases most of us would prefer those extraneous values to the values of the legal order. The proper course here is for the President to act illegally, report his actions and his motives to Congress, and ask Congress for ratification. This is what President Lincoln did at the beginning of the Civil War. Congress will not be ungenerous in any proper case. This course is preferable to legitimizing departures from the legal order. In advance; this will dissolve away the legal order.

To summarize, your bill is not aimed at emergencies. Its operation does not even require the allegation that an emergency exists. It merely authorizes the President to initiate a war whenever he asserts that citizens are in danger or that a treaty which has received Congressional implementation should be invoked, provided he makes altogether unverified reports to what will no doubt be a wildly cheering Congress. Despite the claims of apologists for Presidential usurpation, the President has no such constitutional powers. At present he has no such statutory powers. Nor does the Constitution permit Congress to shirk its duty of taking the decision for war in each individual case by giving the President the option of making war at will in whole categories of cases in the future.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS D. WORMUTH.

SOCIAL SECURITY TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Social Security Tax Reduction Act of 1973, a bill to provide for a more equitable and progressive social security payroll tax. This bill is a companion measure to one Senator GAYLORD NELSON plans to introduce in the Senate.

Briefly, the bill would do the following:

First. Provide general payroll tax relief for all wage earners by reducing the present employee payroll tax rate from 5.85 to 5.2 percent.

Second. Provide specific payroll tax relief for lower income wage earners through a deduction and exemption formula which would for the first time make the payroll tax sensitive to an individual's ability to pay.

Third. Provide for the financing of these changes in the social security tax structure out of general revenues.

There is a well-worn saying that "a picture is worth a thousand words." For those of us in this Chamber, who deal day after day in broad legislative concepts and multibillion dollar appropriations, I think there is a corollary: A letter from home is worth a thousand abstractions.

I would like to share with my colleagues the comments of two constituents who recently wrote to me on the subject of taxes. Wrote one:

Having been unsuccessful in securing a salary increase for over three years now . . . it is with qualified alarm that I watch my net pay become less and less, even though my gross pay figure has remained the same.

Out of a 40 hour week, 11 hours are for taxes! Add in all the "hidden" taxes on goods I buy, plus the cost of living increases, and you see I am losing ground.

Another, a young housewife with a month-old son—whose husband earns \$123 a week and brings home \$90—wrote of the latest social security payroll tax increase:

It really makes me angry and heartsick. I mean it's our hard-earned money they keep taking and we can't do or say anything about it.

These two letters probably do not signal a taxpayers' revolt, but they do say a great deal about the present state of our tax system and what it is doing to the average taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer in this country is being victimized by a tax system that is growing steadily more regressive with each passing year. We started out to raise revenues from those best able to pay. Unfortunately we are not only far from achieving that goal but in recent years have been moving in the opposite direction.

This is not just because of the preferences and loopholes in the Federal income tax. With all its flaws, the Federal income tax still bears some relation to the individual's ability to pay. It may not raise sufficient revenues from wealthy individuals and large corporations, but at least the income tax does not impose undue hardship on lower income taxpayers.

The same cannot be said of the second largest source of Federal revenue, the social security payroll tax. It takes no account of ability to pay. It is imposed at a flat rate, and the \$10,800 a year worker pays as much as the \$480,000 a year corporation president. Because of the ceiling on taxable earnings and because the payroll tax applies only to wages and salaries and no other sources of income, the worker actually pays a large percentage of his income in social security payroll taxes than the corporation president does.

All of this makes the social security payroll tax the most regressive feature of our Federal tax system today. This is singularly unfortunate, because it is also the Federal Government's fastest growing tax. By 1974, this regressive tax will account for more than 25 percent of all Federal revenues. Ten years ago it accounted for less than 15 percent. In sharp contrast, the corporate income tax is

steadily shrinking as a portion of Federal revenues—from nearly 21 percent in 1963 to 14.4 percent by 1974.

The Federal tax burden is steadily shifting away from corporations and onto individuals. And as the social security payroll tax accounts for more and more of all Federal revenues, it is shifting away from individuals in the higher income brackets and falling more heavily on middle- and lower-income taxpayers. It is no exaggeration to say that the social security payroll tax is the greatest source of inequity in the tax system today.

The rise in this tax has been so sharp that it has all but canceled out gains to low- and middle-income taxpayers arising from income tax reductions. Since 1963, a married worker with two children, earning \$10,000 a year, has seen his income tax decline from \$1,372 to \$905, while his social security payroll tax has risen from \$174 to \$585. In other words, his income tax burden was reduced by 33 percent, while his payroll tax load increased 236 percent. The net result was that his overall tax load declined less than 1 percent—from 15.45 to 14.9 percent.

The payroll tax, an increasing onerous burden for all wage earners, hits especially hard at those at the bottom of the income ladder—the working poor. A decade ago a family of four with an annual income of \$3,000 paid 5.6 percent—\$168 a year—in combined Federal income and payroll taxes. Today that same family pays 5.85 percent—\$175—and all of it is in social security payroll taxes. A wage earner with five dependents and an annual income of \$5,500 will owe no income tax in 1973, but he will have to pay \$321.75 in payroll taxes.

Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of repeated efforts—in 1964, 1969, and 1971—to reduce the burden of the income tax on low- and middle-income taxpayers, where are we? We have only succeeded in shifting the burden from a relatively equitable, progressive income tax based on ability to pay, to a flat-rate payroll tax, limited to wage and salary income, which cannot, by its nature, be anything other than regressive and unfair.

The cruellest irony of this sleight of hand is that those at the bottom of the income ladder are actually paying more in taxes now than they did 10 years ago. Individuals and families now considered too poor to have a Federal income tax liability are still saddled with an increasingly burdensome social security payroll tax. At low-income levels, the increase in the payroll tax is working at cross-purposes with income tax reductions, hampering efforts of the working poor to pull themselves out of poverty. At a time when grossly inflated rents and food prices make low income workers' dollars worth substantially less than they were last month—let alone last year or 4 or 5 years ago—the social security payroll tax, by taking more and more of these devalued earnings, is keeping the working poor impoverished.

I am thoroughly familiar with the argument that though all of this may be true, the imposition of the payroll tax

on the low-income worker is nonetheless justified because social security is a form of insurance and eventually he will receive benefits worth far more than his so-called contributions. But what other form of insurance do we have in this country where contributions are involuntary? The answer is, none.

What other insurance program do you find in this country today where benefit payments are increased with the cost of living or by acts of Congress and bear no real relationship to the actual amounts paid in by beneficiaries in the past? Again, none.

And what comfort is the knowledge that he will receive benefits 20 or 30 years in the future—if he lives that long—to a low-income worker who is trying to feed, house, and clothe his family today? Not much.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the benefits the social security system provides retired persons and disabled workers are essential to America's economic and social well-being. I have supported increases in these benefits in the past and I will continue to do so, as it is shown that increases are needed in the future. But I also firmly believe that it is time the Congress leveled with the public and with itself about the real nature of social security. It is not insurance. It is a program to provide income security and health benefits for retired persons and eligible, disabled workers. Its benefits are not financed by past contributions; they are paid for by a mandatory tax on current income.

This year the social security system will take \$62 billion from the wages of working men and women through the payroll tax, and pay out nearly all of it again to those who, because of age or disability, no longer work. It is really a mechanism for income redistribution. Unfortunately, because of the regressive nature of the payroll tax, it has also become an elaborate way of robbing Peter to pay Paul which works a tremendous hardship on moderate and low-income wage earners.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that we can continue to have a viable social security system if we persist in financing it in such an inequitable manner. We will never have a truly equitable Federal tax structure—no matter how many income tax loopholes we close—if social security financing methods continue unchanged.

It is with this in mind that I am introducing the Social Security Tax Reduction Act. I have already briefly outlined the provisions of this bill. I would like now to discuss them at greater length.

First. The bill would reduce the present employee payroll tax rate from 5.85 to 5.2 percent. The tax rate on self-employed income would be reduced from 8 to 7.5 percent. The employer tax rate and the taxable wage ceiling would remain the same as under present law.

Second. To make the payroll more progressive and more sensitive to ability to pay at low- and moderate-income levels, the bill would allow taxpayers a "limited income deduction"—LID. The LID would be equal to the value of a taxpayer's exemptions—\$750 each—and the low income allowance—\$1,300—present-

ly permitted under the personal income tax, reduced by the amount by which his earnings exceed this value.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert an example of how the LID would work for a family of four at three different income levels:

a. A family of four with one wage earner and earnings of \$4,300:	
Basic value of low income allowance (\$1,300) and personal exemption (4×\$750)-----	\$4,300.00
Earnings-----	4,300.00
Earnings minus basic value (\$4,300—\$4,300)-----	0
Adjusted value of low income allowance and exemption, or LID (4×\$750)-----	4,300.00
Earnings minus LID (\$4,300—\$4,300)-----	0
Payroll tax on adjusted earnings (5.2%×0)-----	0
b. A family of four with one wage earner and earnings of \$6,450:	
Basic value of low income allowance (\$1,300) and exemption (4×\$750)-----	4,300.00
Earnings-----	6,450.00
Earnings minus basic value (\$6,450—\$4,300)-----	2,150.00
LID (\$4,300—\$2,150)-----	2,150.00
Earnings minus LID (\$6,450—\$2,150)-----	4,300.00
Payroll tax on adjusted earnings (5.2%×\$4,300)-----	223.60
c. A family of four with one wage earner and earnings of \$8,600:	
Basic value of low income allowance and exemptions-----	4,300.00
Earnings-----	8,600.00
Earnings minus basic value (\$8,600—\$4,300)-----	4,300.00
LID (\$4,300—\$4,300)-----	0
Earnings minus LID (\$8,600—0)-----	8,600.00
Payroll tax on adjusted earnings (5.2%×\$8,600)-----	447.20

For married couples filing jointly and single individuals, the LID would be computed in the manner I have just described. Married wage earners filing separately would each be allowed one-half the low income allowance—\$650—plus their exemptions in computing the LID. The self-employed would receive personal exemptions and the low income allowance under the same rules applicable to employees. LID would not apply in computation of the tax on employers.

Third. The payroll tax revenue loss arising from the rate reduction and limited income deductions would be made up out of general revenues.

These changes in the financing of social security would have the following impact:

All covered American workers would pay less payroll tax than they do under present law.

All wage earners whose incomes are below the poverty level, as implied by the income tax code, would pay no payroll tax.

All families of four with one wage earner with earnings up to \$8,600 would pay less payroll tax in 1973 than they did in 1972.

No worker earning \$9,000 or less would pay more than his 1972 payroll tax.

All workers earning above \$9,000 would pay 11 percent less in payroll taxes than they do under present law.

Payroll tax discrimination against families with more than one wage earner would end because their earnings would be pooled in computing the tax.

The payroll tax burden of low- and middle-income wage earners would bear a real relationship to their ability to pay.

This substantial tax relief can be achieved at a reasonable cost. The increased burden on general revenues of the changes in social security financing contained in this bill would amount to an estimated \$8 billion annually, with the limited income deduction costing between \$4 and \$4.2 billion, and the rate reduction just under \$3.9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, when I say this is reasonable, I do not mean to imply that I believe \$8 billion is a negligible sum of money. It is a considerable amount, but when compared with an overall Federal budget of some \$268 billion, it is a relatively modest amount, which this government can realistically finance.

The most fitting way to pay for social security payroll tax relief is through concurrent reform of the Federal income tax. Combined payroll tax relief and appropriate income tax reform would shift part of the social security cost burden from low- and middle-income wage earners, who now pay nearly all of the payroll tax, to wealthy individuals and corporations, who now escape paying their fair share of federal income taxes. It would at once provide tax relief for those who need it and make our entire tax system more equitable.

Several tax reform bills are already before the Congress. I am cosponsoring one introduced by our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) which would raise \$9 billion a year in new revenues by closing eight loopholes which benefit only wealthy individuals and corporations. This is more than enough to pay for the payroll tax relief I have outlined today. Leading tax experts have estimated, in fact, that elimination of all those tax preferences and loopholes which accrue primarily to the benefit of wealthy individuals and corporations could raise over \$20 billion annually in new revenues, more than twice as much as would be needed to finance this relief.

Mr. Speaker, for over a generation, in deference to the myth that social security is a form of Government-sponsored insurance financed by public "contributions," we have treated the payroll tax as a special creature, not to be judged by the same standards of equity we apply, or seek to apply, to the rest of our tax structure. As long as the social security payroll tax was a nominal one—even as late as 1965, when it was still only 3.6 percent on the first \$4,800 of income—we could persist in this myth without inflicting great harm on the taxpaying public. But today, with the regressive payroll tax taking progressively larger bites out of the workingman's paycheck, with this most tangibly unfair of all Federal taxes now the second largest source of Federal revenues—surpassing even the corporate income tax and the rest of our tax structure any longer.

It is time to acknowledge the social security payroll tax for what it is and

reform it along with the rest of our tax system.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that far more than the relatively simple issue of tax equity is involved in payroll tax and income tax reform. In the end, it is the average citizen's faith in the fairness and justness of his Government and political system which is at stake.

It is through the tax system, which annually withholds hundreds and thousands of dollars from workers' paychecks, that the Federal Government has its greatest impact on the day-to-day lives of average citizens. If the tax system is fair, then people view the Government which administers it as fair. If the tax system is perceptibly unjust, then we can expect the average man to see the Government as unjust. We have an unjust tax system today. We have a public that is increasingly perceptive about its inequities. And not surprisingly, we have an electorate that is growing increasingly distrustful of all Government officials, elected and appointed.

Mr. Speaker, failure to correct the grave inequities of our tax system will fuel the growing attitude on the part of the public that Government is not acting in its interest, but has been captured by powerful, special interests. Only we can dispel that attitude, and we can only do it by our actions, not by our words.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, no other action we could take would do more to show the people of this country that their interests are still paramount in the Congress than this combination of payroll tax reform and income tax reform. Could there be a better time to take such action than now?

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the bill in the RECORD following my remarks:

H.R. 8157

A bill to reduce the social security taxes to the 1972 rates and to provide a further reduction in such taxes for limited income individuals

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 "Social Security Tax Reduction Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. REDUCTION OF TAX RATES TO 1972 LEVELS.

(a) Section 3101(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) is amended by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (2) and by striking out paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1971, 1972, 1973, and each subsequent calendar year, the rate shall be 4.6 percent."

(b) Section 3101(b) of such Code (relating to rate of tax for hospital insurance) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to 0.60 percent of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) received by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b)) during each calendar year."

(c) Section 1401(a) of such Code (relating to rate of self-employment income tax for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) is amended by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (2), and by striking out para-

graphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1970, the tax shall be equal to 6.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

(d) Section 1401(b) of such Code (relating to rate of self-employment income tax for hospital insurance) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there shall be imposed for each taxable year, on the self-employment income of every individual, a tax equal to 0.60 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year."

SEC. 3. FURTHER REDUCTION FOR LIMITED INCOME INDIVIDUALS.

(a) Section 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on employees) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(c) REDUCTION FOR LIMITED INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The taxes imposed by subsections (a) and (b) with respect to the wages received by an individual with respect to employment during a calendar year shall be reduced by an amount equal to 5.2 percent of the individual's limited income deduction (determined under paragraph (2)).

"(2) LIMITED INCOME DEDUCTION.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual's limited income deduction with respect to wages received with respect to employment during a calendar year is—

"(A) the sum of (i) his low income allowance under section 141 (c) for his taxable year which begins in the calendar year (whether or not the individual uses the low income allowance for purposes of the tax imposed by chapter (1) and (ii) the amount of personal exemptions to which he is entitled under section 151 for the taxable year, reduced (but not below zero) by

"(B) the amount by which the sum of the wages received by him with respect to employment during the calendar year and his self-employment income for such taxable year exceeds the sum described in subparagraph (A).

"(3) WITHHOLDING AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACT NOT TO BE AFFECTED.—For purposes of section 3102 and titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act, this subsection shall not be taken into account."

(b) Section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on self-employment income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) REDUCTION FOR LIMITED INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The taxes imposed by subsection (a) and (b) on the self-employment income of an individual for a taxable year shall be reduced by an amount equal to 7.5 percent of the individual's limited income deduction (determined under paragraph (2)).

"(2) LIMITED INCOME DEDUCTION.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual's limited income deduction for a taxable year is—

"(A) the sum of (i) his low income allowance under section 141 (c) for the taxable year (whether or not the individual uses the low income allowance for purposes of the tax imposed by chapter (1) and (ii) the amount of personal exemptions to which he is entitled under section 151 for the taxable year, reduced (but not below zero) by

"(B) the amount by which the sum of the wages (as defined in section 3121 (a)) received by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121 (b)) during the calendar year in which his taxable year begins and his self-employment income for such taxable year exceeds the sum described in subparagraph (A).

"(3) SOCIAL SECURITY ACT NOT TO BE AFFECTED.—For purposes of titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act, this subsection shall not be taken into account."

SEC. 4. CREDIT OR REFUND FOR EXCESS WITHHOLDING OF SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES.

Section 31(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credit for special refunds of social security tax) is amended by striking out the heading and paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) CREDIT FOR EXCESS WITHHOLDING OF SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe regulations providing for the crediting against the tax imposed by this subtitle of (A) amounts deducted under section 3102 from the wages paid to the taxpayer in excess of the tax imposed on such wages by section 3101, and (B) the amount determined by the taxpayer or the Secretary or his delegate to be allowable under section 6413(c) as a special refund of such tax. The amount allowable as a credit under such regulations shall, for purposes of this subtitle, be considered an amount withheld at source as tax under section 3402."

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATES.

The amendments made by sections 2 (a) and (b) and 3(a) shall apply with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1972. The amendments made by sections 2 (c) and (d), 3(b), and 4 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972.

SEC. 6. APPROPRIATIONS FROM GENERAL FUND TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.

(a) There are hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund amounts (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) equal to the amounts by which the taxes imposed by sections 1401 and 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 received in the Treasury are less than the amounts which would have been received if the Social Security Tax Reduction Act of 1973 had not been enacted.

(b) The amounts appropriated by subsection (a) shall be transferred from time to time from the general fund in the Treasury to the respective Trust Funds on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury. Proper adjustments shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or were less than the amounts which should have been transferred.

TWO CENTURIES OF GUN OWNERSHIP HAVE PRESERVED INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, since my election to the House of Representatives, I have been justifiably terrified by the unnecessary, paternalistic, firearms regulation legislation that has been condoned by too many of my colleagues. The ultimate goal of such insidious actions by the Congress is total Federal control and confiscation of all privately owned firearms.

The suicide mission of "protecting the country from the evils of firearms," has fostered legislation that serves as an ugly mask to cover the unprecedented attempts to usurp a constitutional right through measures that reek of asininity

and fear. Without the right to keep and bear arms, the American public will become defenseless against the criminal and the State. Accordingly the American system of government—that has survived on constitutional rights and guidelines—will be disregarded and possibly disposed of for some lasting omnipotent power structure.

One group, other than the DDS—Disarming Demagogue Society—truly understands and applauds total gun regulation—the criminals. After all, they have made their place in society by disobeying and destroying all laws and people who hinder them. The law-abiding citizen will be forced to obey an unjust law and in the process become easy prey for any type of criminal—public or private.

I shall fight to prevent our Government from falling under the control of those associated with black-shirted, goose-stepping tyrants; misfits; and hoodlums.

Once again, I have introduced a firearms bill, H.R. 1150, which would repeal the greatest example of misguided emotion ever to be codified by the U.S. Congress—the Gun Control Act of 1968. I have introduced this bill in each new Congress with the same results. The anti-gun coalition opposes any legislation that would guarantee individual liberties—liberties that have already been granted under the Constitution. Unfortunately, the courts and the Congress reneged on the people's "buyer protection plan" that was so meticulously composed by the founders of our country.

A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

Every citizen was guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms under the second amendment to the Constitution. That amendment states:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

This amendment was added, because certain States, during their conventions to ratify the Constitution, realized the imperfections of, and ramifications inherent in the creation of a Federal-type government. In addition, many States included a similar clause in their constitutions predating the Federal constitutional proposal. For example, the constitution of my home State, Pennsylvania, adopted in 1776, contained a provision that guaranteed the right to bear arms:

That the people have a right to bear arms for the defense of themselves and the state.

Five State conventions, in their letters of approval of the U.S. Constitution, outlined many aspects of individual liberty that had to be safeguarded from Federal control or regulation. Among these individual rights was firearms ownership. The State of New Hampshire said:

And as it is the opinion of this Convention that certain amendments and alterations in the said Constitution would remove the fears and quiet the apprehensions of many of the good people of this State and more effectually guard against an undue Administration of the Federal Government . . .

Congress shall never disarm any citizen unless such as are or have been in actual rebellion.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, New York, and Rhode Island submitted similar statements regarding approval of the U.S. Constitution. The North Carolina commentary is representative:

A Declaration of Rights asserting and securing from encroachment the great principles of civil and religious liberty, and the unalienable rights of the people, together with amendments to the most ambiguous and exceptional parts of the said Constitution of Government, ought to be laid before Congress, and the Convention of the States that shall or may be called for the purpose of amending the said Constitution . . .

That the people have a right to keep and bear arms, that a well regulated militia composed of the body of the people, trained to arms is the proper, natural and safe defense of a free state.

The above statements were made by the citizenry of the Colonies as they reviewed the work of our Founding Fathers before they approved and ratified this great document. It is that same belief in freedom and the ability to protect oneself from all threats that must prevail today. Firearms regulation must be eliminated before it becomes total gun confiscation in the hands of Government bureaucrats.

On March 4, 1789, the Congress drafted a resolution containing 12 amendments to the Constitution. That document stated:

The Convention of a number of States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent mis-construction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best insure beneficent ends of its institution.

Article the Fourth . . . A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Of course, we all know the outcome of this resolution.

It is my contention that the brilliantly drafted second amendment combined two ideas in a single sentence—the right to keep and bear arms and the militia provision. If these were two separate amendments, they would read:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, shall not be infringed.

and

The right of the people to keep and bear arms, being necessary to the security of a free State, shall not be infringed.

Our Founding Fathers realized that not only did the States and the Nation need protection—but so did the individual. By combining the two concepts, they merely provided for both in a concise manner. The safety of the individual was assured by his right to bear arms in protection against internal insurrections, as well as abuses of power by the Federal Government.

When one gets down to the heart of today's "law and order" issue, our situation is similar to revolutionary times. The people and the Government face similar internal problems; instead of "frontier fears" we face gun-toting renegades and various groups seeking to destroy our country.

The second amendment also provided

for a militia. This was important, because it guaranteed the protection of the Nation without establishing a large standing Army—an idea that repulsed our early countrymen.

However, as we all know, the word, "militia," has all but vanished from today's military vocabulary. Militias evolved into National Guard Units which are now incorporated into the national defense structure whenever necessary. Unfortunately, the world situation today mandates a large standing Army.

The security of the States is now provided for on a much larger scale than was ever believed possible in 1789. Yet, the part of the second amendment—the right to keep and bear arms—is as necessary today as it was then. It is our duty to strengthen the desires and reaffirm the foresight of our Founding Fathers in a contemporary interpretation of this amendment.

When an individual possesses a firearm, he can protect and insure his life, liberty, and property against any person or institution.

Instead of acting contrary to the belief in freedom upon which this country was built, Congress should get to the business of cracking down on the demented, gun-toting criminals who have been pampered over the last 50 years by bleeding-heart sociologists, gun control fanatics, and lenient judges. Congress must redirect its sympathies from the criminal to the law-abiding citizen whose rights to life, liberty, and property must be protected, if not by the Government, then by the citizen himself.

As I implied earlier, the Bill of Rights was the colonial equivalent of modern businesses' "buyer protection plan." Just as any manufacturer backs up his product and recalls it if the owner's safety is endangered—so must the Congress abide by its 200-year-old guarantee and recall a bad law if it endangers the basic principles of this Nation. The Gun Control Act of 1968 is such a law. If the guarantee embodied in the Bill of Rights is not fulfilled—the people can and must, as the Declaration of Independence affirms, "provide new guards for their future security."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

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

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MORGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$467.50.

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

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

Mr. BAFALIS in five instances.

Mr. HUBER in three instances.

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

Mr. DAN DANIEL.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. WHITE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. GUNTER in five instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. STOKES in three instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. BRASCO in three instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

S. 251. An act for the relief of Frank P. Muto, Alphonso A. Muto, Arthur E. Scott, and F. Clyde Wilkinson to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer franchise fees received from certain concession operations at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, in the States of Arizona and Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1808. An act to apportion funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and to authorize funds in accordance with title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "National Next Door Neighbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, services on behalf of the late Honorable WILLIAM O. MILLS will be held at St. Marks Methodist Church, Oxford Road, Easton, Md., on Saturday, May 26, 1973, at 2 o'clock p.m.

CXIX—1067—Part 13

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 411

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable William O. Mills, a Representative from the State of Maryland.

Resolved, That a committee of twelve Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral the following Representatives. Mr. GUDE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. BYRON, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. GROSS, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. GROVER.

The Clerk will report the remaining resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 221, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on May 29 next.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 221, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 29, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

958. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to disestablish the Chemical Corps as a basic branch of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

959. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the assistance to family planning programs in Southeast Asia administered by the Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 38 (Rept. No. 93-225). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7446. A bill to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 93-226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7806. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1974 certain expiring appropriations authorizations in the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 382. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 (Rept. No. 93-228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 8112. A bill to provide for a Federal income tax credit for the cost of certain motor vehicle emission controls on 1975 model motor vehicles sold in the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 8113. A bill to amend section 5042(a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals who are not heads of families to produce wine for personal consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. STARK, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 8114. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Population Sciences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8115. A bill to extend the application of section 112(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilian employees who were illegally detained during 1968, and to provide that certain provisions of such code relating to members of the Armed Forces shall apply without regard to whether or not an induction period exists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BRASCO, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. EILBERG, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 8116. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit costs being borne equally by employers, employees, and the Federal Government, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which a bene-

fiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. SLACK and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 8117. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 8118. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States or of a military attack upon the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8119. A bill to provide for a study of the availability of a route for a trans-Canada oil pipeline to transmit petroleum from the North Slope of Alaska to the continental United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRONIN (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 8120. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8121. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain homeowner mortgage interest paid by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on behalf of a low-income mortgagor shall not be deductible by such mortgagor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 8123. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. O'HARA, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 8124. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and to restore the United States to its position as a law-abiding member of the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 8125. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of non-marriage of certain annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8126. A bill to increase the contribution of the Government to the cost of health benefits for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8127. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8128. A bill to provide for continual application of current basic pay scales to Federal civil service annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8129. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8130. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8131. A bill to amend section 121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gain from sale or exchange of residence of individual who has attained age 65) to lower to 60 the age at which the benefits of that section may be elected and to increase the amount of gain which may be excluded under such section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax in the case of an individual or a married couple, for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8133. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8134. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for optometrists' services and eyeglasses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8135. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$750 in all cases the amount of the lump-sum death payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBER:

H.R. 8136. A bill to limit certain legal remedies involving the involuntary busing of schoolchildren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8137. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to school desegregation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 8138. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an exemption of the first \$5,000 of retirement income received by a taxpayer under a public retirement system or any other system if the taxpayer is at least 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKAY (for himself and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):

H.R. 8140. A bill to amend the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina:

H.R. 8141. A bill to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate to improve congressional control over budgetary outlay and receipt totals, to provide for a legislative budget director and staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 8142. A bill to amend and improve the Adult Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 8143. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs for the diagnosis and treatment of hemophilia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request):

H.R. 8144. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting, to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8145. A bill directing the Secretary of Defense to transfer jurisdiction and control of a portion of the property comprising the Boston Naval Ship Yard at Charlestown, Mass., to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 8146. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1974 certain expiring appropriations authorizations in the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and the Development Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 8147. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit bribery of State and local law enforcement officers and other elected or appointed officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. THONE, Mr. WARE, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 8148. A bill to amend title 39 and title 18, United States Code, to provide for licensing and protection of distinctive designs, legends, and insignia of the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8149. A bill to implement the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on their Destruction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8150. A bill to provide for the appointment of transcribers of official court reporters, transcripts in the U.S. District Courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8151. A bill to provide for the appointment of legal assistants in the courts of appeals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. DENNIS, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 8152. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve law enforcement and criminal justice and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 8153. A bill to establish a Consumer Savings Disclosure Act in order to provide for uniform and full disclosure of information with respect to the computation and payment of earnings on certain savings deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 8154. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services of equal grade and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8155. A bill to amend the act of May 20, 1964, entitled "An Act to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States, and by persons in charge of such vessels", to define those species of Continental Shelf fishery resources which appertain to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 8156. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the period of presumption of service connection for certain cases of multiple sclerosis from 7 to 10 years; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 8157. A bill to reduce the social security taxes to the 1972 rates and to provide a further reduction in such taxes for limited income individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 8158. A bill to amend titles 39 and 5, United States Code, to eliminate certain re-

strictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 8159. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 8160. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 8161. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a treatment and rehabilitation program in the Veterans' Administration for servicemen, veterans, and ex-servicemen suffering from drug abuse or drug dependency; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ROE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. YATES, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BELL, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.J. Res. 576. Joint resolution providing for the orderly review of fee-paid oil import licenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STARK, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. McCLODY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, and Mr. COTTER):

H.J. Res. 577. Joint resolution providing for the orderly review of fee-paid oil import licenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 578. Joint resolution designating the last Sunday in January of each year as "Sons' and Daughters' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to reduction of speed limits and certain other measures relating to the alleviation of the motor vehicle fuel shortage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Con. Res. 225. Resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to certain measures for the curtailment of benefits under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FREY:

H. Res. 412. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts introduced a bill (H.R. 8162) for the relief of Silverio Conte, his wife, Lucia Conte, their son Aniello Conte, and their daughter, Silvana Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOWARD "BO" CALLAWAY,
SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1973

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia is honored to have one of her most distinguished citizens recently nominated, confirmed, and sworn in as the new Secretary of the Army. No better selection could have been made than that of Howard "Bo" Callaway, a successful businessman, former Congressman, dedicated community leader, and beloved citizen and family man.

"Bo" Callaway is a good friend of mine and I welcome him to Washington in this important post. I have known of his personal qualities for years and know that he will bring the same dedication and intelligence to this task as he has to so many others.

We all know that the Army faces many difficult problems but they can be solved now as they have been in the past with proper leadership and integrity in the work.

The editor of the Savannah Morning News wrote an editorial for the May 15, 1973, edition and I submit this editorial for inclusion in the RECORD as it does great justice to the stature of "Bo" Callaway. He used the slogan "Go Bo" during

an election and we repeat it now for his work with the Army—"Go Bo."

Go "Bo"

The selection of Georgian Howard "Bo" Callaway to assume the duties of secretary of the Army was a wise choice.

Mr. Callaway, whose appointment by President Nixon was confirmed Thursday, brings to this post an intimate knowledge of public and military affairs. A graduate of the United States Military Academy, Callaway served with distinction as a lieutenant during the Korean war. As a congressman, he represented Georgia's 3rd District as a member of the 89th Congress. In 1966 he ran for governor of Georgia with the slogan "Go Bo." Although he received a majority of the popular vote his percentage of that vote was not large enough to afford him victory. Under the terms of the Georgia Constitution, it was the duty of the General Assembly to select a governor under such circumstances.

Mr. Callaway was and still is a Republican, and the heavily Democratic Assembly awarded the election to his rival, Lester Maddox. It was during this campaign that people throughout our state became aware of the outstanding qualities of this man. He is articulate, intelligent, and devoted to duty.

These traits are the indispensable prerequisites for anyone who wishes to serve successfully as secretary of the Army today. In recent years the Army has suffered several traumatic shocks. Among these were the Vietnam experience, drug abuses, and racial tensions. Adding further strains were the elimination of the military draft and the

The previous secretary, Robert Froehke, did an admirable job of contending with conversion of the Army to an all-volunteer force.

these problems. Due to his efforts Mr. Callaway will inherit a smoothly running machine.

The task now is to work out the final policies and procedures of the post-Vietnam period, and to put the Army back into a condition of combat readiness. Firm policy guidelines must be hammered out and innovations adopted. Some of the practices the army employed when the draft was in effect are not compatible with an all-volunteer force. These practices must be modified or abandoned. Other practices and traditions must be retained and perhaps expanded. Insight and practical experience are needed to make these fine distinctions. Bo Callaway possesses these qualities. It would be hard to find a better man for the job.

EL PASO CELEBRATES ITS 100TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, El Paso—the major city in the 16th District of Texas which I have the honor of representing in the Congress—has just completed a 2-week observation of its 100th birthday. In itself, this anniversary would not be overwhelmingly noteworthy in a country which is preparing to celebrate its second 100th birthday; but it is extremely significant when viewed

from the standpoint that El Paso's 100 years as an incorporated city is by far the lesser fraction of its recorded history. It gives me great pleasure to take advantage of this official 100th birthday to spread on the record a brief description of El Paso's nearly 450 years of recorded history.

Explorers and settlers from the Old World were tramping through the Pass of the North long before the Pilgrim fathers ever contemplated coming to the New World. The Pass of the North was a reference point used by Spanish explorers to identify that spot where the Rio Grande flows between two mountain ranges which today are known as the Sierra Madre of Mexico and the Rocky Mountains of the United States. In the Spanish language this would be El Paso del Norte, a reference which was eventually shortened to El Paso.

The first recorded visitor to El Paso was Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca, a Spanish explorer who was shipwrecked off the coast of Florida in the early 1500's and along with three surviving companions made an amazing trek toward Mexico where he knew Spanish settlers existed.

His travels took him through the vicinity of El Paso in 1535, a point that most historians agree to. Then, the famed Spanish explorer Coronado passed through the El Paso area in 1540 in his storied search for the seven cities of gold. Nearly half a century passed before serious colonization efforts were undertaken by the Spanish with Fray Agustin Rodriguez leading the way in 1581.

During this year he progressed north up the Rio Grande Valley from El Paso creating settlements and converting the native Indians to Christianity. He was followed by Don Antonio de Espejo in 1582, Gaspar Castano de Sosa in 1590, and then Don Juan de Onate who led the largest, best equipped, and most significant of the various expeditions. Onate crossed the Rio Grande into El Paso in 1598, and immediately proceeded to construct a chapel. Records in his journal described a great celebration which took place upon completion of the chapel including religious services, a dramatic production staged by members of his entourage, and then a massive feast, shared by Indians of the area, in thanks for a successful arrival into the remote fringes of the New World. This should end the argument between Massachusetts and Virginia over where the first Thanksgiving celebration was held, and it should also establish where the first dramatic production within our present continental limits was staged as well as the location of the first church.

During this period of exploration and settlement in the area of what is now the State of New Mexico, there were various temporary settlements in El Paso, but the first permanent settlement at the site was established by Fray Francisco Garcia in the late 1650's, and he constructed a church on the south bank of the Rio Grande which is still in use today by the citizens of Ciudad Juarez, El Paso's sister city on the Mexican side of the river.

During the 1680's, the Pueblo Indians

to the north rebelled against Spanish rule and drove the Spaniards south to El Paso. The fleeing Spaniards were accompanied by a sizable group of faithful Tigua Indians who settled in El Paso, started farming activities, built a church, and formed a close-knit community which still exists today. I had the pleasure of introducing and passing a bill in the 90th Congress which finally gave official recognition to the Tiguas as an Indian tribe after all these centuries.

I might add that their church, and two other chapels constructed in the same general vicinity during the 1680's, still stands and that they predate more celebrated old churches and missions in the country by more than half a century. El Paso remained a small but significant town for many years and really did not start booming until the arrival of the railroads in 1881. It had experienced several dramatic episodes in connection with the Civil War, was the focal point of some of the final activities of the Indian wars, and near the turn of the present century gained the dubious distinction of becoming the last stronghold of the rather free traditions of the fabled wild and woolly West.

It was here in 1896 that John Wesley Hardin, the granddaddy of all old West gunslings— with 44 notches on his gun—was shot to death in a saloon in 1896. There was much more violence recorded in the next few years, but by around 1900 a semblance of law and order prevailed, and the solid business and professional people being attracted to the crossroads city launched a steady trend of progress and development which has produced the unique metropolis which now celebrates its first 100 years as an incorporated city.

El Paso today is a city of some 360,000 citizens. Combined with its sister city of Juarez on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, the Pass of the North is home to nearly 1 million people and comprises by far the largest international metropolitan complex on the United States-Mexican border. El Paso is described by an ever-increasing number of travel writers as one of the best-kept tourist secrets in the country, and is enjoying a burgeoning reputation as one of our truly unique and individualistic cities. I salute my home city on her official 100th anniversary, and state my pride for her basic heritage which has been handed down through 4½ centuries of Old World and New World civilization. I appreciate this opportunity of entering this brief history in the RECORD on this very momentous occasion for me and my constituents.

IN HONOR OF OUR POW'S: "FREEDOM—THAT'S WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT"

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, this evening President Nixon will host a dinner at the

White House in honor of our POW's from the Vietnam war. I know that I speak for many of my colleagues when I say it is with pride and respect that we witnessed the return of these men.

In a recent editorial in the *Alternative*, Mr. R. Emmett Tyrel, the magazine's editor, offered a cross section of the comments made by the returning POW's. I think their statements speak for themselves and I am inserting them in the RECORD at this time so that they be shared by my colleagues:

[From the *Alternative*, April 1973]

THE OTHER AMERICA

There seems to be some disagreement as to the merits of life in America and as to the value of our accomplishments in Southeast Asia. The point of view of one side has been pretty well ventilated with increasing drama over the years. It varies from the more sedate statements of *The New York Times* to the frantic remarks of people like Philip Berrigan, Jane Fonda, and Ralph Abernathy. In February of 1971, Tom Wicker stated that "there is something illogical, but most dishonorable in his (the President's) strategy." As late as December of 1972, Anthony Lewis stated, "... the elected leader of the greatest democracy acts like a maddened tyrant ..." and in January, Mr. Lewis remarked that "even with sympathy for the men who fly American planes, and for their families, one has to recognize a greater courage of the North Vietnamese people. ..." Joseph Kraft, in November 1972, stated, "... we have been shamed as a nation ..." The May issue of *Newsweek* titled an article on our actions in Vietnam "The Specter of Defeat."

Those who disagree with this line do not often attract the attention of the above-quoted concerned citizens. Dissenters are rare, after all, and their point of view slips out only under the most unusual circumstances. In a recent instance, a group of fellows had to spend several years isolated in a foreign prison before they could stray from the sagacity of the media commentators. In fact, our POWs have managed to get into print certain sentiments which have not been seen in *The New York Times* since the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor (perhaps one way of getting these sentiments aired is to allow the entire nation to undergo one sort of tragedy or another).

One week before the POW arrival, columnist Madam Van Horne urged that the American public, before deluging the POWs with the best fruits of our decade—bell-bottoms, black power slogans, and the like—pause and reflect upon whatever they have to say. Once the first POWs had disembarked, Van Horne listened to about three sentences before suggesting that the whole show was programmed, and so washed her hands of the affair. One can easily sympathize with her perplexity and the media's fuss. For the confused and astounded and frenetic, the following remarks of the returning POWs could have aroused no greater excitement had they been the voices of three-headed Martians.

Navy Captain Jeremiah Denton, as a spokesman for the first plane-load of POWs to touch down in the Philippines, said: "We are honored to have the opportunity to serve our country under difficult circumstances. We are profoundly grateful to our Commander-in-Chief and to our nation for this day." Then, choking up, he added, "God Bless America."

Air Force Colonel Robinson "Robbie" Risner, speaking for the second craft, said: "I would like to thank you all, the President and the American people, for bringing us home again. Thank you ever so much."

And as the formalities were dispensed with, Risner told an airport crowd, "I want to tell you something, folks. To us this is truly the

land of milk and honey, the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Navy Captain James Mulligan Jr., for the third flight, said: "It has been our privilege to serve you Americans for these many years and during this time our faith in God, our country and in our families has never wavered. Today I'd like to thank the President of the United States, the people and our families for maintaining their faith in us and making this wonderful day possible." Then, looking down at the waiting crowd, he mused, "There's something great about kids waving American flags."

And then, as the men made their way from the plane to the buses, Air Force Captain Galand Kramer waved a sign he'd made while still in Hanoi which read: "God Bless America and Nixon" and one POW flashed a hand-towel upon which he stitched an outline map of the U.S. and the words "God Bless America."

Colonel Richard Byrne told a crowd that had braved the snowy Dayton, Ohio weather: "Somehow I feel a little out of place, for in a way I feel that we should be giving you applause. Because it is you who have kept the faith in us—faith with us through the long years. It is you who have stood by us and effected our release. I owe you a debt of gratitude. Thank you all and thank you to our President."

Captain Burton W. Campbell told his airport crowd: "I have been trying to figure out something to convey to you how I feel . . . the most appropriate thing I could say is thanks to President Nixon and most of all, thanks to you."

Air Force Colonel Ronald E. Byrne of New York City said: "To be back on American soil is a dream beyond our prayers. Thank you America for your unwavering support."

Navy Commander William Shankel said: "I want you to know we walked out of Hanoi winners and we're not coming home with our tails between our legs. We return with honor."

In a reflective mood, Navy Lieutenant Everett Alvarez Jr., the POW longest in captivity, said: "The U.S. is a great country. People don't realize what they have until they don't have it. We have many things to be thankful for, many things that are considered common. These are things I missed most."

As the tedious maneuvering of men through airports, hotels, and hospitals began to wind down, Alvarez said: "It has been a long time coming but we are going home—home to the greatest country in the whole wide world."

"For years and years," he continued, "we dreamed of this day and we kept faith—faith in our God, in our President and in our country. It was this faith that maintained our hope that someday our dreams would come true and today they have. We have come home."

Navy Commander Brian Woods, who along with Air Force Major Glendon Perkins, were the first POWs to be returned, said: "This homecoming is not only for myself and Glendon Perkins but for all the POWs. We are grateful and overwhelmed. We are proud to serve our country and our Commander-In-Chief."

Then Perkins said that to return to "the greatest country in the world" is the "most wonderful experience in my life."

When three POWs visited the elementary school on Clark Air Base to thank the children for posters and place mats they had made to welcome the returnees to the base, Denton, speaking for his two colleagues, told the children: "I know that John and Bill are as overwhelmed as I in being with Little America."

He then read a letter from Risner which stated: "We will always remember you, the

smiling faces, the waving hands, the waving flags—and we love you."

Air Force Colonel Ronald E. Byrne Jr., who has been a POW since 1965, said: "Thank you, America, for caring."

Captain James Stockdale, limping visibly, quoted Greek poetry to express himself: "Nothing is so sweet as to return from sea and listen to the raindrops on the roof of home." He added: "We're home . . . America. America, God shed his grace on thee."

Navy Captain Wendell Rivers said: "I am very happy to come to my family, my friends, and my America."

Captain Mark Smith, who became known as the preacher of his camp, said: "I would just like to express to each and every one of you that it's wonderful to be back in the greatest country in the world, the greatest state in the world, and the greatest people in the world. God bless all of you and God bless America."

Navy Lieutenant Carl Galanti stated simply: "Freedom at last—that's what it's all about."

WATERGATE PERSPECTIVE

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, John Shinnors, publisher of the Hartford Times-Press, Hartford, Wis., like the old time baseball player that he is, knows what it means to cool it.

It seems apparent that some publicity-seeking politicians have developed a shark complex attracted by a trace of blood; they have swarmed in, ripping, tearing, slashing. One Wisconsin representative, carried away by his own mock self-righteous proclamations, has demanded that the President and the Vice President resign. What dangerous hypocrisy. What shameful conviction by political association. We need to calmly get the facts, calmly evaluate injury to the public. But as old pro John Shinnors would say to the over-eager rookie trying to gain attention by a pugnacious demeanor, "cool it a bit."

Here is what Big John had to say in a recent paragraph in his widely read editorial column, "Scratchpadding:"

It is important for the average citizen to understand that the Watergate bugging sensation is being used, has been used, and will continue to be used as a political weapon. The Watergate buggers obviously and admittedly went too far when they invaded Democratic Party headquarters. Some have been caught, tried and jailed, though latest developments have moved onto a much higher echelon of people. This is what the Democrats want—to go as high as possible, even into the White House. The Washington Post and the New York Times have also been digging, simply because they have long been at war with the president. In spite of all of the publicity and muck-raking, one should not necessarily conclude that this is the most frightening thing to happen in America since 1492. Congress had been looking forward to some fun in battling the White House over who would testify, but President Nixon cooled that last week. However, one cannot help but wonder what it would take to satisfy those who are making so much noise about Watergate. From our viewpoint, it should be settled and forgotten, quickly.

HARMFUL EFFECTS UPON ELDERLY BEING IMPOSED BY HEW

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the potential impact on the elderly of the new Social Service regulations proposed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to go into effect on July 1. I therefore asked for comments from interested agencies in New York. I have received a fine reply from the Office for the Aging in New York City which shows that these new regulations will have extremely deleterious effects on the elderly poor. I would like to share this letter with my colleagues:

OFFICE FOR THE AGING,
New York, N.Y., May 16, 1973.

Congresswoman ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN HOLTZMAN: We were very pleased to receive your letter of May 8th asking for our comments on the new Social Service regulations proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to go into effect on July 1st.

Basically, our point of view is the same as that expressed by Mr. Sugarman of Human Resources Administration in his testimony being given before the Long Committee on May 17th.

We anticipate that the regulations can only have a wholly negative impact on present and proposed programs for older people. In the first instance, the ceiling imposed by Federal financial participation will result in an actual curtailment of service and bring about an unproductive and potentially divisive competitive struggle among agencies for the insufficient services that will be available to fund inadequate programs.

Secondly, and even more importantly, the institution of eligibility requirements for programs that, heretofore, have had no membership limitations will have a most deleterious impact on older people. Those older people who now attend and who need the services of the Centers (and in New York this is particularly the poor but non-welfare white elderly) would be driven out of the Centers while the doors of the Centers would be closed to other poor elderly.

As you probably know, many of the present Center participants do not receive public assistance, even though they might be eligible. This Office's Study of the Elderly in Poverty Areas in New York City clearly indicates the fact that older New Yorkers generally reject the concept of welfare. Therefore, to attach a means test to any service offered older people is to institute an effective method of mitigating, if not destroying, the program.

Under these regressive and punitive regulations, our great hope for expansion of social services to older people is evaporating and we can only envision a reduction in service which will fall unfairly upon the shoulders of the poor older people who have always managed to maintain economic independence and are now to be punished for this.

Inasmuch as these regulations appear to violate both the intent and the words of the Social Security Act, we hope you will be successful in preventing them from going into effect.

If we can be of any further assistance,

please let us know. We are very glad to work with you on this important matter.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. BROPHY,
Director.

A NEED FOR REENTRY EDUCATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call the attention of all Members to the need for a program of reentry education. Such a program would eliminate the demoralizing condition of being unable to acquire even the most limited training or retraining necessary for a job in today's technological society that presently exists in the unemployment compensation system.

Our work force continues to grow, and so does the demand for competent people in more technical fields. Such areas demand a greater amount of education. However, regardless of one's educational level, the ability to maintain continued employment will depend largely on one's capacity to keep abreast of advances in the field.

It is time that we seriously consider replacing the unemployment compensation system with a program that will allow workers to return to the economy as productive members. European countries have shown that a program of retraining is possible. Carl Rowan, in two columns in the Washington Evening Star dated March 10, 1972, and March 12, 1972, has demonstrated both the problem, and a possible solution:

PRACTICAL SETUP NEEDED FOR TRAINING
JOBLESS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

When 5,400,000 Americans want a job and can't find one, the political implications are obvious in a presidential election year.

So the constantly enflamed emotions over school busing, trips to China and Russia and all the other stratagems will not erase the nation's economic woes as a major factor when the people go to the polls in November.

But the grim truth is that America's economic miseries are too deep and too serious to be regarded as merely an aberration which produces political advantage for one party or another.

This country has, in recent years, been plagued by high levels of unemployment plus extremely high levels of inflation, even though it supposedly was in a period of economic recovery. The so-called economic experts have hauled out a panoply of classical and dogmatic remedies, but the economic ailments have lingered—or worsened.

The United States has lost her competitive position in the world, with the balance of payments deficit reaching critical proportions. There is not the slightest sign that the U.S. position as a foreign trader is going to improve soon.

We have a situation where the secretary of the Treasury opines that this country cannot hold unemployment below 4 percent (or about 3.5 million jobless workers) without unacceptably high levels of inflation.

But how can this be so when in 1970 West Germany held unemployment to a mere four-tenths of a percent even while the rate of in-

flation was just 2.5 percent higher than the change in real output?

(That same year, in the United States, both unemployment and inflation rose sharply while real output declined!)

What is Germany—or France or Denmark doing right that we insist on doing wrong?

Dr. Herbert E. Striner, dean of the College of Continuing Education at American University here, spent last summer in those countries, examining their manpower policies under a grant from his institution and the Ford Foundation.

Striner has returned with some convincing conclusions and some recommendations that may be bitterly controversial. His report will soon be published by the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. What he is saying may be so crucially important to the health of our economy—and the well-being of America's jobless—that I asked for permission to give readers an advance summary.

Striner found that West Germany, France and Denmark have enjoyed economic near-miracles because they have accepted some truths that the United States goes on ignoring:

"In an economy which is based upon technological change . . . the presence of a large number of adults whose inadequate level of education or training freezes them out of the new economy also becomes a retarding force on that economy."

"An expanding economy whose expansion depends heavily upon new products, new technologies, and new distributions of incomes must also have a labor force constantly being refitted, retrained, and re-educated to meet these needs. To do less is to invite continuing unemployment, inflation, loss of markets and a national sense of frustration."

"An advanced industrialized society must see the . . . retraining of its labor force as a national capital expenditure; without that capital investment, the United States cannot hope to maintain . . . an impressive rate of economic progress."

Striner notes that the Germans have minimized waste of manpower by instituting training and retraining programs. "They don't see unemployed or underemployed workers as 'unmotivated, welfare types,' as too many of the citizens in our country do," the dean writes.

Striner points out that "the German adult who is out of a job or feels that his skill is obsolescing and will result in his unemployment can go to a full-time training program which is free and also receive a stipend, which on the average covers about 70 percent of his former wage. Thus the German isn't told that a free training and education program awaits him if, somehow, he can place his family in a state of suspended animation and convince his landlord not to ask for rent."

Striner points out that the United States never has had a genuine job-training program for its 500,000 hard-core unemployed, or a program to retrain workers whose skills are made obsolete by new technology.

"We nibbled around the edges of a problem, camouflaged inadequate summer make-work programs as training efforts, and then wrung our hands and shed copious tears over 'the failure of another manpower program,'" he writes.

There are 1,028,000 jobless black Americans today whereas there would be only 500,000 if blacks could find work at the same rate as the rest of the population. This is a direct reflection of the fact that we have had no training and retraining programs for people whom the rest of society is happy enough to dismiss as "welfare types."

Striner has come back home with a bold program, which will be discussed in another column, that offers this country a route out of the doldrums. It reserves the most serious consideration by whoever runs this country for the next four years.

OUR OBSOLETE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM

(By Carl T. Rowan)

So your district is short of teachers, you can't get your car repaired promptly, you have to wait forever to get medical or dental care—but they still tell you that 5,400,000 Americans are hunting jobs?

So you don't understand all those help wanted ads in your newspaper when so many people aren't trained to do the jobs that are available.

Dr. Herbert E. Striner, the dean of the College of Continuing Education at The American University here, says this is an indication that "we are no longer committed as a nation to the education and training of our citizens for the world of work."

In my last column I reported on Striner's study of manpower and employment policies in West Germany, France and Denmark. He found that the training and re-training of workers is their key to maintaining the strength of a highly industrial, technological society.

Unless the United States follows their lead, Striner says in a report soon to be published by the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, "Chronic unemployment at high levels for the young and old, for the black and white, will become a part of our society . . ."

West Germany has avoided the twin plague of high unemployment plus high inflation by using its unemployment insurance fund to pay for education and training programs that refit workers to maintain their place in a progressing economy.

Striner argues that the United States must junk its present inadequate unemployment insurance program and replace it with a "National Economic Security Fund."

Striner points out that only people who have been in the labor force for a specified period of time, and for whom payroll taxes have been paid, can now receive unemployment insurance benefits. Thus the many unemployed people between the ages of 16 and 20 are largely uncovered. As things now go, Striner says, unemployment insurance will become increasingly a form of "welfare benefit."

He says the United States must do what West Germany has done: "Use the money to prevent high, chronic unemployment rather than as a palliative once it occurs."

He figures that the United States could train or retrain 1 percent of its labor force (about 800,000 workers) each year, paying them 75 percent of their previous year's income, without costing the nation new monies. This, he maintains, would revitalize the U.S. economy, ease the miseries of millions of families, and help make this country competitive again in world markets.

To do this, Striner makes the following among several proposals:

1. A permanent education and training law should be enacted, which makes it a right for every worker over the age of 17 to pursue an education-training program. Such a program could be for as long as 24 months, on a full time basis, with all expenses paid and a personal stipend granted averaging 75 percent of the worker's immediately prior income. Those without prior work would get a minimal stipend to cover basic living needs.

2. The new act would federalize all state unemployment insurance funds (in which the balance after payment of 1970 benefits was more than \$12 billion) and convert them into a National Economic Security Fund. NESF would finance not only the education-training program but would provide unemployment benefits to any jobless worker deemed likely to regain work in the same skill, company or industry within six months. Two years after enactment of the new law, NESF would be supported by a 1.5 percent

tax, shared equally by employer and employee, on all wages up to \$9,000 a year.

This, Striner says, would produce more than enough income to sustain an education-training program for 1 percent of the labor force every year. It would leave unemployment insurance reserves available for subsidies to workers suffering short-term unemployment who do not desire or need retraining.

Striner concedes that the Federal government does not have the kind of administrative organization needed to administer such a program. But he thinks it may now be ready to create such an organization, considering the critical juncture at which the economy now languishes.

MR. MERRILL A. WATSON COMMENTS ON THE FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, through the many years of my fight to save what is left of the footwear industry in the United States, I have come to know and respect Mr. Merrill A. Watson, formally an economic specialist with the American Footwear Industry. Now retired, Mr. Watson, nevertheless, writes to me from time to time on matters affecting the footwear industry and as one who has lived with the problems of the industry for a long time, his is an opinion which I value highly.

Mr. Watson's warning concerning the so-called safeguard provisions under title 2 of the President's trade bill, are not to be taken lightly when it becomes clear that the President has failed to take action in the past under authority already available to him. No better example exists than the Tariff Commission's tie vote on relief to the footwear industry which has been sitting on the President's desk for over 2 years now.

I submit Mr. Watson's correspondence for the RECORD in the hopes that it will receive the attention and thought of every Member in this body:

APRIL 24, 1973.

HON. JAMES BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I am sure you are aware we now have clear and convincing evidence that the so-called "safeguard" provisions in Title 2 of the Trade Reform Act of 1973 are merely a facade to help the Bill through Congress. The provisions I refer to are those giving the President authority to provide import relief through duties, quotas, orderly marketing agreements and so on. The Administration has no intention of using these provisions except perhaps in some emergency. The proof is the President has had on his desk for 2 years a split decision of the Tariff Commission which would permit him to slow down shoe imports. (No one is asking that imports be shut off) He has the authority; all that is needed is a stroke of the pen. Is he likely to do something when the new Bill passes. Of course not. Why does anyone need more proof that the whole business of Title 2 is a snare and a delusion. It is intended to quiet the protectionists in industry and Congress.

The few cases of adjustment assistance given shoe factories are no answer to this

charge. These were given only when overwhelming evidence on shoe imports could no longer be pushed under the rug. Otherwise the TEA assistance sections would appear to be completely deceptive.

Unless all signs fail industry and Congress will now be fooled for a second time. It was clear in 1962 that the adjustment assistance provisions of TEA were merely camouflage. Those of us who said so were shouted down and the Bill went floating through Congress on a river of hyperbole on how these provisions would help industry and workers adjust to foreign competition. The record speaks for itself.

One watches with grudging admiration the attempt to pull the same trick in the Trade Reform Bill. Yet when you think of it why shouldn't it work again? Certainly the free traders should have no objection. If they have they don't understand the rules of the game. They can be partners in speeding the Bill through Congress knowing that without Presidential action it is harmless. When a situation arises as in shoes where the facts cry out for action they can use their influence behind the scenes to prevent action.

The Bill's promoters, recognizing they must make obeisance to protectionists, can be quietly confident that even if Title 2 passes in tough form it will be shelved in practice. Little more will happen than has happened in the past. The whole maneuver holds a world of meaning on the attitude of the Bill's promoters toward Congress. Apparently they believe they can disregard questions from Capitol Hill on why Title 2 will be used more effectively than the adjustment assistance provisions of TEA.

Had this Administration demonstrated some responsiveness no matter how modest, to the pleas of labor intensive industries other than textiles with its political clout, one might have some confidence in the intentions behind Title two. In the shoe industry, imports were about one half domestic production in 1972. In the first quarter of 1973 imports amounts to over 75 percent of domestic shoe production. Hundreds of shoe factories have gone out of business. When this clear cut case for relief is shunted aside for over 2 years there is no longer room for doubt as to Executive intentions.

A decade of history confirms Executive branch acceptance of the thesis that low cost imports should be allowed to displace domestic labor intensive industry. The pity of it is this is being done as a result of the economic predilections of a few in positions of power. Dozens of studies constituting a waste disposal problem, have attempted without success to place the blame for the shrinkage in domestic facilities on the industry itself. There has been no attempt to provide economic judgment on how much domestic footwear manufacturing should be preserved in this country. In other words shall we depend ultimately on imports for practically all our footwear needs? Or in the light of potential population growth and the needs of a balanced economy is there some point at which action should be taken to preserve a viable shoe manufacturing industry. In this observer's opinion we have already passed that point.

I was pleased to see the appeal of the New England delegation to the President for action in the long delayed shoe case. I can only hope that these legislators who have displayed such consistent interest in the shoe problem will not be gulled into accepting Title 2 as an instrument for shoe relief. Unless history is reversed little will happen until Congress insists on evidence it will be used. There is no better place for the Administration to provide this evidence than in footwear.

Kind regards,

Dr. MERRILL A. WATSON,
Economic Consultant.

DEVELOPING EMOTIONAL IDENTIFICATIONS ACROSS NATIONAL BOUNDARIES

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. David Brook, the distinguished chairman of the political science faculty at Jersey City State College has written a most interesting paper which was delivered at the annual convention of the International Student Association in New York on March 16, 1973. The paper entitled "Developing Emotional Identifications Across National Boundaries" was well received in academic circles. Dr. Brook, a respected member of the scholarly community, is the author of "Search for Peace," published by Dodd, Mead & Co. in 1970, and two other books.

Dr. Brook's paper follows:

DEVELOPING EMOTIONAL IDENTIFICATION
ACROSS NATIONAL BOUNDARIES

(By David Brook)

I wish to propose an alternative to collective security as a strategy for maintaining international peace and security. In essence, I should like to explore the thinking of Sigmund Freud as a guide to developing broader communities across national boundaries. The relevant considerations might be as follows:

Collective security as a concept has failed to achieve its stated goal of maintaining world peace. Many reasons could be given for this failure. However, one explanation might be concerned with collective security's similarity to a Hobbesian view of man. Thus, nations are believed to be in a state of nature in which a war of all against all prevails. The only way to eliminate this conflict is through the establishment of overwhelming force in the hands of the central international organization which would then be able to punish aggression. Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter approaches this concept although it does not totally enact its precepts into international law.

Thus, article 43(1) states that "all members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security undertake to make available to the Security Council on its call and in accordance with a special agreement . . . armed forces, assistance and facilities . . . for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security." Article 42 states that should a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression occur, the Security Council, "may take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to restore international peace and security." Leaving aside the veto question and even assuming that the agreements envisaged by Article 43 would have been entered into, there is still doubt that the arrangement could have worked in a world that is psychologically divided. After all, the factories which produce the necessary weapons are all controlled by nation states. In addition, the members of any United Nations army would, by and large, identify with their own nation's interest. Indeed, even the generals who would command the international army might think of themselves primarily as Americans, Russians, or Chinese rather than as members of a world military force.

It would seem that the establishment of a sense of world community is a prerequisite for the maintenance of international peace. There have been many theories envisaging the development of such a community. How-

ever, one thinker has been generally neglected i.e. Sigmund Freud. The founder of psychoanalysis has received a bad press in the literature of international politics partly because it was believed that he emphasized an aggressive instinct in man and this gave an extremely pessimistic bias to his theories.

However, a closer examination of Freud's theories might dispell this notion. In fact, such an analysis might point the way to possible methods of developing communities which cross national boundaries.

With regard to the theory of the instincts, Freud does believe that societies as well as individuals are motivated by unconscious instinctual factors which are based on the biological needs of man. It is true that there are aggressive instincts. They are represented in the outer world by destructive and sadistic actions. However, there are also life instincts. One feature of these drives is the movement toward bringing entities closer together. Indeed, one way in which life is prolonged is by the uniting of one cell organisms into multicell animals. The same force is at work in mankind, leading toward unity of separate individuals into larger and larger groups. Thus, in Civilization and its Discontents Freud states, "civilization is a special process in the service of eros (life instincts) whose purpose is to combine human individuals and after that families, then races, peoples and nations into one great unity, the unity of mankind." When a unity is established, hostility is lessened within the group although aggressiveness may be projected outward toward other entities. With regard to a united mankind, destructive forces would be channeled into an assault against nature. An attempt could be made to benefit all mankind through an even more determined effort to master our expanding environment.

Drawing upon his psychoanalytic experience Freud discussed methods by which groups are formed. He argued that a group is established as a result of the development of emotional ties among its members. This implies measures beyond the recognition of common interests. He felt that there should be a leader or a leading idea. Thus an abstract concept could be a powerful focal point for bringing people together. The followers would develop emotional ties between themselves and the leader. For example, devout followers of a religion develop such feelings toward their leader. The same is true in regard to followers of controversial political movements. In addition, strong emotional ties exist among members of the group; they are all followers of the same ideal and they, therefore, develop identifications with each other. One way in which peace is maintained in modern society concerns the fact that man is a member of a multiplicity of groups. Thus, Freud states in, Group Theory and an Analysis of the Ego "Each individual is a component part of numerous groups. He is bound by ties of identification in many directions . . . Each individual therefore has a share in numerous group minds—of the race, of his class, of his creed, of his nationality".

The above analysis of Freud's ideas would seem to indicate that international organization has an opportunity to encourage the development of emotional ties beyond the nation state. It might explore the possibility of serving as a leading focal point in various fields. In this way it could develop the type of following that would draw people together.

APPENDIX

Any concrete methods of achieving emotional identifications across national boundaries might be related to considerations raised by Freud. It would seem to me that the basic approach is more important than a discussion of any particular field. The experienced or the knowledgeable might develop organizational forms once objectives are clearly defined. However, I should like to make some

concrete suggestions which could be applied to numerous areas.

It is possible for governmental or non-governmental organizations to deliberately become focal points for transnational identifications. Indeed, governments which dominate public international organizations may be persuaded to assist in the process provided they feel strongly about a particular issue or if they believe that the development of a strong community is in the national interest; in any case, international organizations interested in community development should be organized around a particular felt need; pollution control, narcotic control, the development of a small standing international army, in order to obtain a specific highly prized objective, are examples. Any such organization should center around a concept for which there is support in a number of nation-states. It would be helpful if interested national groups already do exist. Once the international agency is established, it should do more than merely try to encourage activities of separate national groups. It should attempt to organize one great international movement focusing on coordinated activities including petition gathering, rallies etc., and it should strive for unified goals. The members of the movement should be given a feeling of belonging to a powerful force which uplifts or strengthens each and every member. At first, goals should be chosen which can easily be attained. Thus, early victories could be celebrated as evidence of the growing power of the movement and would act as a binding force.

S. 398

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks of one of my constituents, I feel is worthy of consideration by my colleagues and would therefore like to submit the following letter for their evaluation:

BOZEMAN, MONT.

S. 398 is a bill which makes me wonder about the future of Service Industries in general, and the Livestock/Crop Production Industry, in particular; one which my wife and I are proud members of. The question arises: What are we in Livestock/Crop Production supposed to be able to produce, in the way of a decent supply of quality foodstuffs, if our supply of fuel and other raw materials is cut—as could happen under this bill, Section 2(a)? One notes the constant stream of complaints from the Legislature, concerning the acts of the Executive branch, in regard to the latter's lack of accepting the advice and consent of the former. If the members of the Legislature feel so strongly on this matter, how is it that as a body, they chose to give the President such a wide-ranging tool to use at his discretion, only?

As I have stated before, a great many of our problems stem from the drain on American Tax-dollars which has been caused, in the main, by foreign aid. This is one endeavor which has cost, cost and cost, without returning a single benefit to the livelihood of any American laborer, whether he is of the 9-to-5 variety Urbanite, or the Rural Livestock/Crop Producer.

Of particular concern is the Watergate situation. At a time when too many questions are unanswered, giving more power to

the Executive Branch is too risky. I do not, herein, attempt to place the blame for any event, upon any of those in Government; but, rather, to suggest that the Watergate should be fully investigated and prosecuted, before power is distributed, by the Legislature to the Executive Branch.

In establishing priorities, I hope that the Executive shall remember one rule-of-Thumb: Any society exists by first being able to feed and clothe itself; all other activities, follow, therefrom! This has always been the order of priorities, and, of necessity, must remain so. It is the only way to secure a viable existence for everyone in a particular social unit. Concerning the 267 Members who "threw away" their prerogative, on their vote, 4/30/73, I can only say: "God save the Democracy!"

WILLIAM ROBERT EDWARDS.

CREATION OF A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF POPULATION SCIENCES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the 91st Congress I introduced a bill to create within the National Institutes of Health a National Institute of Population Sciences. At the time, it was clear that the pace of innovation and discovery in the critical areas of reproductive biology, new contraceptives, and social science research in population growth was inadequate to meet the increasing needs of our society. At that time, also, we had a number of studies by various Government panels indicating that a major reason for this inadequate progress was the lack of a sufficiently strong institutional focus for the Federal population research program.

The Center for Population Research, which serves as the main institutional focus under the current system, is only one element in the program of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. The Director of the Institute controls such questions as the relative allocations of funds between the population research program and the other components of the Institute's work, the degree to which funding shall be allotted to supporting research centers versus individual contracts, and other key questions. Yet the current Director is a specialist in pediatrics and possesses no expertise in the population area. In addition, the Advisory Council to the Institute of necessity cannot specialize in population. This is a particular problem since the council is the body charged with reviewing the decisions on scientific merit made by the independent study panels of the NIH, panels which are not even appointed by the Institute. Theoretically, such a review should permit allocation of grant moneys to reflect program priorities, but in fact the NICHHD Council is spread too thin to make such a review a reality.

Since 1969, we have had several

promises from the administration that this problem would be dealt with, and one semireorganization in 1970. We have also had several recommendations by the Population Commission, the American Public Health Association, the Secretary's Advisory Council on Population, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science that a separate institute should be established. Nevertheless, we have not had any significant change in the structural arrangements or operations of the Center for Population Research. In addition, although the 1970 legislation called for the budget of the CPR to be presented to the Congress by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs, he has never been permitted to do so.

We have also seen the increasing controversies swirling around issues related to birth control, contraception, and abortion; controversies which have been deeply divisive and which reflect, in large part, the inadequacies of our present contraceptive technology. Recent information on problems of informed consent and proper medical practice with regard to the use of such drugs as Depro-Provera indicate clearly that the FDA and the CPR together are proving inadequate to the task of insuring adequate dissemination of information on the appropriate and inappropriate uses of such drugs, and that adequate monitoring is not being conducted.

The failure of funding levels for this program to keep up with any of the sets of need projections which have been developed, including that of HEW's own 5-year plan for population research, has indicated that the level of funding for the population research program is being held back by the need, in the words of the House Appropriations Committee, to "maintain balance" between the different and basically unrelated programs falling under the authority of the NICHD.

The Congress has already recognized the basically inadequate nature of the NICHD structure by passing a bill last session to create a separate Institute for Aging Research. For these reasons, I rise today to introduce a new version of my bill to create a National Institute of Population Sciences. I am pleased that my distinguished colleague, Mr. HORTON, is joining me as a principal cosponsor of this legislation. I am also pleased to announce that the following Members have joined me as cosponsors of this bill: Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. STARK, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WHITEHURST. The bill spells out in some detail the nature of the research programs to be conducted by the Institute, and I believe it could get our research programs in contraceptive development, reproductive biology, and social science research on population phenomena, moving again.

CXIX—1068—Part 13

DISTRICT HEARINGS ON CUTS IN FUNDING SOCIAL PROGRAMS

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to my colleagues on the results of a series of public hearings which I conducted throughout my Seventh Congressional District relating to the impact of the President's 1974 budget cutbacks.

The hearings were held on March 31 in Chelsea, Mass.; on April 7 in Malden, Mass.; and on April 14 in Revere, Mass.

The purpose of these hearings, which lasted the better part of the day in each case, was to hear on a firsthand basis from the people who are being affected by the President's budget reductions. I heard from the administrators of the various programs involved, and more importantly, from individuals who had actually participated in and been helped by the programs.

Topics of testimony included education, health, employment, housing, the elderly, youth, poverty, alcoholism, and mental health.

I can assure my colleagues that these hearings served to reinforce my already deep concern about the disastrous impact which the proposed budget cuts would have on the people of my district and on the people of Massachusetts in general.

The categories hardest hit in Massachusetts in terms of lost Federal revenue include:

	[In millions]
Anti-Poverty programs.....	\$10.7
Community development.....	119.6
Education funding.....	28.9
Health programs.....	35.9
Housing programs.....	18.4
Manpower programs.....	48.6
Welfare and elderly.....	95.1

Equally compelling to me is the fact that countless persons who depend on these programs may be abandoned as a result of the budget reductions.

I have spoken with the mayors of cities and towns throughout my district, and while they are working hard to compensate for the possible loss of these programs, they readily admit that the future is not bright if Government sponsorship is eliminated. They share my skepticism about special revenue sharing as an answer.

This Congress is faced with a choice. It can go the easy political route and simply abandon these programs, blaming the results on the President and his party. Or, it can continue the funding and operation of these programs while a long hard look is taken at their efficiency to determine whether and where modifications might be necessary. The question for some seems to be whether or not it is worth the effort. If any of you have such doubts, I urge you to ask the people of your district as I have asked mine. The answer is likely to be

the same as the one which I received: "It is not only worth the effort; it may be our only hope. We should be doing more, not less in these areas."

I would like to include at this point a list of witnesses who appeared at these meetings and some of the press clippings from the local newspapers which cover the content of the hearings:

DISTRICT HEARINGS ON CUTS IN FUNDING SOCIAL PROGRAMS

CHELSEA—MARCH 31, 1973

General topics

Philip J. Spelman, Mayor of Chelsea.
Representative Francis Doris.
Representative Angelo Cataldo.
Representative Robert F. Donovan.

Education

Mrs. Esther Perez, Title 7 Program, Williams School, Walnut St., Chelsea.
Paul Casino, Chairman, Chelsea School Committee (8 Chester Ave.).

Robert McCarthy, Representative to Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational School from Chelsea, (58 Garfield Ave.).

John Ridge, Superintendent of Schools of Chelsea (68 Fremont Ave.).

Mrs. Susan Clark, Director, Upward Bound Program, 311 Broadway, Chelsea.

Mrs. Emmaline Cromwell, 140 Walnut St., Chelsea—citizen.

Mrs. Rosalie Fox, 25 Cottage St., Chelsea—citizen.

Mrs. John P. Wozniak, 96 Watts St., Chelsea—citizen—in support of Title I.

Health

John Quigley, Commandant, Chelsea Soldiers Home.

Robert Botchley, citizen, 236 Central Ave.—re lead poisoning.

Lawrence McVay, member of Mental Health Board—16 Hillside Ave.

Mrs. Ivy Tufo, 132 Constitution Ave., Revere—citizen who has retarded son.

Doris Waxman (Mrs. Wm.), 889 Broadway, Chelsea, citizen, re Title I.

Employment

Thomas Kerrins, Director, EEA of Chelsea and Revere—54 South Ave., Revere.

Mrs. Marie Fonseca, citizen, 274 Chestnut St., Chelsea—parent whose children have been helped by EEA.

Alderman Thomas Fay, 13 Guam Rd.

Housing

David Namet, Director of Urban Renewal, 140 Bloomingdale St.

Jack Croucher, Director, Community Assn. to Save Homes (CASH) non profit organization, c/o City Hall, Chelsea.

Mrs. Geraldine King, 4 Clinton Court, citizen.

Ex-Alderman Joseph Greenfield, 221 Shurtleff St.

Elderly

Sam Moschella, Director, Chelsea/Revere Home Care Center, Inc., c/o American Legion Bldg., 419 Broadway, Chelsea.

Rosario Pucci, 172 Pearl St., citizen.

Youth

Mrs. Gayle Walker, Day Care Center, 418 Central Ave., Chelsea (director).

Terry Burke, c/o EEA Office, Chelsea City Hall, participant in program.

Joseph Riley, 39 Crescent Ave., Chelsea, participant in EEA program.

Mrs. Florence Cirino, Director, Neighborhood Youth Corps, 224 Bdwy., Chelsea.

Poverty

Edward Greenberg, Pres., Board of Directors of CAPIC, 224 Broadway.

Citizens who spoke in support of EEA

Harry Rubin, 69 Shurtleff St.

Charles Chesna, 161 Shurtleff St.

Michael Devonick, 164 Shawmut St.
Carmen Rivera, 9 Chester Ave.
Leticia Toro, 45 Fourth St.

REVERE—APRIL 14, 1973

General topics

Mayor William G. Reinstein.
Representative Angelo Cataldo (also spoke in Chelsea).
Representative Francis Doris.
Councillor Joseph DelGrosso—815 Broadway.
Former Councillor Leonard Ginsburg—54 Nahant Avenue.

Education

Dr. Charles Diamond, Guidance Director—Garfield School.
Edward Manganiello, Supervisor, Work Study Program, care of School Department.
Mrs. Harvey W. Tatelman, 45 Thornton Street, Citizen, on behalf of Title I.
Mrs. Charles Salvetti, P.T.A. President, 234 Cooledge Street.
Mrs. Ivy Tufo, 132 Constitution Avenue—mother of retarded son (also spoke in Chelsea).

Health

John Hurley, citizen (no address available).

Employment

Peter Tata, Director of CAPIC, Revere Office, 270 Broadway.
Charles Salvetti, 234 Cooledge Street—participant in EEA program.
Miss Linda Gibson, care of CAPIC, 270 Broadway (youngster being trained for job).

Housing

Mrs. G. Roger Cafarelli, member of Revere Housing Authority, 21 Adams Street.

Elderly

Sam Moschella, Director, Chelsea-Revere Home Care Center, Inc. (also spoke in Chelsea).
Nell Darcey, Revere Welfare Department, City Hall, Revere.

Youth

Mrs. Jean Leydon, Director, Ready Day Care Center, care of Our Lady of Lourdes Church, Revere.
Mrs. Ruth Limoli, assistant to Mrs. Leydon.
Florence Cirino, Director, Chelsea NYC (spoke in Chelsea).
Miss Janice Shwager, Community Organizer for State Office for Children, 1729 North Shore Road, Revere.
Robert Vetere, Director, NYC of Revere, 130 Hutchinson Street, Revere.
Donald Newbury, citizen, participant in NYC program, 84 Keayne Street, Revere.
Lt. James Cowhig, Revere Police Department, in favor of NYC.
Chief of Police George P. Corbett, in favor of NYC.
Mrs. Francine DiMaria, 83 Atlantic Avenue, citizen in favor of NYC.

Poverty

Mrs. Bernice Kenny, 168 Beach Street, citizen.

MALDEN—APRIL 7, 1973

Mel Shea, Exec. Director, EMOC, 73 Union Sq., Somerville.
Jim Coughlin, Director, Malden Action Program for Elderly, 341a Forest St.

Outreach program

Greg Albert, Director, Outreach Program, YMCA, Pleasant St., Malden.
Rich Catrambone, participant in Outreach Program, YMCA, Malden.
Arthur Surette, participant in Outreach Program, YMCA, Malden.

Alcoholism programs

Joseph Howard, citizen on behalf of halfway house.
Jim Shea, 12 Cedar St., Malden (resident in halfway house for alcoholics).
Ray Blake, 12 Cedar St., Malden (resident in halfway house for alcoholics).

Richie Santiago, 12 Cedar St., Malden (resident in halfway house for alcoholics).

John Christian, Supervisor of halfway house for alcoholics, 12 Cedar St., Malden.
Mrs. Sally Mayne, 139 Linden Ave., Malden—citizen on behalf of halfway house.

Neighborhood youth corps

Joe Sacco, Director, Malden NYC Program, 333 Bryant St., Malden.
Carmen Belmonte, Assistant Counselor, Malden NYC, 333 Bryant St., Malden.
Nancy Rogers, youngster being aided by Malden NYC, 333 Bryant St., Malden.
Louise Sousa, youngster being aided by Malden NYC, 18 Lombard Ct., Malden.
Keith Caine, youngster being aided by Malden NYC, 162 Newland St., Malden.
Miss Marsha Signal, youngster being aided by Malden NYC, 333 Bryant St., Malden.

Headstart program

Marie Galvin, Director, Headstart Program, c/o 73 Union St., Somerville.
Miss Jean O'Hearn, citizen, re Headstart Program, c/o 333 Bryant St., Malden.
Theresa Consalvo, citizen, re Headstart Program, c/o 333 Bryant St., Malden.
Diane Everard, citizen, re Headstart Program, c/o 333 Bryant St., Malden.

Citizens on behalf of various programs

Mrs. Susan Glick, 41 Dexter St., Malden, representing League of Women Voters.
Mrs. Patricia Montgomery, re Day Care Center, 162 Newland St., Malden.
Mrs. Geraldine Sousa, re NYC program, 18 Lombard Ct., Malden.
Mrs. Isabelle Hallahan, 19 Benner Ave., re EMOC.
Attorney Edward Gorfine, 76 Central Ave., re EMOC.

Mental health

Mrs. Mae Selvitelli, 563 Riverside Ave., Secretary of Tri City Mental Health and Retardation Board.
Marcia and Debbie Ross, volunteers for working with retarded children.

Misc.

Mrs. Hilda Allen, Director of Sewing Project, 333 Bryant St., Malden.

Elected officials

Councillor at Large Amelia Miclette, 31 Ivy Rd.
Senator Stephen McGrall, State House, Boston.
Representative John Brennan, State House, Boston.
Councillor Thomas Cosgrove, City Hall, Malden.

[From the Chelsea (Mass.) Record, Apr. 2, 1973]

CONGRESSMAN MACDONALD URGED TO OPPOSE BUDGET CUTS

Welcoming the opportunity to listen, and telling his constituents he would carry their message back to Washington, Cong. Torbert H. Macdonald heard pleas by directors and participants Saturday that he oppose budget reductions in federally funded domestic programs.

In the city to learn at the grass roots level what the effects of federal budget cuts would be, the congressman heard ample testimony through the late morning and early afternoon of the benefits from the programs accrued to Chelsea and its residents. Predictions of what the funding reductions would mean were also forthcoming from many who crowded the aldermanic chamber.

Foreseeing a head-to-head confrontation in the Supreme Court over the budget, Cong. Macdonald said he has introduced a bill that would prevent the president from impounding funds he has already earmarked.

"The President is isolated at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue," Cong. Macdonald said. "He does not see the good results of social pro-

grams". Admitting that there might be a little waste here and a big waste there, the Congressman said the solution was to use a scalpel rather than the President's "meat-axe approach."

He called the President's position on social program the "nadir of extremism and charged the President with hypocrisy."

"He said in his inaugural address that we should be more self reliant," Cong. Macdonald said, "and then he takes away half of the funding for rehabilitation and training. This year he sent to Congress the highest budget in U.S. history ever sent by any President. Then he says, 'If there is a rise in taxes, don't blame me, blame Congress.'"

Testimony was heard on the effects of budget reductions for programs in the fields of education, health, employment, housing, elderly, youth and poverty. Statements were submitted by members of Chelsea's State House delegation, city department heads, and members of the board of aldermen and the school committee. Clerical help volunteered time to assure that the congressman would have copies of all statements and testimony to take with him back to Washington.

EDUCATION

Stating that federal funds are absolutely necessary if the city is to carry on many of the programs in the field of education, John Ridge, superintendent of schools, said threatened Title I funds have enabled the city to provide school libraries, courses in English as a second language, speech therapy, guidance and psychological services, diagnostic testing, field trips, arts and crafts, transportation and lunch programs. "In 1972, the federally funded Title I program," a statement submitted by the school superintendent said, "served 1,050 students in public and private schools at a cost of \$282,000."

Funding for the Title VII bilingual, bicultural program, also threatened by proposed budget cuts, amounted to \$80,000 in 1973-74, according to a statement submitted by Saul B. Slavitt, project director. Plans for the 1973-74 school year call for vertical expansion with each school adding a third grade to involve a total of 120 children. The plans depend on receipt of \$92,000 in federal funds.

Speaking about cuts which would effect CAPIC education programs, Alan Hurwitz CAPIC education coordinator, said the situation had reached a tragic point but it was gratifying to see the hearing taking place. Referring to the President's budget he said, "Only by being part of the defense industry do you have a justifiable claim for inefficiency. If the President wants to understand thrift let him go to the supermarket and try to buy meat for a family of five."

Paul Casino, school committee chairman, emphasized the points made by Supt. Ridge, Robert M. McCarthy, Chelsea's representative on the vocational school board, reported to Cong. Macdonald the effect budget cuts would have on the vocational school and Sue Clark, program director, outlined what the effects would be if funding for the Upward bound program were cut off.

HEALTH CARE

Calling CAPIC the dynamic catalyst that has coordinated community activities to assure improved health care for Chelsea citizens, John L. Quigley, commandant, Chelsea Soldiers' Home, said CAPIC represents an excellent merging of the voluntary sector and government to improve health care in this community. "Any jeopardization," Quigley said, "of this soon to be attained goal should be unthinkable."

A letter from Gerald L. Klerman, M.D., superintendent of the Lindemann Mental Health Center, read by Lawrence McVay, assistant superintendent, Chelsea Soldiers' Home, emphasized the impact of cuts in

federal programs on his department's capacity to deliver services to Chelsea.

A staffing grant was approved but probably will not be awarded. Special funds for Children's Services have been discontinued. Major cuts in training of personnel in psychiatry and other mental health fields have been announced. The mental health center will not, as planned, be able to place a third year resident with special emphasis on consultation, at Chelsea Memorial Hospital.

"The net impact of these cuts," Dr. Klerman said, will be felt predominantly in the area of locally based services to families and children."

EMPLOYMENT

Thomas Kerrins, EEA director, told Cong. Macdonald the 67 participants in the program earn annual salaries totaling \$495,000. Most of the money is spent in Chelsea, he said, and has a vital impact on Chelsea's economy. The program participants have refurbished many public buildings in the city, he said, and hope to be able to refurbish every one.

"The president has earmarked \$424 million in EEA funds for a summer program to replace the neighborhood youth corps," Kerrins said: "I would hate to be a city official left with the decision to lay off the father to hire his son."

"It will be a long hot summer," Kerrins added, "if 300 to 400 youths normally employed are walking the streets."

Many of the participants in the program underscored the importance to the city of the program by reporting to the congressman the importance of the program to themselves.

In a letter to Cong. Macdonald, Charles W. Adams, EEA training coordinator, said, "One of my responsibilities as the Chelsea training coordinator, was to assist the State Office of Manpower Affairs in conducting a statewide formal evaluation of the EEA program. The result of the interviews revealed that 90% of the participants had the same overall reaction. 'EEA has given people an opportunity to work at a necessary and respectable job that pays a decent wage, thereby enabling individuals to provide for themselves and their families, and spares the humiliation of accepting public assistance of one kind or another.'"

HOUSING

Speaking of Chelsea's renewal program, David Namet, executive director of the urban renewal authority, said, "We had hoped to continue our efforts in an orderly, intelligent, well planned and well timed program taking advantage of the increased revenues generated by our prior efforts to move into other areas and to satisfy other needs."

"This now becomes impossible," Namet told the congressman, "for the tools of our rebuilding effort have been recalled and scrapped."

"A rehabilitation renewal program, Section 312 loans, a multi-service center, a codes enforcement program, the FHA assisted housing programs, as well as many other aids that we could not only avail ourselves of but which we desperately need are gone." Replaced, he said by "a revenue sharing program so apparently underfunded that its entire budget would not meet the needs of New York City. A program that distributes to municipalities without due regard to their present needs or past performances—all accompanied by the bland assurance that the crisis of the cities is over."

Representatives of Chelsea Association to Save Homes, an organization of volunteers with a director whose salary is paid by the local CAP agency, said their projects are now in limbo because they are waiting for further word from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The funding freeze has impeded their project, they said, but the elimination of the CAP budget would kill their organization.

ELDERLY

If the entire population of the city were placed in groups of 13, Samuel R. Moschella, executive director of the Chelsea/Revere Home Care Center, told the congressman, six would be elderly, one would be poor.

"Working with the elderly," Moschella said, "I know them not as six in thirteen or one in six rather as people I know, faces that respond to any consideration. I beseech you to help us fulfill our mission. We want to do for the elderly, not to them."

As proposed in the fiscal 74 budget, Moschella said, rent supplement, rental housing assistance, and low rent public housing funds would be eliminated. In addition, he said, the President proposed to cut \$516 million off Medicare costs by increasing out-of-pocket expenses to the 23 million aged and disabled beneficiaries.

YOUTH

Other spokesmen at the hearing told the congressman that some of the mothers who send their children to day care centers would no longer find it feasible to go out and work if cost of day care were to increase, should federal assistance be withdrawn, from \$15 to \$45 weekly.

Also on the topic of youth, Florence Cirino, project director, Neighborhood Youth Corps, said NYC since 1966 has served thousands of the most needy youths in the community. Last year alone, she said, 650 took part in the program.

"Although President Nixon has allocated funds for NYC through FY 74," she said, "he has now impounded FY 73 monies which has resulted in cutbacks in all NYC programs. Because of these cuts, we are further faced with turning away more than 800 youths that have applied for employment."

"I feel it is our responsibility, yours and mine," Mrs. Cirino said, "to prevent the cruel termination of this program. I am doing everything I can. Will you, Congressman Macdonald, do everything that you can?"

"I am impressed," Cong. Macdonald told participants, with the sincerity at every level in getting and keeping the community going. I was asked earlier if I am ready to override the President's veto. I am not only ready, but I am waiting with great anticipation. I think we have more than a fighting chance."

[From Boston Sunday Herald Advertiser, April 8, 1973]

MACDONALD ATTACKS NIXON BUDGET CUTS

President Nixon did not make his budget cuts on a rational basis but used a "meat-axe" approach to save federal tax dollars at the expense of the nation's poor, U.S. Rep. Torbert H. Macdonald declared yesterday.

He promised an all-out fight against Nixon's spending curbs in order to prevent loss of many domestic social programs aimed at helping the poor and welfare recipients to obtain jobs.

Speaking to a group of Malden residents and poverty program leaders at the Eastern Middlesex Opportunity Council Multi-Service Center, the Democratic lawmaker also predicted that a growing number of Republican congressmen will join opposition to the president's plan.

"I can assure you that I will oppose the president on these cutbacks," Macdonald said. "There is a lot of arm twisting being done by the Republican leadership because they are afraid GOP opposition to the budget cuts will be a repudiation of the mandate given Nixon in last November's election."

Macdonald said that because the programs about to be abolished or curtailed or of such importance to thousands of people, he decided to make his position on the controversial budget cuts made clear to his constituency.

"No one in Congress will support a pro-

gram that is a waste of taxpayers money," Macdonald said. "However, the president has not made his budget decisions on a rational basis."

"Rather he has adopted a meat-axe approach which will mean the end of many of these very important social and economic programs."

"Many of the programs Nixon plans to dump have helped families to get off welfare by finding for them gainful employment and job training and counseling assistance."

"We are getting organized in Congress and we expect several Republicans to join us," Macdonald said. "The president may have a right to veto certain measures but he has no right to impound funds for these programs."

At yesterday's hearing, a steady stream of government workers and program recipients explained to Macdonald the benefits they would be losing and what would be lost if poverty funds are not appropriated.

A Malden mother of six who was able to find employment and who no longer depends on welfare for support said "every program in the City of Malden has done a fantastic job to help the poor."

"In my own case I know I received a great deal of dignity and so did my children when we were able to get off welfare. I hate to think of going back on it."

Another woman, also a mother of six, told Macdonald through proper counseling that she managed to keep her home.

"If it wasn't for that one program I want you to know that I would have found myself out on the street with my six children," she said.

Edward Gorfine, a Malden resident, summed up the general feeling of most attending the meeting. He told Macdonald:

"When you return to Washington tell Congress the people back home are hurt, angry and frightened. Through many of these programs, they have had the opportunity to see the light of day and now they are afraid of being sent back into the darkness."

Programs facing abolition range from child care centers to classes in sewing for mothers who have learned to supplement their income by doing part-time seamstress work to remain off welfare rolls.

CRITICAL NEEDS OF SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAMS

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks today to the actions of the executive branch in relation to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Whether intended or not, the effects of these actions have been to kill Federal support for programs that have consistently provided summer jobs for thousands of disadvantaged youths over the last 4 years. Unless President Nixon sets up and implements immediately a summer job program as Congress has directed, this Nation, as the House majority leader has stated, "is going to face the prospect of another long, hot summer."

The executive branch has taken actions undermining Neighborhood Youth Corps programs by—

First, impounding \$239 million in appropriations which Congress made available for 1973 summer job programs, and

failing to make any requests at all for program funding in 1974;

Second, advised the Congress that adequate funding for NYC could be available through the public emergency employment program—PEP; and

Third, counseling concerned supporters of NYC that any increase in youth unemployment could be absorbed by the private sector due to improvements in the economy.

The impact of the executive branch's actions has been devastating at the local level. In Los Angeles, for example, summer NYC programs received \$10.4 million in Federal funds last year and provided jobs for 27,000 disadvantaged youths. This year, however, the city and county of Los Angeles apparently will receive no Federal funds for NYC programs. Plans are now going forward to try to mount a limited NYC-type program from local revenues, but at this time, there is no clear idea of where the money is going to come from. Moreover, the number of youths employed will be reduced by approximately 50 percent.

The administration has rested its case on the belief that adequate funds would be available for the continuation of NYC programs through Federal allotments under the Public Emergency Employment Act. But this would mean that cities would have to fire adults in the PEP program to hire teenagers.

Moreover, in Los Angeles, the PEP program already is overextended and operates at a level 10 percent below last year's. We have put local officials in a Solomon-like role by providing that PEP money should now be stretched to cover NYC costs as well.

The young people who will be affected by these cuts in this program are the disadvantaged. They come from families with incomes below the poverty level of \$4,500. There is no doubt that they need the income and work experience that 9 weeks in NYC provides. In the Los Angeles area alone, there are 140,000 young people who would be eligible for NYC jobs if funding were available.

Our communities will lose out as well as the youngsters from these cuts. NYC jobs are not custodial, make-work assignments but service-oriented. NYC youths file library books, run errands for senior citizens, arrange recreational programs, and perform many more useful tasks that enrich the life of our communities.

Unemployment among all workers is still at 5 percent. Thirty-eight major labor areas have unemployment as high as 6 percent. The entire situation requires that the administration do more—not less—to promote employment among all kinds of workers.

LIBRARY CUTBACKS IN THE SOUTHEAST

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on Libraries and

Information Science recently conducted a hearing, in Atlanta, Ga., on library service in the Southeast.

At that hearing, Mr. Speaker, the overriding concern of over 30 witnesses was the cutback in library services proposed in President Nixon's 1974 budget.

The witnesses told the Commission that they would have to reduce their library services, and that:

General revenue sharing funds—are not compensating for former grants.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Commission's report on this hearing in the RECORD.

The report follows:

ATLANTA LIBRARY HEARINGS

The NCLIS listened to testimony from more than 30 witnesses in Atlanta last month during the third in its series of nationwide hearings. Librarians and library users from ten states and from the Virgin Islands were present to give testimony and to answer questions put to them by the Commission regarding the library service in the southeast. Many who spoke evidenced deep concern for the public library and its ability to continue service in the face of the recent sudden withdrawal of Library Services and Construction Act funds by the Federal Government.

CUTBACKS NECESSARY

The types of cutbacks that will be necessary as a result of the fund loss ranged, they said, from the elimination of bookmobile services in rural areas to the elimination of book collections in penal institutions and to services to the mentally handicapped. General revenue sharing funds, it was stated, are not compensating for former grants. In the American Virgin Islands, revenue sharing is not available at all for library service.

Testimony was heard from public librarians, county and regional librarians, members of the public, the League of Women Voters, school librarians and people concerned with problems of CATV, correctional institutions, the aged, the Appalachian poor, black economic libraries, corporate uses of libraries, personnel and college students. There was a special emphasis in this hearing on service to the poor and to rural areas.

One area of particular concern to the Commission was illuminated in the testimony of Donald Sager, Director of the Mobile Public Library, Mobile, Alabama. He suggested that political boundaries serve as barriers to effective library support and result in information resources being barred to the user. In Mr. Sager's case, Mobile, Alabama, is a short drive from Pensacola, Florida; Gulf Port, Mississippi; and New Orleans, Louisiana. For that reason, he is serving a much larger constituency than that for which his library is supported.

LSCA FUNDS

Margaret Willis, State Librarian of the Kentucky Department of Libraries in Frankfort, Kentucky, was particularly concerned with the cutback in LSCA funding in Kentucky. She told the Commission that their budget will be cut by 43% for this year and that will mean that there will be curtailment of purchases of bookmobiles and books, the department book catalog will come to an end and that there will be no more new buildings. Mrs. Janet Smith, Director of the Highland Rim Regional Library Center in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, told the Commission that the rural regions in middle Tennessee will have services cut back by more than 60% and that the LSCA funding situation will affect her libraries negatively.

OTHER HEARINGS SCHEDULED

The next public hearings of the Commission are in Boston, Massachusetts, on October 3, 1973, and in San Antonio, Texas, on April 24, 1974.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science consists of fourteen members appointed by President Nixon with the consent of the Senate. The Librarian of Congress serves as an ex officio member of the Commission.

Dr. Frederick H. Burkhardt, President of the American Council of Learned Societies in New York is Chairman of the Commission.

THE SILENT MAJORITY SHOULD BE HEARD

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, with no more than a bit of tongue in cheek, Dr. Max Rafferty, in his May 15 column in the Macomb Daily, Mount Clemens, Mich., makes the point "that in democratic America the majority is increasingly frustrated in achieving its goals."

Dr. Rafferty cites a couple of examples to illustrate how the wishes of the majority are being ignored in such matters as legalized pornography, an outlawed death penalty, forced schoolbusing, and continued flow of taxpayers' dollars into foreign aid.

The column, reprinted below, is recommended reading for my colleagues and others who believe—without any tongue in cheek—that the views of the majority really do deserve our attention:

THE SADNESS OF THE SILENT MAJORITY

Have you wondered why everyone seems to be so sad these days? I don't mean sad as in "sad sack," but sad as in plain old downhearted.

Well, wonder no more. Your helpful columnist has come up with the answer, and it's this: In a democratic society dedicated to the proposition that the will of the majority should prevail, people tend to become increasingly sad as the will of the majority is told to get lost.

Let me show you what I mean, with a couple of examples from my own field of education:

1—A vast majority of parents want their children taught to read via the phonics method, with Junior memorizing his A-B-Cs, learning their sounds, combining them in syllables and finally putting the syllables into words. In the typical school of today, Junior instead is taught to read by the "Egyptian hieroglyphic" method, trying to recognize "whole words" and then to draw pictures of them.

2—The average parent thinks "social studies" is for the birds, and yearns wistfully for the days when history was taught as history, geography and civics as civics. Yet they see these ancient and highly differentiated academic disciplines being hanged, drawn, quartered and mixed up all together in a steaming, bubbling witches brew labeled "social studies," which offers the children dubious gobbets of undigested and variegated information designed to confuse them completely about virtually everything.

See what I mean? The voice of the people is clearly not being heard by us educators, or if it is, we are studiously ignoring it. What we're really doing is saying that the great majority is wrong, and that we—the tiny minority—are not only right but are properly imposing our will upon everybody else. And that, as I say, makes an awful lot of parents very sad indeed.

It's not just in education that this kind of undemocratic carrying-on is occurring, however. Shortly after the Supreme Court opened the floodgates to pornography in the Sixties, a whole series of public opinion polls showed that the American people overwhelmingly wanted the filth banned and kept off the streets, out of the theaters and away from their children. Similarly, when the high court dealt a virtual death blow to capital punishment late last year, a Gallup poll dated Jan. 19, 1973, reported that 57 per cent of the pollees wanted the death penalty not only restored but invoked more frequently. Recent soundings indicate that public support for the death penalty has risen sharply since January.

But we still have legalized pornography and an outlawed death penalty. In a nation supposedly dedicated to majority rule, why? There's more.

Hardly anyone wants forced busing. We have it, though. Somebody's shoving it down our throats.

Most Americans want to stop giving their money away in carload lots to jerky little comic-opera nations who hate us at home and who insult us in the United Nations. Our money still flows overseas like Old Man River, however. Somebody keeps it flowing.

During the early Sixties, most Americans wanted to go all out to beat the Communists in Vietnam, just as we had gone all out to lick the Kaiser and to stomp Hitler. We didn't do it, though. Somebody wouldn't let us.

And to carry the thing right down to weekly TV entertainment, when Lawrence Welk's contract was allowed to lapse by his employing network, old "Wunnerful, wunnerful" promptly syndicated his program and ended up with more money and a lot more stations running his show than he had before, thus proving beyond peradventure that the overwhelming majority of his viewers still wanted to watch him. But somebody tried to say no.

I'm not going to try to guess who "somebody" is. That way lies paranoia, and one of my gentle readers is sure to suggest that I'm in need of at least a prefrontal lobotomy.

All I'm saying is it's very, very strange that in democratic America the majority is increasingly frustrated in achieving its goals. Contrarywise, it's not strange at all that so many members of that great majority are heartsick, sorely tried and just plain sad.

TAXPAYERS' RIGHTS ASSOCIATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to bring attention to a newly founded organization, the Taxpayers' Rights Association. This organization is a nonpartisan, nonpolitical coalition of groups and individuals who have joined together in order to create a greater public awareness of the tax laws and tax policies at all levels of government.

The association feels that the complexity of the tax laws and revenue collecting procedures should not preclude participation by ordinary citizens, of all political philosophies, from having input into perhaps the most basic function of Government.

The need for this association is based upon the single realization of several logical conclusions. First, that almost every

time there is a tax break or a new loophole it goes to the big money interests and not the average taxpayer. The reason for this is that those who are rich and have special interests are able to hire lobbyists and lawyers to get special consideration.

Second, everytime the special interest groups get a new tax break the average taxpayer makes up the difference. The effective tax rate on corporate profits is supposedly 48 percent, yet studies consistently show that the Nation's 100 largest corporations pay less than 30 percent on their profits. Indeed, as another prime example of tax abuse, in 1970, 112 individuals making over \$200,000 a year did not pay a thin dime in Federal taxes. This situation is simply unfair and intolerable.

The average taxpayer should be made aware of these outrages and they should be informed of their rights and powers as citizens to correct this disgraceful situation—such is the purpose of the Taxpayers' Rights Associations.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to include in the RECORD a statement of Mr. H. H. Guillot which outlines the purposes of this organization, and cites as a major example of tax abuse the practices of Tenneco, Inc., a corporation which I announced to be "Tax Dodger of the Week" on March 22 of this year.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. H. H. "BOOTS" GUILLOT
TAXPAYERS' RIGHTS ASSOCIATION,
Houston, Tex.

We're here today because we just can't take any more. You and I have been taxed to the hilt. We've been clipped in every way possible. And we're fed up. It's reached the point where we have to do something. And that's why groups and individuals from all political persuasions have joined together here today to announce the formation of the Taxpayers' Rights Association.

Why is it, that every time there's a tax break or a new loophole it goes to the big money men and not to you and me? I'll tell you why! It's because the rich and special interests have the money to hire lobbyists and fancy-pants lawyers to get special consideration. The people don't have that. And that's why we're getting this group together—the Taxpayers' Rights Association.

Every time those special interests get a new tax break, you and I make up the difference. Big corporations are supposed to pay 48 percent of their profits in Federal taxes—but the top 100 pay less than 27 percent on billions of dollars of profits. And you and I and all the other taxpayers make up the difference.

In 1970, 112 individuals making over \$200,000 a year did not pay a thin dime in Federal taxes—we were the ones to carry their load. That load just seems to keep getting heavier. Many older folks, who have worked all their lives to pay off their homes, now find themselves on a fixed income with spiraling property taxes and find they can no longer afford the simple homes they have worked for all their lives. But instead of their getting some relief, the relief goes to the rich and powerful. To top it off, the social security taxes—the average worker's payroll tax—continues to go up and the wage earners' share of the Federal revenue increases while the corporate share goes down. The tax laws are complex—the IRS tax code is many thousands of pages long, but it doesn't take a tax lawyer to know that the average American is paying more than his fair share.

That's why we've formed the Taxpayers' Rights Association. We've enlisted the sup-

port of scores of individuals and groups with thousands behind them. While we may disagree on some things, we do agree on this: the tax laws are unfair. And that unites us! We're an independent local organization, although we will cooperate with the national tax action campaign to get a fair shake.

While the Taxpayers' Rights Association welcomes the participation of individuals and organizations regardless of political affiliation, it does not now, and will not in the future, support or oppose any person seeking or now holding elected or appointed office, or any political party or politically motivated group.

The Taxpayers' Rights Association believes "the tax laws are unfair and the people need justice". Our elected officials must understand the people demand that justice.

In the next few weeks we will be presenting our local tax dodger awards to the most deserving tax dodgers we can find. On April 16th, the last day you have to pay your income tax, we'll celebrate national tax action day by giving a series of awards. Today we give our first tax dodger award to Tenneco, Incorporated.

Our Federal tax laws have been so influenced and subverted by the special interests that the corporations now have a whole shopping list of loopholes to dodge their fair share of taxes. And Tenneco is taking advantage of you and me in every way they can.

According to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Tenneco made over \$245 million in before-tax profits in 1971. They paid just 17 percent in taxes. Of course, the law says they should pay 48 percent in Federal taxes alone. Now I don't want to be picky, but that means Tenneco got away without paying at least 75 million—75 million in Federal taxes. And guess who gets to make up that \$75 million? It sure wasn't the big-wheel millionaires on Tenneco's board of directors. Friend, it was you and me.

As Tenneco says in their 1969 annual report: "Tenneco touches the life of every man, woman and child in this land. Even though we're already an important part of people's lives, we'd like to be even more so." My gosh, we can't afford for them to touch our lives any more.

I'm not a tax expert, but Tenneco, with their army of tax lawyers, have a whole bucket full of loopholes to salvage that \$75 million. Now, I can't tell you how all of these complex tax loopholes work, but I do know that Tenneco just pays half of what it should on profits on capital assets. And that even includes their cattle and Christmas trees. Their depletion allowance allows deductions many times more than the cost of drilling operations. Tenneco gets immediate tax write-offs on things that many other corporations must spread out over several years.

And the list goes on and on—it's a whole barrel of worms. And each time, you and I make up the difference. The value on this building is increasing, but the law allows Tenneco to claim a depreciation rate. The law even stretches this loophole to Tenneco's breeding cows.

Tenneco can set up dummy corporations outside the United States to avoid taxes on export profits—while all the money from these profits really comes back here to Tenneco Incorporated in the form of "loans."

If you're big enough, and have enough tax lawyers, you can search the loopholes to get rebates from the Federal Government. In 1969, Tenneco Oil, which is owned by Tenneco Corporation, which is owned by Tenneco, Inc., figured up their taxes and using the loopholes, the United States taxpayers wound up owing Tenneco an additional \$13.2 million.

Don't feel bad if you don't understand all this—the loopholes are vast and complex. And each and every one of these loopholes forms a noose around the taxpayer's neck.

But Tenneco doesn't just play tax dodger on the Federal level. How would you like to be able to set your own local property tax rates? Tenneco does. Tenneco gets to tell the city what this building's worth—which means they set their own taxes. The city has to take Tenneco's word. No citizen has this same right, and we think taxpayers have rights. One of those rights is that we don't have to pay more than our fair share of property taxes.

Of course, Tenneco doesn't stop here. Tenneco figured out several more ways to fleece the taxpayers through their water district adventures at Columbia Lakes. In 1961, Miss Ima Hogg, one of our most distinguished citizens, donated over 2,700 acres of land to the citizens of Texas through the University of Texas. In 1965, over 1,800 acres were sold to Charles Lingo on some pretty nice terms—\$10 cash and a \$281,505 note, which comes to under \$200 per acre. Another four years passed, and Lingo transferred 1,180 acres to Tenneco. Of course, Mr. Lingo is a Tenneco executive. That property is now known as Columbia Lakes, and their 1,500 lots sell for \$7,500 to \$18,000 a lot. That's from \$15 to 20 million in windfall profits which isn't too bad for ten bucks and a note.

Next, Tenneco decided to create a \$6½ million water district—the Vandercreek Utility District. Homebuyers, on seeing tennis courts, lakes, streets, gutters, a marina, golf course and other improvements, assume that the up to \$18,000 they pay covers these beautiful improvements. Not so. After Tenneco has sold out and moved on, buyers will still have 30- to 40 years of bonded indebtedness to pay off.

Of course Tenneco did not stop there. On this land, with an estimated market value of at least \$15 million, Tenneco's property taxes were a gigantic \$1,061.01, or .0007%. Wouldn't it be nice if the ordinary citizens' taxes were so low?

These are just some of the reasons the Taxpayers' Rights Association was formed. It's not fair that Tenneco makes windfall profits on land given to our school system for the benefit of our citizens. It's not fair that every tax break goes to big interests such as Tenneco. It's not fair that Tenneco pays 17 per cent and not 48 per cent. It's not fair that more money comes out of our pockets each year. Tenneco says they want to touch our lives even more, but we just can't afford that. Taxpayers have rights—and it's time they had a voice! For these reasons and no doubt many more we are not aware of, Tenneco, Incorporated, is more than deserving of our first tax dodger award.

The Taxpayers' Rights Association welcomes the support and participation of all individuals and groups. All of those who believe that the tax laws are unfair and want to join in creating a greater public awareness of tax laws and tax policies, we ask them to write us at 3520 Montrose, Suite 208, Houston, Texas 77006.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF MANMADE FAMINE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, May 27, the Ukrainian-American community of Metropolitan Detroit will gather at Cobo Hall to observe the 40th anniversary of the infamous man-made famine in the Ukraine.

This famine, which claimed the lives

of 7 million Ukrainian peasants, was nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt by Soviet Premier Stalin to exterminate the peasant population of Ukraine. Stalin realized that the peasant population was the strongest bastion of opposition to his program of Russification and incorporation of the Ukrainian people into the U.S.S.R.

Despite the fact that 1932-33 was a bumper-crop year, the farmers of the Ukraine went without food. Their crops were taken from them and shipped to Russia. The Stalin regime then exported these crops in exchange for industrial hardware while their own people starved.

The Ukrainian man-made famine is one of the most brutal, most devastating examples of genocide in the 20th century. Even as foreign nations offered to send food supplies to the dying people of the Ukraine, the Soviet regime steadfastly denied that a famine was in progress.

While Stalin succeeded in bartering the lives of 7 million people for the industrialization of Russia, he failed in achieving his secondary goal of breaking the resistance of the Ukraine to his Communist dictatorship. Even today, the Ukrainian people harbor a deep sense of cultural and national identity. They will strive for freedom and independence with unqualified determination and perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following appeal issued by the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America be inserted in the RECORD.

The appeal follows:

APPEAL TO THE UKRAINIAN COMMUNITY AND MEN OF GOOD WILL EVERYWHERE ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT FAMINE IN UKRAINE

The year 1973 marks the 40th anniversary of the great man-made famine in Ukraine (1932-1933), which resulted in the death of millions of Ukrainian men, women and children. This famine constitutes one of the most tragic events in the long, over one-thousand-year, history of the Ukrainian people. Mankind has suffered many famine disasters in various parts of the world, which were caused by long wars, drought, floods, or other cataclysms. But never and nowhere did any people suffer such a famine and in such great dimensions as that caused by a special government policy as did the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933.

As is known, the Communist government of the USSR in its political designs to transform the USSR into an "industrialized state" in the shortest possible time, proceeded to collectivize agriculture by coercive means and against the will of the overwhelming majority of the population.

The enforced collectivization evoked massive resistance on the part of the Ukrainian people, especially on the part of Ukrainian peasants, for whom the principle of private property and ownership was deeply embedded in their national and social psychology.

Therefore, Communist Russia decided to break the resistance of Ukraine through naked force by using the terroristic methods which a totalitarian government had at its disposal.

Consequently, the inhuman liquidation of the Ukrainian peasantry through official pillage of foodstuffs, arrest and deportations of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians was only a means to realize the actual intent of the Soviet government—the destruction of the Ukrainian peasantry as a "class enemy" which was only one of the numerous ways used by Moscow to eliminate the very es-

sence of Ukrainianism. This point was commented on extensively in the Soviet press at the time, namely, that the collectivization of agriculture in Ukraine must "destroy the social basis of Ukrainian nationalism, which the individual farm-holdings constitute."

In August, 1932 the government of the Ukrainian SSR issued a special law on the "inviolability of socialist property," according to which even the smallest infractions of this law were severely punishable by the Soviet regime. Moreover, during the harvest that year Moscow dispatched to Ukraine tens of thousands of Communists, members of the Comsomol and other agents of the party who indiscriminately confiscated by force all grain and food products from the peasants, which was stored in state warehouses, from where it was transported by freight cars to Russia, and subsequently the Kremlin exported it abroad. The proceeds received from the grain sales were used by Moscow to buy industrial equipment for the "rapid industrialization of the USSR." At the same time detachments of the GPU and the Red army raided Ukraine, arresting and executing without trial all those who refused to surrender the grain.

On August 7, 1932, the government of the Ukrainian SSR passed a draconic law, which stated:

a) The ownership of *kolhosps* and cooperatives (crops in the fields, community surpluses, cattle, co-op stores, warehouses, etc.) is to be considered that of the state, and the guard over them was to be increased;

b) The penalties for thievery on *kolhosps* and of co-op property are to be increased in the interest of social protection—execution by firing squad and confiscation of all possessions, and where leniency may be advisable, loss of freedom for at least ten years with confiscation of all possessions.

This barbarous policy of genocide by Moscow soon led to the shocking and unprecedented famine in Ukraine in the spring and summer of 1933, despite the fact in 1932 Ukraine had a bumper crop. People were dying by the thousands in the villages, and those who could were fleeing to the cities in search of bread, but they found none there, and many of them were dying on the streets of Kiev, Kharkov, Odessa and other cities of Ukraine.

The Soviet government denied stubbornly the existence of the famine in Ukraine in that year, although in 1921 Moscow had publicized the famine in the USSR, and even admitted the American Relief Committee headed by Herbert Hoover. But in 1933, the so-called "Ukrainian Soviet government" in Kiev, headed by Vlas Ya. Chubar, could not hide the great tragedy in Ukraine, and at a meeting in Kiev, when asked whether the government knew what was going on in Ukraine, he replied: "The government knows, but cannot help in any way whatsoever."

According to Ukrainian specialists on Soviet affairs, the famine in 1932-1933 in Ukraine destroyed 7 to 10 million people. It was the horrible deliberate consequence of Russian Communist genocide in Ukraine, inasmuch as the famine was planned and implemented by the Soviet government for the total eradication of one of the strongest foundations of the Ukrainian nation—the Ukrainian peasantry.

Despite strong Communist censorship, the Western world was exceedingly well informed about the catastrophe in Ukraine, and the American, Canadian, British, Belgian, French and German press carried extensive reports on the famine and cases of cannibalism. Mention should be made of the reports by British writer, Malcolm Muggeridge, the Hearst papers in the United States, and others. The famine in Ukraine is also discussed now in the writings of former Communists, such as Arthur Koestler, Anatole Kuznetsov, and even the former Soviet Premier, the late Nikita S. Khrushchev.

The famine in Ukraine was also the subject of numerous debates in the parliaments of several European states; the International Red Cross and the Supreme Council of the League of Nations in Geneva tried to find ways and means to help the famine victims in Ukraine, but to no avail, as the Soviet government would not permit any outside aid for the starving nation.

Also, it is to be recalled that Ukrainians in Western Ukraine and those in Western Europe, the United States, Canada and South America cried out against the man-made famine. In protest against it, a young Ukrainian revolutionary and member of the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) Mykola Lemyk, shot a high official in the Soviet Consulate in Lviv. The Ukrainian Parliamentary Representation in Poland conducted vigorous protest activities in the Polish *Sejm* in Warsaw and at various inter-parliamentary conferences and congresses of national minorities in Europe.

Ukrainians in the United States conducted especially strong protest actions in 1933, coordinated by the *Obyednannia*, then the political representation of Ukrainians in America. In all larger cities of the United States public protests were held, denouncing the man-made famine in Ukraine and protesting the recognition of the USSR by the U.S. Government (in New York 30,000 Ukrainians took part in such a protest demonstration).

Similar protests were conducted by Ukrainians in Canada, Europe and South America. Regrettably, although the world press reported the truth about the famine in Ukraine, Western industrialists and businessmen proceeded to do business with the USSR—buying Ukrainian wheat at cheap prices, not caring that millions of Ukrainians had perished from hunger because Moscow had confiscated this wheat from them to sell it for profit abroad.

UKRAINIANS

Following the appeal of the Secretariat of the World Congress of Free Ukrainians, which announced that beginning March 25, 1973 the 40th anniversary of the great famine in Ukraine will be marked throughout the world, and, in implementing the decision of the XIth Congress of the UCCA (III. "On the Situation in Ukraine," Par. 7, which states: a) To declare the third Sunday of May, 1973 a "Day of National Mourning by Ukrainians in the United States," b) To appeal to the leadership of the Ukrainian Churches to mark this day as a "Day of Mourning and Prayer."

We appeal to our communities in the United States to mark this tragic anniversary of the man-made famine on a massive and organized scale.

For the effective implementation of this large-scale mournful anniversary, extensive preparations are needed. Therefore, the UCCA Executive Committee announces that the general national Mournful Manifestation will take place on *Saturday, May 26, 1973 at the Shevchenko Monument in Washington, D.C.* That day will mark the anniversary of the unprecedented tragedy inflicted by the Russian Communist dictatorship upon Ukraine.

Other such manifestations throughout the country should be held on *Saturday or Sunday, May 19 and 20, 1973.*

These manifestations should begin with special liturgies and prayers in the Ukrainian Churches for the millions of Ukrainians who perished during the man-made famine forty years ago. In all communities special commemorative observances and public meetings should be held, to which outstanding American leaders and representatives of ethnic communities should be invited. Also, the local American press, radio and TV stations should be informed about the manifestations marking the anniversary of the great famine in Ukraine. At these public gatherings and

meetings special resolutions should be adopted condemning not only the Soviet Russian genocide forty years ago, but also the current persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals and the destruction of Ukrainian churches and culture. These resolutions should be sent to the State Department, with copies to U.S. Senators and Congressmen.

The Ukrainian nation is waging an incessant struggle for its liberation in the home country, and therefore our protests in the free world are important and essential in this struggle of the Ukrainian nation for its independence and inalienable rights.

MRS. ELIZABETH PEREGORY RETIREES

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to participate recently in the retirement ceremony for Mrs. Elizabeth Peregory, the retiring principal of Manchester Elementary School in Manchester, Md. It was obvious during the ceremony that the staff and faculty of the school as well as her many past students held Mrs. Peregory in great esteem and affection. I would like to share with my colleagues the account from the Evening Sun of her retirement.

The article follows:

MRS. ELIZABETH PEREGORY RETIREES

(By Joan Candy)

Elizabeth Peregory, principal of Manchester Elementary School, was honored Thursday night by more than 300 parents. Twice during the evening the audience rose to show its respect through standing ovations.

The educator will be retiring at the end of this school year, having been associated with Manchester school for 52 years as a student, parent, teacher, and administrator. Mrs. Peregory taught at the school for 32 years before beginning her seven-year service as principal.

Charles Evans, PTA President, in presenting Mrs. Peregory with gifts from the PTA, attempted to put the feeling of the group into words. "You've served so long, and so well," he began; then added, "If it looks like I'm about to choke up, you're right. I am."

Accepting a silver tray, candleabra, and an engraved charm, the modest principal commented, "I don't feel I deserve any rewards. The work I've done here is the richest reward I've had in my life. There were no rewards expected. I've had those."

Evans said that the PTA had planned to present Mrs. Peregory with a life membership in the Carroll County Council of PTA but found that she had already been so honored.

Two surprise guests attended the PTA meeting to pay tribute to Mrs. Peregory. Dr. George Thomas, Superintendent of Carroll County Schools, left another meeting to attend "because I wouldn't have been anywhere else this evening." Dr. Thomas was principal at Manchester School while Mrs. Peregory was teaching there.

"I learned to respect her then," said Dr. Thomas. "She has contributed heavily to this school and to this county."

Congressman Goodloe Byron said that he first heard of Mrs. Peregory when he was serving in the State Senate. It was his duty, he said, to pass out scholarships, and he often received letters from Mrs. Peregory suggesting students' names to him.

"I learned that she followed the progress of some of her students all the way up through high school and went to the special trouble to see that I knew of the financial need of those students. It takes a special kind of person. That's the kind of person Mrs. Peregory is."

Byron presented Mrs. Peregory with two American flags that had previously flown over the Capitol in Washington. One was for the school and one for herself.

The small lady accepted the gifts and praise. Then she told of another gift given her earlier by a small student after recess. The child had come to her office timidly to present her with bouquet of hand picked dandelions. "I've received other flowers," she confided, "but the love those conveyed touched me the most."

Mrs. Peregory will be leaving the school system on July 1. Two days later she will start a new job, working as a tour director for a travel service. In her new position, she hopes to visit most of the United States and Hawaii.

In her farewell speech, Mrs. Peregory thanked the parents for all the help they had given her saying "I've had the best community support any principal could have." She said that, since October, 53 volunteer aides have contributed 3,652 hours to helping teachers inside and outside of classrooms.

She then urged the parents to work for changes and improvements in the school.

"I believe the day has come when you, as parents, have to decide what kind of schools you really want to have. I think you can be a really big influence," she said.

Mrs. Peregory said she was not in a position to tell the parents what would happen to the school next year because the budget was still indefinite. She said that she felt that the great influx of population had created a bad situation in the school.

"I think that the first and second grades will be much too big next year," she complained. "I don't think we need fancy buildings nor elaborate equipment. But we do need a teacher who can relate to your children individually. There would be no more than 28 children for a class to function to the maximum capabilities of achievement. We do not have enough space."

She said that in early fall the school had requested two relocatable buildings but the request had not been approved by the State Interagency Committee. The anticipated population growth of the school between June 1972 and September 1973 is 145 additional students.

"This is taxing a facility already being used to its capacity," Mrs. Peregory stated.

Mrs. Peregory said that she did not ask for more staff for next year because there was no more room for them. There is the possibility of an additional kindergarten teacher to teach an Early Intervention Kindergarten Class. This class would be for beginning students identified as having special learning difficulties.

Mrs. Peregory thanked the staff saying she could not have done the job she had if it had not been for the help of her staff who are "outstanding."

Dr. Thomas has said that the Board will officially accept Mrs. Peregory's resignation at the May 9 School Board meeting. A directive will then be sent out stating the need for an administrator. The new principal will be selected from subsequently received applications.

As she returned to her seat, a child handed Mrs. Peregory a carefully colored page from a coloring book as an additional farewell gift.

The principal carried the page with her as she went to the cafeteria to cut the cake baked in her honor.

Clutching this last token of love in her hand for the remainder of the evening, Mrs. Peregory proudly showed it to her well wishers, many of whom viewed it through the tears in their eyes.

HURRAH FOR THE VITAMIN BILL

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, lately the New York Times has been kicking around H.R. 643, the so-called vitamin bill. Its syndication service then has passed the Times' canards around nationwide to unsuspecting newspapers. The Times charged right in, alleging the bold untruth that H.R. 643 would allow the unlimited sale of injurious vitamins, and then intimates that the bill's supporters must be a bunch of nuts, dupes, crackpots, and food faddists.

Actually, H.R. 643 would do nothing more than stop the Food and Drug Administration from, in effect, banning the sale of vitamins and food supplements which have never been determined injurious to health in any quantity. This is done by giving FDA authority to label substances which have never been determined injurious or unsafe as drugs and thus potentially make them available only by prescription in any but very smallest quantities.

Of course, the big drug lobbies love that idea as it will line their pockets as it drives the small vitamin and food supplement stores out of business.

Actually, H.R. 643 would do nothing whatever to prevent the FDA from policing the use of vitamins or anything else which has been determined inherently unsafe or injurious when taken in excessive quantity. The people who support H.R. 643 really are not intellectual basket cases, they just do not believe the FDA ought to be allowed to spend the taxpayers' money to take something away from people which they want and which cannot hurt them.

But, says the FDA and the New York Times, even though some vitamins and food supplements may not hurt you, you cannot prove they do you any good and therefore let us play God and ban them.

Now that is just crazy. Who determines they do not do you any good? The New York Times? The big prescription pharmaceutical houses? If a man buys and pays for these harmless substances, takes them and he thinks they make him feel better, then they do. He is not going to part with his cash for them if they do not. Does prayer make a lot of people feel better? No one can prove that, either. But a lot of people must think so. They keep on praying and that is good enough for me. But because they cannot prove it should the FDA or some other Government agency or some New York City newspaper get away with banning or maybe putting a limit on the length of prayers? Or make you get a prayer chit from some psychiatrist before appealing to the Almighty?

It is about time we had some sensible thinking on this H.R. 643 issue and the following column seems to move in that direction:

CONTROVERSY: VITAMIN PILLS, CONGRESS AND THE FDA

(By Robert Rodale)

Basic issues are at stake in the controversy over new Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations of vitamin pills.

Can legal limits be placed on nutritional elements just because they are sold in tablet or capsule form? That's what FDA wants to do, mainly by exercising its power to regulate the labeling of foods.

Impetus for the FDA's action comes from two directions, I believe. It's opposed to the trend toward use of self-prescribed higher-potency food supplements to prevent disease. FDA also sees vitamin and mineral supplements as the life blood of the health food movement, which continues to gain supporters and may, I think, even eventually remake the foundations of American food and eating patterns. That bothers those who still look on health foods as being far-out and perhaps slightly subversive.

The "guts" of the new food supplement regulations are the provisions setting low potency limits on all vitamin and mineral supplements. Once they're in effect, you won't be able to buy tablets with more than 90 milligrams of vitamin C or 45 units of vitamin E, for example, unless you have a doctor's prescription for higher potency vitamins.

Much of the controversy about the regulations stems from FDA's prohibition of five statements about food and nutrition that have been associated with the vitamin industry.

For example, FDA plans to prohibit supplement companies from saying that food becomes inadequate or deficient because it is stored, transported, processed or cooked. That flies in the face of a body of evidence showing that all those factors can lower food quality and even be the direct cause of nutritional problems.

Another rule prohibits statements "that a diet of ordinary foods cannot supply adequate amounts of nutrients." Here again, mounting evidence shows that the "ordinary foods" many people are eating leave them deficient in vitamins C and A, and the mineral calcium.

A third rule would stop claims that inadequate diet is due to the soil in which a food is grown. There is clear evidence that plants do reflect in their makeup the mineral balance in soil, although experts argue over whether the difference is big enough to be significant.

Reaction to the regulations is already strong, and getting more intense. Much of the pressure from both consumers and food supplement companies is directed at Congress, which is considering several bills to limit FDA's authority to act.

A bill by Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.) would forbid the FDA or any other federal agency from restricting in any way the right of the public to buy safe foods and vitamins.

Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D-Calif.) has introduced a similar bill. It would prevent the government from limiting the potency, number, combination, amount, or variety of any vitamin, mineral or other safe food supplement ingredient.

"Do you think an individual should be required to have a prescription in order to take vitamin C?" asked Waldie on the floor of Congress. "Is it not his right to take 5 milligrams, or 50 milligrams, or 500 milligrams of vitamin C as he sees fit, as long as the product itself is not harmful, and as long as the product label accurately reflects the contents?"

Another congressional opponent of FDA's action is Rep. Hamilton Fish, Jr. (R-N.Y.), who is co-sponsoring corrective legislation.

"The result of this FDA ruling if allowed to stand," he said, "in addition to reducing the nation's vitamin and mineral food supplement business by an estimated 80 per cent, will be the denial of a basic freedom of choice to the millions of Americans who wish to supplement what they deem an inadequate diet."

REPORT TO COLORADO'S FIFTH DISTRICT

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of my May 1973 newsletter to residents of the Fifth Congressional District of Colorado:

NEWSLETTER

DEAR FRIENDS:

If you think your grocery bill is high now, brace yourself!

With American families being whipsawed by shortages and wild price increases, and rationing almost here, you'd expect Congress to do something to protect the purchasing power of our hard-earned dollars long before now. But so far Congress has opted for stalling tactics and superficial solutions.

What about wage-price controls? Yes, just six hours before expiration of the old law, Congress did rush through an extension of economic controls. But these measures have failed so far. In fact, such controls have never worked in any free country in peacetime. So there's no reason to think the new wage-price law will stop inflation.

Is the situation hopeless? Definitely not. Congress does have the power to curb spiraling prices by attacking the cause of inflation... excessive federal spending and mounting budget deficits. Economists have repeatedly warned that our federal spending spree would lead to disaster. But Congress has always seemed to put partisan considerations, squabbling with the President, and special interest appropriations ahead of balancing the budget.

In the long run, grass-roots sentiment will force Congress to face the financial facts of life and to adopt basic budgetary reform. I hope it won't be too late.

NEW HOPE FOR CLEAN AIR IN COLORADO

The so-called Clean Air Act discriminates against Colorado. This law requires car manufacturers to adjust engines to meet federal air pollution standards at sea level. But if vehicles are operated at mountain altitudes, they discharge up to twice as much hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide.

So when the Clean Air Act was being extended by the House, Second District Representative Don Brotzman and I took the Floor to explain the problem. We recommended amendments to require new cars to meet emission control standards at all altitudes.

I am glad to report partial success. The Commerce Committee Chairman, who was managing the extension legislation, has promised to hold hearings on these amendments in the near future, a vital first step in solving our state's unique air pollution problems.

MY FIRST 4 MONTHS IN CONGRESS

A few days ago, my old friend J. Edgar Chenoweth dropped by for a visit. As you know, Judge Chenoweth represented the people of Colorado's Third Congressional District with great distinction for many years.

He is a man of vast experience and wisdom. I have often benefited from his advice.

He made one comment I want to pass along because it sums up so well my feelings about representing you. He said: "Very, very few Americans have such a great opportunity to serve their country as a Member of Congress."

Nothing could be more true. It is a great opportunity. A great honor. And with it comes a great obligation which I feel very keenly.

The first few weeks of the new session have been a chaotic time for me. I've been burning the candle at both ends trying to organize the office, meet my new colleagues, learn the rules and procedures of the House and so on. But I am starting to get a good feel of Congress. Through contact with other Members, committee work and participation in floor debate, I hope to play a meaningful part in turning attention of Congress, and the country, to problems that have been ignored too long.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

I have been fortunate to win a seat on the House Armed Services Committee, a prize assignment. The committee is directly responsible for all national defense matters and overseas operations and spending of all branches of the armed services.

I am also extremely pleased to be appointed to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy. I participated in my first Board meeting a few days ago and had the opportunity to review the entire program of the Academy. It really gives my spirits a lift to have this contact with the outstanding young men of the Cadet Wing and the Academy faculty and staff.

STAYING IN TOUCH

The toughest problem I've encountered so far is maintaining day-to-day contact with people at home. Obviously I cannot represent the people of Colorado's Fifth District without effective two-way communication. So I am making every effort to let you know what I am thinking . . . via newsletters like this one, radio and TV broadcasts, newspaper articles, etc.

But it is just as important—in fact, more important—for me to get *your* thinking. I'll be circulating questionnaires and public opinion polls in the District, holding Open House get-togethers, rap sessions at schools and Town Hall type meetings. I have also opened local offices in Aurora and Colorado Springs. Even though I will be in Washington much of the time, these offices will be open to answer your questions, provide assistance and pass along your comments.

But . . . I need your help. Please don't wait for me to contact you. In order to properly represent you, I must know your opinion about pending legislation. So please drop me a postcard or letter to express your views.

SPEAKING OF LETTERS

A lady who wrote recently asked if I would even see her letter. And she wondered if I had personally read it and signed the response. The answer to both questions is . . . yes. Sometimes I'm buried under piles of correspondence. And my staff does most of the research for letters that require factual answers and also drafts many replies. But I personally see every incoming letter and personally sign each one going out.

That's quite a stack of mail. In March, I received over 1,500 personal letters; in April, more than 2,000. So don't blame the postal service if my reply to your letter is a little slow in coming. I think it's worth the time and effort to maintain a truly personal contact.

THE ENERGY CRISIS

Our country is so rich in resources and productivity that shortages seem unimaginable, almost un-American. But the energy crisis is real. And its effects will be felt in

every household. Skyrocketing fuel prices and/or rationing are certain; restrictions on travel, auto ownership and home appliances are possible . . . unless we close the energy gap.

The situation is critical: The U.S. has only 6% of the world's population but uses 35% of world energy. Our consumption is more than USSR, Japan, Germany, Great Britain . . . combined.

Our energy use is rising rapidly, but production is falling far behind the need. Potential consequences to our standard of living, national economy, balance of payments and foreign policy are staggering.

I have just been appointed to study this problem as a member of the House Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources. So I will be writing to you about this matter again very soon.

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

In the ten seconds it will take you to read this sentence, the national debt of the United States will increase by more than \$5,000. Think it over.

ABOUT THIS NEWSLETTER

This is the first edition of Washington Report, a monthly newsletter for residents of Colorado's Fifth Congressional District. The cost makes it impossible to send to every home of the District each month. But I will do so as often as possible. Between general mailings, I will be circulating the newsletter to those who express an interest by filling out and returning the coupon below.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Cuban Independence Day, May 20, 1902, has become a day of remembrance, a day of pride and a day of hope. For the dream of independence from Spain was a dream nourished by the spirit, courage, and tenacity passed down from generation to generation. One recalls movements for independence as early as 1820 in the actions of Soles y Rayos de Bolivar and other organizations for freedom. One remembers the courageous 1850 expedition of Gen. Narciso Lopez. One looks back on the 10 year war, beginning in 1868 with only a handful of men at Yara, leaving behind great suffering, destruction and loss of life, and resulting in Spanish promises of change and improvement soon to be forgotten. Tomas Palma, later to become the first President of the Cuban provisional government, Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, men whose burning belief that freedom would indeed be a reality for the Cuban people, men whose dauntless work and whose unyielding spirit laid the very foundation for Cuba's future independence from Spain, have become a vital part of the legacy of this brave people. And the words of Jose Marti—"the general happiness of a people rests on individual independence"—his belief in the dignity and equality of man, still ring in our ears. We recall, at the conclusion of the

Spanish-American War, the detailed study made by the leaders of the free Cuban Republic in setting up their constitution—a document built upon a presidential system with a bicameral legislature, a bill of rights firmly guaranteeing individual liberty, and the great emphasis upon freedom of speech, press, and assembly. The people of the United States were, indeed, pleased with the success of the Cuban struggle in 1902. Our disappointment was deep with the advent of the Castro regime but a half century later.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Immigration for over two decades, I have been intensely aware of the difficulties experienced by the Cuban people since Castro's rise in 1959 and have assisted in supporting all feasible efforts to bring many of these people to the United States in their quest for freedom, justice, and the right to live a life of personal fulfillment and peace. The United Hias Service, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Church World Service, and the International Rescue Committee are to be highly commended for their extensive efforts and achievements in this area.

The Cuban airlift, as we well know, began in December 1965, bringing more than 650,000 Cubans to the United States. Its termination just 1 month ago, at the request of the Cuban Government, gives us the opportunity to see exactly what has happened to those who have come to seek refuge in our land. In New Jersey alone, according to Nelson Menedico, president of the Cuban-American Association of New Jersey, nearly 122,000 Cubans have settled. Few other nationality groups have taken root so quickly or progressed so rapidly. Dr. Carlos Sterling, a professor of Spanish literature at C. W. College has stated:

Most of the people who have come to the United States from Cuba have succeeded. Their success has been outstanding in many fields—business, medicine, teaching, accounting, law, transportation.

These men and women have shown themselves to be extremely capable and hard-working people and are making major contributions to our way of life. To have had the motivation to uproot from one's homeland, to overcome the obstacles of obtaining permission to depart, and then to buckle down and begin all over again adjusting, learning, and becoming a part of an entirely new society, involved a great deal of courage and determination. The key to the success of the Cubans in America lies in their tremendous community spirit—their close family ties, their willingness to help one another and their dedication to work hard. We have witnessed and enjoyed since their coming, the establishment of fine Cuban restaurants, of Spanish movie houses, of beautiful customs and traditions and of a growing and articulate Spanish-language press.

Only last week, I introduced a bill here in the House of Representatives to assure the millions of Spanish and other non-English-speaking Americans fair and equal opportunity to all the benefits of our legal system. In districts in which at least 5 percent or 50,000 of the

residents do not speak or understand English with reasonable facility, certification will identify them as bilingual and they will then have qualifications for interpreters, with fee schedules and all necessary facilities, established for them. In another area, the House Subcommittee on Immigration is presently holding hearings on legislation to establish a preference system for the Western Hemisphere nations and hopes to conclude its study in June. I have also sent the following letter to Secretary of State Rogers requesting him to support the admission to the United States of Cuban refugees presently residing in Spain:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that the airlift of Cubans directly from Cuba to the United States has been terminated. Furthermore, I understand that the number of Cubans arriving in third countries, particularly Spain, has virtually ended and that few, if any, Cubans will be coming to Spain in the future.

There are approximately 28,000 Cuban refugees presently in Spain and their presence has unduly burdened the voluntary relief agencies responsible for their care while they are awaiting the issuance of immigrant visas to enter the United States. The remittances from relatives and friends in the United States also contributes to a substantial dollar drain.

As a result of the cultural affinities in the United States, as well as the desire to be reunited with family and friends, most of these Cuban refugees have applied for immigration. Sooner or later they will be admitted to the United States.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Cuban refugees are in third countries, they are, and continue to be refugees from the totalitarian regime in Cuba. The arbitrary decision that these people be considered as immigrants is inconsistent with the late President Johnson's speech of October 4, 1965, that the United States would readily accept all Cuban refugees, and with the agreement that was the predicate for the airlift of Cubans from Cuba into the United States.

I strongly suggest that the Department of State reconsider its policy and recommend to the Attorney General that the Cuban refugees in Spain be immediately paroled into the United States. It would only be reasonable to establish a cut-off date, perhaps June 1, 1973, for the use of parole.

This recommendation is in complete accord with the humanitarian refugee policies of the United States and would significantly promote the reunification of families, which is the primary objective of our immigration law.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Chairman.

Thus as we recall the 71st anniversary of freedom for the Republic of Cuba, we should certainly continue our efforts to help reunite Cuban families who enter the United States and we should surely encourage all who have come to continue to work, develop and grow in this "land of opportunity". And, needless to say, we should certainly support these special people in their prayers and hopes that in the not too distant future, their Cuban homeland will once again be a land of peace, freedom, and justice for all.

CAMBODIA LAW SUIT STATEMENT

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this is a time when the institutions, the very roots of our Nation, face severe tests. Certainly the Watergate and the Ellsberg trials continue to put each branch of our Government up against a wall of the highest standards.

It was the Vietnam war, the wars throughout Southeast Asia that put the Nation, its people, and institutions to severe tests. Too often we were not able to respond well as a nation to these standards. My colleagues in the Congress understand full well how we as a body failed to live up to our responsibilities. Time and again we failed to act as first one President and then another committed this Nation to involvement in a full-scale war. It was the pressure of millions of Americans that finally allowed us to withdraw our men and enter into a peace agreement. Millions of Americans were thankful that our Nation was no longer risking the lives of Americans nor bombing innocent Asians.

There has been little time to rejoice. The peace has been a short-lived one. The real truth is that the bombing in Cambodia goes on; 80,000 tons at a cost of \$160 million by the Pentagon's own estimate since the "peace accord" went into effect. American ground troops and civilian advisers remain in Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia. Perhaps the price of the war has been lessened for Americans, but it remains a tragic one for Cambodians.

This Congress has at long last recognized its responsibility for military actions taken in the name of the Nation. Our action in refusing to authorize a transfer of appropriations authority of \$500 million for the Pentagon for military actions in Cambodia is one such indication. Our actions finally speak as loud as our words.

I believe that the action of the Congress is commendable, and I believe that it is vital that we take our confrontation of the President's authority to wage war in Cambodia one step further. The arrogance of Secretary Richardson who tells us that he will continue bombing in Cambodia despite our vote makes action imperative. Therefore, eight of my colleagues and I will file suit today in U.S. District Court, the District of Columbia against Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson and Secretary of the Air Force Robert Seamans seeking a declaratory judgment that without appropriate congressional authorization, the defendants may not take actions to support combat activities in Cambodia.

Further, the plaintiffs also request a further judgment that in the absence of congressional approval, any resumption of actions in Vietnam is in violation of the law. There are no American forces stationed in Indochina. The sole justification offered for American intrusion

into Cambodia in 1970 was to protect American forces in Vietnam. There are no treaty obligations with Cambodia, Congress has specifically prohibited use of American ground forces in Cambodia. Secretary of Defense Richardson, in testimony before the Congress, was unable to offer any constitutional basis for the current bombing of Cambodia. The Cambodian situation is thus a clear legal question of the authority of the President.

Copaintiffs in this suit include Congressmen HERMAN BADILLO, RONALD DELUMS, DONALD EDWARDS, DONALD FRASER, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, ROBERT KASTENMEIER, BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, and Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG. The lawsuit is being sponsored by the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

I invite my colleagues to join in this suit. I believe that the time is finally at hand, the time to end once and for all the killing in Southeast Asia, the time to once and for all reestablish the right and responsibility of this Congress to assert this Nation's warming and its peace-making powers.

BEYOND CIVIC PIETY

HON. JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the great sermons of the last century referred to the hypocritical piety of Government leaders. The minister said that when officials wish to do a particularly evil deed, they bow their public heads, bend their public knees, and pray to their public God in whose name all wickedness begins.

On Sunday, May 20, 1973, Dr. Eugene S. Callender preached a sermon entitled "Beyond Civic Piety." Dr. Callender is president of the New York Urban Coalition and spoke at the National Presbyterian Church under appointment by the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States of America as the 1973 National Church Preacher.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Dr. Callender's sermon is reminiscent of the one I earlier referred to. He carefully points out the danger of a civil religion and says correctly:

Alongside our Christian religion there has developed a religion that superficially looks like it, that overlaps it at some points, but which is different from it in essential respects. But some Americans do not know the difference—the flag and the cross arouse the same sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all our colleagues to read Dr. Callender's sermon with great attention, for it contains a message of utmost importance:

BEYOND CIVIC PIETY

(By Dr. Eugene S. Callender)

Scripture: Acts 19: 23-41—"Righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people." Prov. 14: 34.

I wish to speak this morning on the theme, "Beyond Civic Piety."

There is a form of religious expression in this nation which we may call civic, or more broadly, civil piety. Scholars have identified civil religion, though they are not entirely agreed as to its structure, its content, or its functions. Some see it in the President's participation in televised prayer breakfasts or in the cozy closeness of Billy Graham and the President in White House religious observances. Some see it in the rituals of national ceremonies as when a Kennedy is inaugurated. On such occasions the piety we have in mind is not found so much in the presence and prayers of priests, rabbis, and preachers as in the appeals and arguments of the address delivered by the President. There are many forms of it. But its reality is a fact. It is not completely separate from the plural strains that make up the organized religious bodies in America, but it is distinguishable and as this sermon suggests Christians must go beyond *civic piety*. Today they must become prophetically clearer on the transcendent claim which the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ makes on the unity and mission of the church in relation to the unity and mission of the nation.

Civic religion and its expression in civic piety are not new. All groups, tribes, nations form symbols, beliefs, and rituals which heighten group consciousness, which symbolize values, which articulate shared ideas about authority and its agencies, and which conserve and unite the members. Some sociologists have argued that all religion is but a mode of group consciousness. In the story in Acts we have an illustration of a city which is the center of a cult and identifies that cult—the worship of Artemis—with the interests of the city. A particular group in the city—the silversmiths—use the civic piety for their own purposes. The new faith of the Christians threatens the special interests of the silversmiths and they, in turn, arouse the fears and the patriotism of the Ephesians by holding a mass religious rally in the city. By showing the Ephesians that the Roman law was above the rioters the clerk quieted them eventually. In due course the Christian faith was to be viewed as a threat not only to civic piety but to imperial piety as well.

Their early Christian forebears repeatedly found themselves in the conflict between loyalty to their all transcending God and the Lord Jesus, on the one hand, and the idolatry which the piety of emperor worship required. The books of saints and martyrs are prominently marked by the stories of heroes of the faith who were victims of this civic piety. The persecutions of the first three hundred years are historical witnesses to the fact that the Christian community understood itself to be called to obedience to the Christ whose righteousness and mercy transcended the justice and the peace of Caesar and Rome. The piety of the City of God, as St. Augustine showed, made of God's people a pilgrim people whose movement through history was essentially different from the piety of the City of Earth, though these two cities were commingled in their day by day membership.

In our day the holocaust of World War II dramatized the civil piety of national socialism that swept through the German people, hypnotized its youth, and infiltrated many churches in what was called German Christianity. Belatedly did Christian leaders recognize the grave dangers of Nazism and the fundamental conflict between the Cross and the Swastika. What is instructive for us is the power of a long, slow penetration of nationalism, militarism, and economic despair into the collective consciousness of both Protestants and Roman Catholics. So when the hour of decision came only a minority were spiritually and morally prepared

to be obedient to the Lord of the church and the world.

In the United States we are in grave danger of such a penetration by our own civic piety—our own civil religion. The danger is that churches will not express and radiate our authentic Christian piety in contrast to that civic piety. Alongside our Christian religion there has developed a religion that superficially looks like it, that overlaps it at some points, but which is different from it in essential respects. But some Americans do not know the difference—the flag and the cross arouse the same sentiments.

Wrap up in one package of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the deism of Franklin and Jefferson, the hymn, "America", Washington's "Farewell Address", Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and Second Inaugural, his re-establishment of Thanksgiving Day, the institution of Memorial Day, Veterans' Day, the century-long tradition of orations on July Fourth, the vision of this country as the Promised Land and the model for all nations to follow, the repeated allocation to God in the speeches of Presidents when they are inaugurated, or deal with great crises or goals, and the inculcations of democratic values in the public school system with (until recently) prayers and the salute to the flag—and you have a pattern of civic piety which you can readily recognize. Add to this our ethos of good sportsmanship, training in the Scouts and Campfire Girls, and belief in the soundness of our economic system—and you have a cluster of meanings and value that comprise what some people mean when they speak about this country being a Christian nation.

Jefferson talked about our being endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights; Franklin taught in his *Autobiography* that belief in God's providence has utility in promoting and confirming morality; Washington said that "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity. Religion and Morality are indispensable supports," and that we cannot expect national morality in exclusion of religious principle; Lincoln gave a new Testament quality to sentiments drawn from the Old when in his official utterances he said: "If God wills that (the Civil War) continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether,'" and then he began—"With malice toward none, with charity for all"—Lincoln gave to civic piety also the great sacrificial phrases of the Gettysburg address and the mission "that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth." It was at the dedication of a national cemetery that the Gettysburg address was spoken. Arlington Cemetery added the symbol of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and it is also now the site of the tomb of another martyred President and of its symbolic eternal flame.

The rituals of sacrifice and memory—of personal and national survival—are fused with militarism and patriotism in Memorial Day and in Veterans' Day. Thanksgiving Day integrates family life into civic piety as Memorial Day integrates the local community into the national cult. The public school system while crowding out sectarian Bible study and compulsory prayers serves to introduce children and youth into the cultic celebration of the civil rituals.

At his inaugural, John F. Kennedy reaffirmed (as Robert H. Bellah notes) the religious legitimization of the highest political authority. He said: "I have sworn before

you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forefathers prescribed nearly a century ago." He echoes Jefferson in another place when he said, "the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God." He also echoed the missional activist part of religious sentiment when he said in his final words "here on earth God's work must truly be our own." The parallels to Biblical appeals are clear in a passage such as this:

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation'—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

I shall refrain from illustrations from the ceremonial and political utterances of Presidents Johnson and Nixon, not only in the interests of time but also to focus on issues more basic than politics related to party and personality.

Now, how does all this differ from explicit Christianity, though much of it is noble and socially beneficial?

This civic piety never mentions Christ and with that omission goes many of the explicit conceptions of Christian community, agape, crucifixion, salvation, forgiveness, and the final end of man. Absent is confession of sin and of national wrong doing. With the absence of guilt is absence of repentance.

By and large civic piety is a religion of order, of law, of national unity, of uncriticized values and priorities; justice and right are more prominent than salvation and love.

Through much of the early period the analogy of America and Israel was common. Europe is Egypt. America is the promised land. So Jefferson said: "I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessities and comforts of life." When these sentiments are not corrected by statements of divine righteousness and judgment, they can expand into self-righteous and arrogant attitudes of power. The sense of mission fortified by religious sentiments becomes idolatrous messianic policeman of the world. Instead of a sense of God's righteous rule over all the earth we get a fusion of civic piety with belief in God against other political and economic systems. Napoleon's cynicism that God is on the side of the biggest battalions becomes the McCarthy era's line that God is on the side of believers in the greatest industrial society opposing atheistic communism. The American-Legion type of ideology often invokes civic piety to fuse God, country and flag while attacking nonconformists and liberal ideas and groups of all kinds. There is a far cry from Jefferson and Lincoln to McCarthy and the American-Legion—but in our day we are more in grave danger of civic piety being effectively harnessed for fascist and reactionary goals and purposes than for civil rights and responsible foreign policies.

Civic piety lacks by its nature and function a truly Christian universalism. It simply cannot symbolize adequately the unity of mankind. It is potent in legitimizing adventures in imperialism. It has been impatient in placing the U.S. appropriately under the rightful authority of the United Nations. Civic piety tends to divide the world into those who are on "our side" and those on the "other side," between the "good guys" and the "bad guys." Instead of moving out into God's larger freedom under Christ inspired by the Holy Spirit, civic piety tends to make us view America as "the last hope of earth."

There are, of course, as I have said, some noble values that have been incorporated into the civil religion of America; but there are elements of conservatism, self-adulation, and militarism so great as to endanger the possibility of achieving some kind of viable and coherent world order.

Civil religion blunts the faith of the Christian Church by substituting a vague providence for an explicit historical revelation; it tends to reduce so-called revealed religion to a private matter, thus pushing church life to the periphery of public life; it so stresses the pluralism of American churches as to suggest that civic religion alone can provide national community; it substitutes its own rituals for those of the churches and synagogues gradually replacing them by a ceremonial piety that has qualitatively different values; it draws on biblical analogies but it distorts their prophetic power and imagery in the national interest.

In these days, therefore, the church must insist on the centrality and sovereignty of God's authority and the place of Scripture and tradition and reformation in its self-understanding. The church must press its place in the community over against the state so that freedom for full prophetic utterance is assured. The church must teach and insist that no civic piety can displace or overlook the distinctive realities we have in Jesus Christ. Moreover, the quality of community life which the church represents has a conception of peace which transcends radically that of the political community. The church must expose the explicit and implicit idolatries inherent in civic piety and expose the sham and hypocrisy of America's cultural religion. Finally, since the church sees all history under the judgment and redemption of God, it must free itself from the pollution which has entered its own life and pray continually for purgation and renewal.

We are not called upon to deny or reject the noble sentiments which have from time to time been incorporated into political utterances—for indeed, Christianity should inform our cultural and all cultures. But our true calling is always to go beyond civic piety and bear witness to the righteousness and love of God in Jesus Christ.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people."

THE BUDGET COMES HOME TO AKRON

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1973, at a public hearing in Knight Auditorium of Akron University, I heard testimony from 43 witnesses, representing public and private agencies in the greater Akron metropolitan area, on the local impact of the administration's fund impoundments and of the President's proposed fiscal 1974 budget.

During the course of the testimony on threatened programs in education, health, veterans affairs, planning and community development, housing, manpower, aid to the poor, environmental protection, law enforcement, delinquency prevention, and cultural affairs, many witnesses questioned the administration's elimination of over 100 federally funded categorical aid programs on the

grounds that they are either ineffective, badly managed, or so successful that they can be maintained by non-Federal funds. Other witnesses posed an even more serious question, asking, "what are the priorities of a budget that eliminates domestic programs but raises the military appropriation?" They emphasized the need for a more feasible approach than the President has proposed for meeting the people's needs while keeping a ceiling on spending.

Several common concerns underlay much of the testimony. There was considerable confusion over what programs would be funded under the administration's proposal to supplant categorical aid programs by vaguely defined "special revenue sharing" programs. There was serious concern over the question of fiscal responsibility in abandoning partially completed projects, notably in education and medical research, where a considerable investment in time, manpower, and Federal moneys have already been made. Finally, representatives of nearly every social service agency voiced dismay over proposed new guidelines limiting eligibility for such services as child care, family planning, and aid to senior citizens, the mentally retarded, handicapped persons, drug addicts, and alcoholics. According to their testimony, the new regulations would have the effect of excluding the working poor and other disadvantaged persons who are struggling to stay off the welfare rolls.

Following is a brief summary, by program areas, of the testimony taken at the hearing.

GENERAL TESTIMONY

Robert H. Baker, acting director of finance for the State of Ohio, voiced satisfaction with the special revenue sharing concept. Given an equitable distribution of special revenue sharing funds, Baker said, the State as a whole would not fare too badly. However, local programs would be affected.

Proposed cutbacks on the State level would be felt in library services, in the termination of the emergency employment act—resulting in a net loss of \$2.6 million—in the loss of almost \$400,000 to the agricultural research and development center, and in the loss of almost \$5 million—excluding the work incentive program—by the bureau of employment services.

Mr. Baker said that \$400 million in Ohio funds for 1973 have been impounded by the President. This includes \$112 million for community development programs: water and sewer, model cities, urban renewal, neighborhood facilities, and open space land programs.

Mr. Baker also cited the effects of impoundments on the bureau of employment services, the department of education, the Agriculture Department, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, and the State department of transportation.

Delores Warren, representing the Akron, Cuyahoga Falls, and Kent Leagues of Women Voters, spoke for programs which the league supports in housing, education, social services for the poor and aged, and environmental protection.

In housing, the league has asked that the administration rescind its moratorium on federally subsidized housing. In education, the league sees the establishment and financing of equal educational opportunity programs as a Federal responsibility, and questions the States' and localities' willingness and ability to do this. The league questions, on constitutional grounds, the President's authority to eliminate social service programs, and also takes exception to the Presidents' impoundment of funds for sewage treatment plant construction, stressing that "Federal assistance is essential, along with State and local money" to insure that water quality standards will be enforced.

Cliff Skeen, director of the Akron Labor Council Community Services Committee, AFL-CIO, stressed the need to reject the administration's callous abandonment of social programs and stop passing the buck to States through various forms of revenue sharing, an ill-advised revival of "let the States do it."

Joseph T. Sereno, urban renewal manager for the city of Akron, reviewed gains by the city under the HUD community development program, which will be terminated as of June 1973. Akron has received Federal urban renewal grants averaging \$7 million a year for the past 10 years. Mr. Sereno took exception to the view of proponents of special revenue sharing that no city or State will receive less than its previous level of funding under categorical programs. "This will not be possible," he said, "unless there is a substantial increase in community development dollars, since a large number of cities and counties previously not involved in renewal will become eligible" for special revenue-sharing funds.

Mr. Sereno also stated that the freezing of the 235 and 236 housing subsidy programs will impede efforts to reconstruct housing in Opportunity Park, in downtown Akron. He expressed strong criticism of the administration's funding moratorium on these and other urban development programs, and said:

The momentum we have gained over the past ten years, both in programs and staff capabilities, should not be implied by a two year moratorium.

John Looney, of the American Friends Service Committee, urged Congress to respond to the administration's cutbacks and impoundments by, first, establishing a total spending ceiling, equal to or lower than the President's, second, setting a much lower military spending ceiling by eliminating duplication and mismanagement, and, third, reducing unfair tax loophole losses. Mr. Looney said that—

We now look to Congress as almost a last resort to restore fiscal responsibility, integrity, wider respect, moral leadership, and common sense to the conduct of the government of the United States.

EDUCATION

Dr. Lloyd W. Dull, assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction for Akron public schools, testified in favor of continuation of a number of

Federal programs which have greatly benefited Akron schoolchildren.

NDEA title III funds have been used for nonconsumable instructional supplies and equipment for science, mathematics, history, economics, government, English, foreign languages, and industrial arts. Dull feels—

We can ill afford having capable professional people working with improper instructional equipment and supplies, to do the kind of quality teaching that ought to be done today.

According to Dr. Dull, the elimination of ESEA title II money for libraries and learning resource centers would be most ill advised. This is a period when educators are recommending greater use of libraries, and when learning resource, or multimedia, centers are a focal point of educational activity in many schools.

The percentage of children from ADC homes in Akron schools has increased from 8.5 percent to 4.5 percent in the past 7 years. Dr. Dull urged the continuation of ESEA title I funds for disadvantaged children if "we are to have any depth of concern at all about the nature of our big cities."

Dr. Dull also strongly urged that Federal funds for vocational education and education of the handicapped be increased. Vocational funds used in Akron for Y-Noah and Camp Rex prevocational programs "are making a tremendous difference in the saving of about 165 youth annually who have been heading toward crime," Dull said.

James W. McGrath, associate provost and dean of graduate school and research, Kent State University, criticized the withdrawal of Federal support for higher education and research. "Progress and well-being of this society depends more than ever before on our educated and talented citizens," he stated. "Our problems require the most skilled and intelligent attack."

NSF and NIH funding for basic research has decreased. Though NSF claims there will be an increase in effective spending for fiscal 1974, due to the release of previously impounded funds, Dean McGrath stated the increase is barely enough to cover inflation, especially in scientific equipment costs. As a result, equipment-related programs have been eliminated, and equipment requests in project grants are discouraged.

The cuts in NIH research budgets, except for heart disease and cancer research, are, in Dean McGrath's view, a shocking blow to basic research in physical and mental health fields.

Impoundment of funds for science education and institutional support has been especially severe for the past 2 years, McGrath stated, resulting in confusion in the Science Foundation's educational programs and increasing the difficulties in maintaining quality research at a time when State budgets and private giving for basic research were also reduced.

McGrath criticized the increased targeting of NSF funds in the areas of applied research and industrial process engineering, at the expense of basic research in other fields.

Federal support to graduate students

has declined by almost two-thirds since 1969. McGrath detailed how eight Federal fellowships and traineeships at Kent State University have been phased out. All will be terminated by the end of the 1973-74 academic year, and the university, Dean McGrath noted, has been unable to make up the decrease in Federal support. The Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972 would have provided relief through title X, graduate programs, but the administration does not propose to fund these programs in the new budget.

McGrath mentioned other severe reductions in the proposed fiscal year 1974 budget: elimination of NIH traineeships and fellowships for health professional researchers; virtual elimination of the Nurse Training Act of 1971; elimination of funds for vocational education.

Robert W. Larson, director, University of Akron student financial aid, and William E. Johnson, director, Kent State University student financial aid, testified jointly that the budget has knocked down the roof and walls of our time-tested financial aid program.

The budget does not provide funds for National Defense Student Loans or Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, which will affect over 2,700 students at Akron and Kent State Universities.

The funding level for the college work-study program, which has provided employment for thousands of college students is \$20 million less than fiscal year 1973.

Funding for nursing loan and scholarship grant programs is reduced to about one-third of the appropriation for fiscal year 1973. Three hundred and fifty students at KSU and AU will be directly affected.

Both Johnson and Larson were skeptical that the law enforcement education program funds, eliminated from the 1974 budget, would be funded through special revenue sharing, and are concerned about the 750 students receiving LEEP loans and grants at Kent State and Akron Universities.

Though the budget includes funding of \$622 million for the new basic opportunity grant program, proposed as the foundation of all federally supported aid to students, Johnson and Larson estimate this is only 62 percent of the estimated \$1 billion—needed—to make the program effective.

Johnson and Larson urged the retention of aid programs at adequate levels and warned that the administration's budget, if funded as requested, will have a profound and disastrous effect on college students throughout the country.

Dr. Linnea E. Henderson, dean of the school of nursing, Kent State University, elaborated further on the effects of the proposed budget on the 5½-year-old nursing baccalaureate program. Under the budget, the school of nursing would lose almost \$200,000 in operating funds plus an anticipated half a million or more in proposed special projects. In addition, over \$100,000 would be lost in direct scholarship aid to students and over \$2 million for a much needed school of nursing building.

Dr. Henderson disputed HEW Secretary Weinberger's contention that funds from State and local governments, private sources, and patient care revenues can be substituted for Federal financing of nursing education. The Kent State school of nursing, she stated, was established when 2 large and nationally acclaimed hospital nursing programs were discontinued because of the expense to the hospitals. With today's prices, she added, patients can no longer afford to subsidize nursing education.

She expressed great concern over the loss of funds for a building. The Kent State school of nursing is presently housed on the second and third floors of the old health center, with the campus police occupying the first floor.

HEALTH

Dr. John D. Morely, director of health for the city health department, supported spending controls and the evaluation and reduction of some programs, particularly overlapping planning agencies, but stressed that we need to proceed in an orderly manner with sufficient notice and information to communities, agencies, and people.

Dr. Morely said he feared the loss of Federal leadership and innovation in developing new and better approaches to some of our social programs. He felt the cutbacks in grants for health manpower training were especially serious, and was disturbed by the fund cuts in alcoholism programs, which, he stated, come at a time when the public is becoming aware of alcoholism as a major public health related problem.

Gordon B. McKeeman, D.D., president, board of trustees, and Arthur D. Ziegler, M.P.H., executive director, Summit-Portage County comprehensive health planning agency, also commented on the confusion regarding the future of health-related Federal programs.

The ratio of medical practitioners to population in the Akron metropolitan area is already much below communities of comparable size in Ohio and nationally, they said. With the need for professional and paraprofessional health manpower increasing, they are concerned about the termination of capitation payments for schools of nursing, veterinary medicine, optometry, pharmacy, and podiatry, and the discontinuance of special programs for allied health.

Outpatient care facilities, a local need, McKeeman and Ziegler said, will no longer be built through the Hill-Burton-Harris program, which is being phased out. They also expressed concern that public long-term care facilities, for those who cannot afford private nursing or custodial care, will no longer be assisted through Hill-Burton funds.

Regional medical programs will no longer be funded, and concern was expressed that there would be insufficient funds for already understaffed planning organizations to carry out responsibilities the RMP's had assumed.

McGeeman and Ziegler said that the continuation of maternal health care and projects grants is in doubt because no funds are allocated for them in the fiscal year 1974 HEW budget, and there

has been no indication that additional dollars will go to the States for this purpose.

David L. Cox, executive director, Summit County mental health and retardation—648—board, and Dr. Suzanne Hettrick, executive director, Portage County mental health and retardation—648—board, spoke on program cuts in both counties.

Mr. Cox stated that proposed regulatory limitations and reductions in Federal funds would affect community health centers, drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, alcoholism services, and services to the developmentally disabled and mentally retarded. He emphasized that these preventative and early treatment services minimize long term and potentially more costly chronic care programs in the future.

If proposed title IVa regulations are enacted, Summit County would lose \$130,000 in 1 year for present services and an estimated \$200,000 for anticipated programs. Expiration of the Community Mental Health Centers Act would mean the loss of over \$3 million over the next 5 years. In addition, a model alcoholism program designated for Akron will go by the wayside, and cutbacks in Federal support for community based drug programs could result in a loss to the county up to \$2 million—over—8 years. The result of these fund cutbacks, according to Cox, is that the Summit County 648 board must now either deny some anticipated services or attempt a substantial increase in real estate taxes.

Cox feels it is unrealistic to expect special revenue sharing to take care of these programs. Revenue sharing money, he stated, is being channeled to communities where there is no traditional support for mental health and retardation, and the funds will be spent on much needed services, no doubt, highways, garages, sewers, and so forth.

Dr. Hettrick enumerated programs in Portage County which are in varying degrees of jeopardy. These include:

First. Portage family counseling and mental health center, aftercare for patients in psychiatric hospitals—readjustment to community and prevention of return—\$25,000, source, 314(d), Public Health Services Act.

Second. Community house proposal for a work enterprise program for chronically unemployable—\$25,000, source, 314(d).

Third. Town Hall II help line, drug education and crisis intervention center—\$52,000—75 percent of its budget for fiscal year 1974.

Fourth. Portage family counseling and mental health center; approximately 40 percent of case load qualifies for title IVa reimbursement \$40,000—program cost.

Fifth. Portage information and referral service—would terminate—\$25,000—program cost.

Sixth. Mental health manpower will be affected by the loss of NIMH training grant of the psychology department of Kent State University.

Seventh. Children's services center, a diagnostic clinic for children with suspected developmental disabilities, slated

to begin operation July 1973, with proportion of funds from the Developmental Disabilities Act.

Eighth. Loss of model program funds for alcoholism under the Hughes Act would eliminate a planned outpatient alcoholism clinic and adjunct mental health service for alcoholics and families over \$20,000—program cost.

Dr. Hettrick said that the major effects of cutbacks and regulation changes would be felt on future plans of the Portage County 648 board, which now has a very modest mental health and retardation program.

Dr. Louis Kacalief, medical director, the Akron child guidance center, cited the findings of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, which in 1965 found that despite the fact we are the richest world power, we have no unified commitment to our children and youth. He expressed concern for the almost 21,000 children in Summit County alone who need assistance with emotional difficulties at some level of intervention.

Programs made possible through the Community Mental Health Centers Act and title IVa of the Social Security Amendments of 1968, were just beginning to have an effect in this neglected area, according to Kacalief. The danger of the proposed cutbacks and impoundments of Federal funds is to leave us with no alternatives but to scrap plans, to return to the middle ages of social service programming.

Howard Lischeron, executive director, Planned Parenthood Association of Summit County, referred to the confusion surrounding future funds for family planning. Planned Parenthood had received two-third of its funding under title X of the Public Health Service Act, which expires June 30, 1973.

The proposed fiscal year 1974 funding seems to indicate that funds would be sought under title III, section 314, of the Public Health Service Act, and since this also expires June 30, 1973, there appears to be no hint as to how the administration proposes to fund family planning programs after June this year.

Lischeron also noted that there has been no increase in funds for family planning between 1972 and 1974, despite the target set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that all women in need be served by 1975.

New regulations proposed for title IVa social service funds would make it almost impossible for those funds to be utilized, according to Lischeron. One of the proposed regulations would limit eligibility to recipients likely to need financial assistance within 6 months. Since the usual gestation period is 9 months, the provision of family planning services cannot avoid a birth and possible dependency within the time period specified in the new regulations, Lischeron pointed out.

Dr. David A. Goldthwaite, professor of biochemistry, Case-Western Reserve University, commented on the administration's decision to concentrate Federal funds on cancer and heart research, while dramatically cutting funds for research on other diseases.

Though supporting a major effort to

conquer cancer, the doctor disagrees with the Cancer Institute's policy of research by contract which does not necessarily get the best talent and—may miss many original ideas which require exploration before they are ready for a contract. Goldthwaite noted further that some of the moves outlined for fiscal year 1974 are made at the expense of basic research which could provide a cure for cancer.

He also expressed concern about the elimination of training grants, which discriminates against students in the low- and middle-income brackets. He questioned how the average Ph. D. in biochemistry would pay back a private loan for his training which may cost him \$30,000 to \$35,000 and take 7 years.

The policy of the administration to discontinue training grants will have considerable impact on both the universities and the supply of well-trained medical scientists 10 years from now, Dr. Goldthwaite said.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

James Comedy, speaking on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, opposed changes in veterans programs because these programs have been and always will be the cost of war.

Comedy called for support of several bills dealing with medical care for veterans. He stated that Veterans' Administration hospitals have had to turn away veterans needing medical care to improve the staff/patient ratio. Despite this, the VA ratio is far below community hospitals. Comedy said the Veterans Medical Care Act (H.R. 2828) would halt further cuts in veterans hospital care, and he criticized the President's veto of a similar bill passed last year. The VFW is also critical of the reduction in funds for medical research and the elimination of the Medical School Assistance Act in the fiscal year 1974 budget.

Mr. Comedy then addressed himself to the problems of disabled veterans. An administration proposal to cut benefits for disabled veterans of the Vietnam war has been withdrawn, but the VFW is seeking support for H.R. 4185, which would freeze the rating schedule. Veterans receiving nonservice pensions will lose \$267 million this year, according to Comedy, due to the 20-percent social security increase. There is no provision in the budget to amend this. Also of concern is an administration proposal to include a wife's income in determining a veteran's eligibility for pension.

Mr. Comedy ended his testimony with a plea for assistance to the over 200,000 unemployed Vietnam veterans.

HOUSING

Dr. Juliet Saltman, president, Fair Housing Contact Service, expressed deep concern over the administration's current housing moratorium and proposed budget cuts. FHCS feels that the administration has noted the abuses of the housing subsidy programs, but has failed to note the benefits of these programs, if properly administered.

Dr. Saltman urged the President to rescind the freeze on subsidized housing, release all impounded funds for housing and other social and economic programs,

development legislative improvements and budgetary allocations to meet housing needs, and to insure that all Federal programs are utilized affirmatively to achieve genuine equality of opportunity.

Joseph P. Petracca, representing the Home Builders Association, concentrated on the FHA 235 and 236 programs, particularly the difficulties encountered by builders who were operating on the strength of conditional commitments from FHA when the moratorium was imposed. These builders have invested capital, but, Mr. Petracca stated, are now left with no method by which to sell their product.

Most of these units were built on inner-city renewal land. According to Petracca, the people who can afford it won't buy it or rent it. The buyers who want it, cannot afford it without the aid of a subsidy.

The program was far superior to any program that would give direct grants to the homebuyer or renter, Petracca said.

Dr. John D. Morley, director of health, Akron City Health Department, addressed himself to another FHA 235 program. The bulk of Dr. Morley's testimony has been summarized in the section on health.

The rehabilitation program of FHA 235 has provided an opportunity for enterprising contractors to purchase and totally rehabilitate vacant and abandoned houses for eventual sale to lower- and middle-income families, Dr. Morley said. He feels that the program has proven successful in the Akron area in preserving our existing housing stock.

Dr. Morley also expressed concern over the cutoff of 312 loan funds, which provides low interest loans to qualified homeowners. He finds this particularly disturbing as these funds are repayable. Dr. Morley further stated that this program should not only be continued, but expanded.

PLANNING AND AREA DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Robert L. Lance of the school of home economics at Kent State University is involved in many university and community organizations in Portage County that are affected by the cutbacks and changes in titles IVa and IVb of the Social Security Act.

Dr. Lance has helped establish an interdisciplinary university-community organization called the Institute for the Advancement of Human Services, whose function is to deal with the complex human problems related to delinquency, school dropouts, learning problems, marital disruption, mental illness, and unemployment. His primary concern is that the change in eligibility guidelines will result in services that are aimed at the old-style maintenance approaches rather than prevention and rehabilitation. Of equal concern is the reduction of social services to what seems to amount to day care only that fail to reduce many school-related problems that later become the community-at-large problems.

Dr. Lance claims that the proposed changes will destroy the creative efforts begun just this past year by the Welfare Department—that will reduce the need for other more expensive maintenance programs.

Ray Robinson, executive director of Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, summarized local programs and plans currently dependent on Federal aid, adding that lack of official notification as to the scope and specifics of the administration's intended cutbacks makes it difficult to discuss the regional impact of these changes.

First. Federal Sewer and Water participation is 25 percent, and Robinson sees little likelihood that sufficient alternate sources of funding could be tapped, resulting in numerous commercial, industrial and residential projects being threatened or indefinitely postponed, and jeopardizing the expansion of employment opportunities.

Second. Urban Renewal and Neighborhood Development programs—although central city concerns, the programs have regional impact. If major efforts are not forthcoming, business and industrial concerns may leave the cities and possibly the region. It is unlikely, Robinson said, that support would come from the private sector if public funds are unavailable.

Third. Housing—though private money is being investigated for low income and elderly housing, it is unlikely this will come soon enough or to the extent needed to compensate for reduced Federal funds. It is essential the Government continue assisting housing plans either through continuation of existing HUD and FHA programs or through special revenue sharing.

Fourth. Public facilities—community and safety buildings, county office space, fire stations, improvements to the Akron-Canton airport, are some of the needed projects in the cities and suburbs jeopardized by budget cuts.

Fifth. Open space—with the growing and competing demands for land use, there are few financing alternatives other than massive public subsidy available to the already heavily urbanized Tri-County region. Robinson considers open space conservation a critical element in the total regional development plan.

Sixth. Social programs—private funds cannot compensate for any significant reduction in public support for social programming, which communities should continue to deliver without a break in continuity, or much earlier groundwork may be lost.

Seventh. Planning—comprehensive planning is essential if all needs are to be coordinated and integrated, yet a continually smaller amount of Federal assistance has been available for county and local planning, resulting in a general deterioration of county and local planning capabilities. The emphasis on returning government to local governments must include the return of funds or new financing capabilities.

MANPOWER

Ron Oskar, of the public employment program, city of Akron, testified that the grant for the city, under section 5 of the Emergency Employment Act, had been divided between the city, the Akron Board of Education, and the Akron Metropolitan Regional Transit Authority. The program had benefited returned vet-

erans, minority groups, and other disadvantaged persons, with over 25 percent of those in the program placed in regularly funded public or private employment after the first year.

Section 6, EEA money had benefited the model neighborhood, where unemployment was over 6 percent, Mr. Oskar said.

Kenneth Herbert is director of the Manpower Development and Training program, which, since 1966, has served annually more than 500 disadvantaged trainees and Vietnam veterans. Through the Manpower Development and Training Act, the program provides vocational skill training, basic education, guidance and counseling.

Mr. Herbert urged passage of a new Manpower Training and Employment Act to replace the act of 1962, which, in the words of the Ohio Association of Manpower Administrators, has made self-sustaining taxpayers of our former recipients of social services.

Also testifying with Herbert were two manpower graduates, Mrs. Susan Ellerson, and Michael Yovanovich. Mr. Yovanovich, had never held a job for any length of time, is now employed as a welder, a skill he was taught in the manpower program. Mrs. Ellerson holds a responsible position as senior record clerk with a local firm, as a result of the clerical skills training she received.

Lewis G. Robinson, executive director of the Opportunities Industrializations Center, Inc., testified that one out of every seven citizens in the city of Akron is part of the subculture of unemployed, underemployed, the aged, the youths, those on welfare, the high school dropouts, and those who have been institutionalized.

Even with all present Federal, county, and city agencies which provide services of education, prevocational, and vocational training, only one-fifth of this subculture can be reached annually.

Shifting the responsibility from the national to the local level, Robinson said, will serve to force local and national agencies that service the poor to scramble among themselves for local money, which will further divide our communities along racial, religious, ethnic, generation and sexual lines.

AID TO THE POOR

Al Cox, chairman of the Model Cities Commission, stated that there has been a 36 percent cut—from \$3,407,000 to \$2,180,000—in Akron's supplemental fund grant for each 12 month period. The impact of this budget cut on existing programs is as follows:

The Montessori School.—Proposed plans to expand this preschool educational project from 50 to 75 children, and to begin a junior class—ages 5 to 8—have been dropped.

Day care centers.—Plans for program changes, including night care, short term temporary care, and so forth, have been eliminated.

Career opportunities project.—The program, utilizing model neighborhood residents as paraprofessionals while they work for a BA in education, will be cut back.

The unwed parents project.—This pro-

gram, providing educational, health, counseling, and social services to unwed pregnant girls, will be phased out by December 1973, unless community sources of funding can be found.

Infant stimulation.—This demonstration project for very young children will be dropped.

Youth services bureau.—Counselors will be laid off and services reduced.

Environmental services.—Garbage bag distribution service will be eliminated and several staff of the project will be released.

Neighborhood arts.—Plans for a recreational and cultural facility have been dropped.

Family planning.—Model Cities' portion of the local share for a family planning grant will be reduced.

Richard Landis, director of the Summit County Legal Aid Association, fears for the future of competent and aggressive legal representation of the poor. Two-thirds of the agency's income has been provided through the Office of Economic Opportunity through the community action council. When CAC is terminated, financial support will be terminated, and the effect, according to Landis will be catastrophic. From a projected 4,000 clients for the year, the agency would be reduced to serving 600 clients, at most.

Landis has investigated alternatives for funds, but has found: First, approval will come too late to make the agency a direct grantee; Second, legal services are excluded from receiving money under title IV of the Social Security Act.

Though he approves the American Bar Association's proposal for a National Legal Services Corporation he voiced several reservations about the administration's proposals for such an agency. Undue political pressures would result, Mr. Landis said, if the board of the new Corporation were appointed by the President, or if funds for the new agency came through Special Revenue Sharing, with decisions made by State and local officials.

Robert T. McDonald, acting director of the Summit County Welfare Department, discussed the concern over the changes in regulations under title IVa of the Social Security Act.

Restrictions on eligibility for service, particularly changes narrowing the definitions of former and potential recipients of assistance would, according to McDonald, eliminate a large group of persons most amenable to preventative intervention.

The redefinition of mandatory and optional services in the proposed regulations would eliminate services which, in McDonald's words, are first priorities in Summit County. These include child development services, family life education, legal services, placement services, unmarried parents services, and special needs services.

Don Ellis, director, Summit County Community Action Council, and Tracy Lewis, director, Portage County CAC, both testified of the effects on the poor of the termination of their agencies, emphasizing that CAC's have been

unique advocates of rights and needs of persons suffering poverty, and that no program has acted in this way before, nor is one proposed for the future.

William McMillan, president of the Akron chapter, NAACP, supported both Mr. Ellis' and Mr. Cox's statements, and urged support of poverty programs threatened by impoundment or cutbacks.

ENVIRONMENT

Douglas Hasbrouck, of the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, stated that progress on the cleanup of Ohio's waters will be seriously impeded if Federal funding policies are not clarified.

He referred to 126 badly needed sewage and water treatment projects, only half of which will be funded because of cutbacks. The list of 126, he pointed out, does not represent the actual number needed in Ohio to meet goals set down by the 1965 Federal Water Quality Act and does not even begin to take into account standards outlined by the 1972 Federal water quality legislation or goals established by Ohio's EPA.

Hasbrouck emphasized that each of the 126 projects is a badly needed facility that probably will only be placed under construction if Federal help is available.

YOUTH PROGRAMS

Richard Ondecker, director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps for the Akron public schools, stated that it is difficult to imagine that a program considered one of the more positive manpower programs nationally is being phased out.

Forty students annually who have completed the NYC program are graduated from the Akron public schools, and statistics show that underachievers and students with poor attendance records improve markedly as a result of this program.

Ondecker also expressed great concern over the summer NYC program, which reached 1,190 students in 1972.

Charles L. Pryce, regional administrator of the Ohio Youth Commission, testified that the commission's activities in the areas of delinquency prevention, vocational education, and health care would be seriously hampered by Federal funding cuts. Pryce said the youth commission is directly affected by Federal funding in three primary areas—title I of the Educational Act—ESEA—LEAA—and title IV-A of the Social Security Act.

According to Pryce, the youth commission has utilized ESEA title I funds for many years. The commission's present title I funding level is approximately \$700,000 per year. Pryce testified that these funds provide, among other things, for employment of teacher aides, teaching specialists, and equipment needed for remedial programs in reading, math, and speech therapy. With cutbacks in ESEA title I funds, Pryce said, decreases in both the scope and quality of the youth commission's education programs would be unavoidable.

Mr. Pryce stated that 90 percent of the youth commission's community-level delinquency prevention program is dependent on social security title IV-A funding. A cutback in this source of funding, he said, would be disastrous to

any hope which the youth commission might have in successfully decreasing the delinquency rate in the State of Ohio.

CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

John Rebenack, chief librarian of the Akron public library, feels that the impact of administration recommendations to eliminate all funds for the Library Services and Construction Act, on the State library of Ohio and Ohio library services will be catastrophic. Rebenack considers LSCA one of the most effective and best regulated programs to come out of Washington.

A number of important local projects have been funded through the State library, with a sizable portion of funds made up by local contributions. These have included the construction of the main library; a many-faceted survey of Summit County library services; and a books/jobs project for the underemployed and unemployed.

Rebenack has great doubts that revenue sharing will fill the void left by LSCA, contending that cities with their magnitude of problems, would not give library support high priority.

A. Robert Rogers, professor of library science at Kent State University, cited the elimination of Federal support for four major areas of librarianship.

Under title III of the Library Services and Construction Act, which would receive no funding under the proposed budget, public libraries in Ohio have attempted to facilitate cooperation among academic, public, and art museum libraries. This has resulted in a reduction of duplication and better service to local users.

School libraries, under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, have been substantially improved on the secondary level. ESEA grants have also made possible a great many libraries in elementary schools. There are no provisions for these grants in the fiscal year 1974 budget.

Rogers noted that aid for the construction of new library buildings under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is not to be phased out, even though this program is not of top priority among college and university librarians.

The item of top priority, in Professor Rogers' view, is the problem of what he termed "the publications explosion." As the demand for and prices of books and other materials increase, the need for more funds is urgent. The situation is particularly critical in Ohio where the State-assisted universities do not meet generally accepted national standards. Again, the administration has proposed no moneys under title IIIa—College Library Resources—of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Title IIb—Library Training and Research—of this same act has also been eliminated. Kent State has received over \$20,000 for fellowships and institutes under this program. Rogers particularly emphasized the need for assistance to qualified disadvantaged minority students. Such people are in heavy demand, in contrast to the relative surplus of white librarians from the middle class, he said.

NATION AUTISTIC CHILDREN'S
WEEK

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday this House passed House Joint Resolution 296, the National Autistic Children's Week. The main thrust of this proposal is to demonstrate to the people of this Nation the needs of those children who are afflicted with autism and to offer a vehicle by which parents of autistic children can obtain information on services available to their children. The National Society for Autistic Children operates an information and referral service which can be helpful to all parents. Its director, Mrs. Ruth Sullivan, may be contacted at 101 Richmond Street, Huntington, W. Va.

During the past 2 years, I have become involved with the problems of autism. On September 22, 1971, I inserted into the RECORD—page E9909—a pamphlet entitled "Children Apart" which describes autism and the problems encountered by parents in obtaining a proper diagnosis and care for the child. This article elicited a tremendous response—phone calls and letters—from parents all over the Nation who thanked me for making public some understandable information on this illness. I was astounded by the obvious need for and the dearth of pertinent material with which to fulfill the need. Subsequently, I initiated a Wednesday Autism Insert series in the RECORD during the summer of 1972 and intend to do the same this summer.

Because of the rule prohibiting articles from exceeding two pages, I am able to reprint only a small portion of "Children Apart." What appears will be informative to all, but much less than the total picture. In the next RECORD, I will attempt to print more of this article so that all may know about autism.

I do not believe that any of us who have not experienced directly the problems of autism can fully understand the walls of silence and frustration surrounding this illness. The Proclamation of National Autistic Children's Week will help break this silence and let the parents and the children know that we do care and that there is information available to aid them.

A major part of this week is the education of the Nation to what autism really is. Autistic children are those children who are afflicted with infantile autism—Kanner's syndrome—profound aphasia, childhood psychosis, or any other condition characterized by severe defects in language ability and behavior and by the lack of ability to relate appropriately to others. Characteristics of autism include a limited ability to understand, communicate, learn, and participate in social relationships. These are a result of a pervasive impairment of the child's cognitive powers and/or perceptual functions.

In the very recent past, many parents of autistic children were told that au-

tism was the direct result of the parents not loving their child. This is absolutely not the case. These parents love their children and are keenly concerned about their child's welfare. Research now indicates that autism is caused by a biochemical error rather than social or parental relationships. It is a disgrace that these parents were treated in such a manner.

Another element involved in National Autistic Children's Week is the need for a coordinated research program on the causes and care for autism. Joined by 30 colleagues, I introduced H.R. 5785 which would authorize the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to attack this disease in an organized effort. This proposal would also provide grants or loans to public and private nonprofit hospitals which operate educational programs for autistic children.

There is still one more area in which autistic children as well as other handicapped children are being discriminated against. Costs for education of these children exceed \$2,000 a year in the less severe cases. For more serious afflictions involving residential schools with intensive care, costs can soar to \$20,000 a year. It is difficult for any family to meet the cost of these needed services. To this end, I have introduced legislation to give the parents of all handicapped children tax credits that would ease their financial burden.

It would be good that if during National Autistic Children's Week we could announce that such programs would go into effect. Although this is unlikely, we can at least promise action in the very near future to meet the human needs of these people.

The article, "Children Apart," follows:

CHILDREN APART
FOREWORD

Autistic children are "children apart"—cut off from normal life because of their handicaps. At birth their handicaps are rarely obvious. It is only gradually, when the baby fails to make normal progress and behaves in an odd way, that it is realized that something is wrong. Of course, the development of normal children is often uneven and may, for a time, involve apparently strange behaviour, which must not be confused with autism.

There are about 4,000 autistic children in Great Britain at any one time and in the past ten years there has been a great increase in public interest about them. Clearly such children and their families face great problems both in themselves and in the attitude of the world towards them. But what is the reality of these problems? What is autism really about? And what help can be given? It is to answer such questions that we have asked a leading authority on the subject to write this book.

TREVOR WESTON, M.D.,
Editor, Family Doctor Publications.

AUTISTIC CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Ten years ago very few people who were not doctors, psychologists or teachers had heard of autistic children. Recently, however, the problems of these children have been discussed in newspapers and magazines, and most people know that autistic children exist, even if they have only a very vague idea of what the children are like.

This new interest may have given the impression that childhood autism is a new

problem. In fact, it is possible to find descriptions of children who were clearly autistic in books and papers written long ago. One of the most interesting is an account called *The Wild Boy of Aveyron* by a French physician, J. M. G. Itard, first published in 1799. Itard was given charge of a twelve-year-old boy who had been found wandering in the woods of Aveyron. His description of Victor's behaviour, and of the special teaching methods he devised, make a most interesting and moving story. Itard's ideas on education are still used in teaching handicapped children to this day.

Children suffering from autism, however, were not until recently identified as a separate group. In fact, it was only in 1943 that an American children's psychiatrist, Professor Leo Kanner, first described the syndrome of *Early Infantile Autism*. The word autism comes from the Greek word *autos*, which means *self*. Kanner used this name because the children go through a stage when they are very withdrawn into themselves and do not show much interest in other people. However, many of them are like this only when they are very young (under five or six years old) so the name is not really a very good one. A new and more accurate name is badly needed, but no one has yet suggested one that is both short enough and precise enough for general use.

Even after Kanner described and named the children, it was almost twenty years before the general public in Britain began to hear of them. Nowadays, there is much more widespread interest, partly because attitudes to all kinds of handicaps have changed and people are willing to talk about these problems and do what they can to help, and partly because a group of parents and professional workers started a society to help autistic children.

I hope that this booklet will be of some interest to readers who are not working or living with an autistic child, as well as to those who are directly involved as parents or teachers. It is true that childhood autism is a rare condition compared with, for example, mongolism, but it is still common enough for most people to know at least one autistic child, perhaps as a neighbour, perhaps as a distant relation, or a child of a friend. I shall describe how the children behave, and how this behaviour affects their families, give an account of the recent ideas about why they are so different from normal children, and make some suggestions as to how friends, neighbours and relations can help.

How many children are involved?

A study made in Middlesex and another in a county in Denmark showed that about four to five children in every 10,000 will have early childhood autism. This means that in England or Wales there will be about 3,000 autistic children of school age.

Boys are affected three or four times more often than girls. No one knows why this is, but all conditions in which language problems are important seem to be commoner in boys.

The condition begins from birth, or else in the first two to two-and-a-half years of life. Children can develop other kinds of abnormal behavior after this age, but it is most unusual for the typical autistic symptoms to begin after two-and-a-half.

Roughly one third to one half of the children who have autistic behavior also have some other severe condition, such as spasticity, hydrocephaly or epilepsy. The rest appear physically healthy apart from their strange behaviour, although special examination often shows that they have difficulties which may be due to some abnormality in the brain.

There seem to be autistic children in all parts of the world, although it is not yet possible to say what differences there are in the numbers in various countries.

The study in Middlesex showed that these children are likely to have parents with a higher educational and occupational level than average.

Learning problems

Autistic children seem very strange and puzzling to people who know nothing about them, but they are easier to understand if they are looked at as a group of children with severe learning difficulties.

Special learning problems are very common, even in children whose intelligence is otherwise quite normal. Some children have great trouble in learning to read, because they find it difficult to distinguish right from left, tend to write words backwards, and cannot tell the difference between letters such as b and d, p and q, w and m. Some are very slow with arithmetic, and others may have problems with hand-eye co-ordination, so that their handwriting is poor and they cannot do handwork or play games well. However, if a child has one learning problem only, and if it is not too severe, he can usually overcome it well enough to make progress at school, especially with the help of a good teacher.

Autistic children are unfortunate in that they have several severe learning problems at once, including some which hinder the development of one of the most important human skills—that is, the ability to understand and to use language. When they are young, it seems that they cannot make sense of the things they see and the things they hear. Their eyes and ears are usually quite normal, and so are the nerves which take the messages from the eyes and ears to the brain. The problem seems to arise at some stage during the process of *interpreting* these messages. It seems that information from the outside world is not made into a clear and understandable picture, but remains a confusing and frightening muddle. Autistic children must feel like a normal person would if he was left alone in a foreign country without knowing the language or customs, or being able to read the alphabet or even understand the gesture which people make.

A normal person could set about learning the language, but the autistic child does not seem able to do this. It is hard to imagine that someone could hear words and see gestures clearly but not understand them. It makes it a little clearer if you think of people who are tone-deaf to music. They can hear all the sounds, but the most beautiful symphony has no more "meaning" to them than water running down a drain. You could say that autistic children are, in a way, "tone deaf" to any kind of language.

No one knows exactly at which stage of "information processing", the difficulties occur. Some people working with these children feel that the information from the senses is distorted in some way, thus making it difficult for the child to understand. Others feel that the information is received normally but that the problem lies in the child's difficulty in understanding the meaning of *symbols*. For example, an autistic child may (unlike some other retarded children) be able to copy a picture of a triangle at the normal age, and match triangle shapes and so on, but he takes a very long time to learn that the word "triangle" is a symbol for the shape. Even after he has learnt to name many different things, he will still have difficulty in linking words together into sentences. He has even more trouble understanding the connections between things, and therefore in working out answers to questions like "Why did so-and-so happen?", "What is such-and-such for?" "How is this done?" "What is the reason for that?" The abstract ideas and complicated meanings of words in poetry and literature are completely beyond these children even if they eventually learn to read fluently.

Research workers are investigating these problems, and trying to devise tests to define exactly where and when the children's difficulties in understanding begin. Many problems are still unsolved, but it is possible to describe how an autistic child behaves, and how he can be helped.

FIRST SIGNS AND SYMPTOMS

If a child is autistic from birth, it may be quite difficult for an outsider to guess that there is anything wrong for the first few months. Sometimes a mother has an uneasy feeling that her baby is unusual in some way, but finds it difficult to put her finger on what is wrong. Perhaps the reason is that an autistic baby does not show all the little signs of awareness of his mother's presence which the normal baby does from quite an early age.

Some autistic children are "model" babies, hardly ever crying even when they are hungry. Others behave in exactly the opposite way. They scream continually and cannot be comforted except perhaps by continual rocking or by riding in a car. In this case even short stops for traffic lights will cause the screaming to begin again. Both kinds of babies are difficult and unrewarding for the parents, the quiet ones because of their lack of responsiveness, and the over-active ones because of demands which can never be satisfied. Neither the quiet nor the over-active babies lift up their arms or make themselves ready to be picked up when their mothers come to them. This is quite unlike normal babies who, when they are strong enough, show just how eager they are to be picked up and cuddled.

Feeding problems are fairly common, beginning with poor sucking after birth, and sometimes going on to a refusal to chew any lumpy food when the child has been weaned.

Many of the children smile and sit up, crawl and walk at the usual ages, but they may smile only when rocked, bounced or tickled, and they often do not bother to sit up and look at the world around them even when they are able to do so. They do not point things out to their parents or show any of the normal baby's delighted interest in the world. They may not even reach out for their food when it is placed in front of them.

Sometimes these children spend hours scratching on the covers of their prams. (This behaviour also occurs in babies who are blind). When they reach the age at which a normal baby can handle toys, they seem to be interested only in the feel of the surface of the toy, and the way it looks when it is twisted and turned, instead of trying out all its possible uses as a plaything. They may be fascinated by lights, and will often stare fixedly at a lighted lamp, perhaps smiling and chuckling and wriggling with excitement.

The toddler stage

Even if the parents have not worried about their child in his baby stage, when he reaches his second year the problems become obvious. This is partly because he does not begin to talk at the expected time, and partly because it is much easier to notice unusual behaviour in a child who is mobile than in one who is lying in a pram. Furthermore, at this stage the child himself begins to be frustrated by his handicaps and reacts to this in various ways depending on his temperament.

Unusual response to sounds

An autistic child in the toddler stage seems to respond to sounds in quite unpredictable ways. He may completely ignore some very loud noises, but at other times cower away from a sound, covering his ears as if in distress. Yet again, the same child may be fascinated by a special noise, such as that made by a friction drive toy. What is really worrying, however, is that he often shows no interest when people talk to him, not even when they call his name.

Lack of understanding of speech

The children are disinterested in speech because they do not understand its meaning. At first it seems to the bewildered parents that their child is quite deliberately "shutting his ears" and refusing to listen. However, when the children grow older, they do begin to try to understand, and it is then possible to see how much real difficulty they have. Those who make progress go through a stage in which they can understand and willingly obey very simple instructions, but are still muddled by anything complicated. One little boy learnt the meaning of "give me the cup" but he could not understand when his mother said "Put the cup on the table". At this stage it is clear that the trouble is not due to lack of co-operation. The children may have the same reaction as an Englishman who knows just a little French, when he is with French-speaking people. He will understand the simple familiar sentences, but when the conversation gets at all complicated, he will stop listening. Like the autistic child, his attention is not on the conversation, but, also like the autistic child, he has a genuine "handicap" which makes it very frustrating for him when he tries to listen. Most of us lose interest when we are asked to do something well-nigh impossible.

FLORIDA STATE LEGISLATURE COMMENDS THE PRESIDENT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution passed by the Florida State Legislature commending President Nixon for achieving an agreement to end the war and bring peace with honor in Vietnam and Southeast Asia and inviting President Nixon to address the Florida Legislature. It is encouraging to receive communications such as this expressing support of our present administration rather than, like so many others, trying to tear down the good work President Nixon is doing, and I commend the Florida State Legislature for its initiative in this regard.

The resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 258

A concurrent resolution commending President Richard M. Nixon for concluding an agreement to end the war and bring peace with honor in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, and inviting the President to address the Florida legislature.

Whereas, all the world is joyous that an agreement was signed on January 27, 1973, which is bringing an end to destruction of American and Asian lives and property, and

Whereas, the peace agreement will ultimately bring peace throughout Vietnam and Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, the peace agreement is the instrument responsible for freeing American Prisoners of War and returning these brave men to their families, and

Whereas, the entire nation owes a debt of gratitude to President Nixon for his role in preserving the respect for the United States in the world and establishing the United States as a leader in the cause of world peace by "staying the course in Vietnam" and bringing about "peace with honor" instead of choosing the dangerous course of "peace at any price", and

Whereas, an overriding majority of all Americans and especially Floridians have supported President Nixon in his successful quest for a just and honorable peace and the release of all Prisoners of War. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida, the House of Representatives Concurring:

That the legislature of the State of Florida, on behalf of the citizens of Florida, commends the President of the United States, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, for his steadfast and successful role in bringing peace with honor in ending this nation's involvement in the Vietnam War, and for bringing about the release of American Prisoners of War.

Be it further resolved that the legislature of the State of Florida issues a standing invitation to President Nixon to address a joint session of the legislature during his term of office.

Be it further resolved that this resolution, under the Great Seal of the State of Florida, be presented to President Nixon as a token of appreciation from the people of Florida and that copies of this resolution be presented to the officers of the United States Congress and to the members of the Florida congressional delegation.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, May 28 commemorates the 55th anniversary of the proclamation of Armenian independence. Located in the mountainous region in the eastern and northeastern part of Asia Minor, this area of about 11,000 square miles today constitutes the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic—part of the Soviet Union.

The history of the Armenian people has been one largely of turmoil and turbulence, characterized by long periods of duress under foreign rule. Because Armenia forms a bridge between east and west, it has served timelessly as a battleground for conquering forces. In the early 16th century, the Ottoman Empire engulfed most of Armenia and maintained control over the struggling Armenians until the end of World War I. Some of the cruelest and most inhumane acts committed by man against his fellowman were witnessed during the massacres of 1915, when some 2 million Armenians, subjugated by the Turks, were eliminated through deportation, starvation, and wholesale murder.

With the end of World War I, President Woodrow Wilson, recognizing the necessity of assuring freedom for all peoples of the world, included Armenian independence as one of his Fourteen Points for peace. On May 28, 1918, Armenia proclaimed independence from all alien regimes. This was the culmination of the dream of generations of Armenians over the centuries.

Unfortunately, that dream was sadly short lived as America, in its tragic historical tradition, became the battleground between the Turks and the Soviet army. While Armenians put up considerable resistance to the Turks, they

were not in a position to overcome the Red Army. In December 1920, the Armenian government was forced to submit to Soviet dictates as the only alternative to total destruction.

During 2 years of freedom, Armenians governed themselves proudly in a democratic fashion and established schools and social institutions. Government housing was provided for the tens of thousands of homeless people among their number.

Mr. Speaker, the 2,500,000 Armenians must now live under the Soviet system. The hopes and prayers of free people throughout the world are with the Armenians who want to return to the freedom that they once enjoyed.

OBJECTIONS TO SONNENFELDT CONFIRMATION MUST BE ANSWERED—PART III

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in my previous two insertions concerning the nomination of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt as Under Secretary of the Treasury a major objection to his confirmation related to his alleged leaking of classified information. Directed at one who occupies a highly sensitive position on Mr. Henry Kissinger's National Security Council staff, such an objection cannot be taken lightly.

Another key consideration in the nomination concerns the duties to be performed by Mr. Sonnenfeldt as Under Secretary. In his testimony of May 15, Mr. Sonnenfeldt indicated that he would be a senior adviser to Treasury Secretary Shultz who was recently designated to head an executive branch committee on East-West trade policy. The selection of Mr. Sonnenfeldt for this post was no doubt due in part to his involvement in this area as Mr. Kissinger's senior adviser in East-West trade negotiations.

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington bureau chief of the Des Moines Register, along with George Anthan and James Risser, raised some interesting points recently concerning the Soviet grain deal and Mr. Sonnenfeldt's views on the deal as they were elicited from Senator HARRY BYRD at the hearing. This transaction, it will be remembered, raised so many unanswered questions that Senator HENRY JACKSON and his Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee intend to investigate the deal from top to bottom.

I insert at this point the article from the May 20 issue of the Des Moines Register concerning Mr. Sonnenfeldt and the Soviet grain deal:

[From the Des Moines Register, May 20, 1973]

TIE WHEAT SALE TO ELECTION—NIXON URGED CONCESSIONS TO RUSSIA—IN ORDER TO IMPROVE HIS FARM IMAGE

(By Clark Mollenhoff, George Anthan and James Risser)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Pressure from the White House to complete a grain deal with

the Soviet Union before the 1972 election was a major factor in the U.S. decision to subsidize the sale to Russia with American tax money, Nixon administration sources have told The Register.

An administration official said U.S. negotiators working on the wheat sale last year openly discussed among themselves the fact that President Nixon wanted a deal to be consummated quickly, and that he wanted "reasonable concessions" made to the Russians.

Among concessions granted was a \$500-million line of credit from the U.S. government to the Soviets, and cash subsidies totaling more than \$132 million.

"WORLD PRICE"

Also, the Russians were assured they would have to pay only the so-called "world price" for the grain, as low as \$1.59 a bushel and far below the level the domestic price could be expected to reach under pressure of massive overseas exports of wheat.

A National Security Council source told The Register that the Soviet-American grain deal was outlined by members of the council staff, directed by Presidential adviser Henry Kissinger and by Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz, who went to Russia in April, 1972, to discuss East-West trade.

"We were all very much aware of the President's desire to pull this off before the election," the council official said.

A high official of the National Security Council has acknowledged in a congressional hearing that top-level government negotiators were involved in planning the grain sale to Russia and that the arrangements they made was of financial benefit to the Soviet Union.

The information from the National Security Council source that political pressure resulted in concessions to the Russians is significant because he indicated that a so-called "package" deal was put together.

IMPRESS FARMERS

Up to now it had been understood that the administration had discussed credit terms to enable the Russians to buy feed grain but not cash subsidies to enable them to buy wheat.

National Security Council sources said the wheat deal was seen as a means of impressing farmers by boosting grain prices, as a way to eliminate some government-owned grain stocks and as a method of improving the nation's balance of payments deficit.

But most important, they said, it was seen as a means of boosting the Nixon administration's political image throughout the nations' then-disgruntled agricultural belt.

The sale was hailed last summer by President Nixon as an "historic" event and Secretary Butz said the wheat deal was "good for consumer taxpayers . . . good for American farmers . . . good for labor . . . good for our economy . . ."

Later, however, it became clear that the sale of more than 500 million bushels of wheat and additional millions of bushels of feed grains to the Soviets had resulted in higher food prices in the U.S.

ONLY LARGE SUPPLIES

Also, it became clear that the sale was subsidized even though the U.S. had the only large supplies of wheat available to the Soviets.

Many wheat farmers sold their crops at relatively low prices because the sale was negotiated secretly.

Officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) say they didn't notify farmers and the public of the massive wheat deal because they didn't know of the meetings between the Russians and grain company officials.

But a high official of Continental Grain Co. has stated privately that he did, in fact, notify USDA officials of the sale.

Also, at the same time the USDA officials say they were unaware of the huge deal, the department was agreeing to sell to the export firms record amounts of government-owned grain, needed by the companies to fill their contracts with the Russians.

The USDA also was agreeing to pay subsidies on a record volume of wheat exports, and the agency was receiving daily reports that grain firms were buying wheat in record amounts on the nation's commodity markets.

SECRET REASON?

There is a growing belief among some members of Congress, including Representative John Melcher (Dem., Mont.), that Russians were guaranteed a relatively low price for U.S. wheat in return for aid in settling the Vietnam war and in regard to other international matters and that this agreement, worked out by top-level negotiators, has been kept a closely-held secret.

Melcher said, "This is the only plausible explanation for our paying millions in subsidies when we had the only available supplies."

Senator Dick Clark (Dem., Ia.) has expressed puzzlement over the government's decision to subsidize the Soviet sales. "We had all the bargaining power, yet we ended up paying them tremendous subsidies," he said.

Testimony during Senate hearings last week indicated that Nixon administration officials who negotiated the grain agreement made major errors in dealing with the Soviets, and that these mistakes now have been privately recognized and admitted within the administration.

The testimony came in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on confirmation of Helmut Sonnenfeldt as under-secretary of the treasury. Sonnenfeldt has been Kissinger's senior adviser at the White House, and has been specifically involved in East-West trade negotiations.

SOVIET GAIN

Asked by Senator Harry Byrd (Ind., Va.) if the Soviet Union gained financially from American wheat subsidies, Sonnenfeldt stated:

"I think that is correct. I think our government and everybody else learned from that experience and I don't think that that will ever occur again."

Byrd said, "As a result of that deal the price of wheat went from \$1.63 as I understand it, to \$2.25 by as early as September of last year?"

"I am aware of the figures," Sonnenfeldt said, "I am really not particularly qualified to give you any more specific answers except that it is clear that if the Soviets came into our market again this year, that these kinds, that type of tolerance that occurred last year will not occur again."

He was asked by Byrd: "Do you believe that the interests of the American consumer, the American baking industry, and the American farmer were adequately protected in the Soviet grain sale?"

The Kissinger aide said, "Well, my judgment on that would be that the effects of the grain sale were probably not fully anticipated. The effects on domestic prices, well, I frankly cannot tell you what the effects of some other kinds of arrangement might have been assuming we were going to sell the kind of quantities that we sold to the Soviets."

A 3-YEAR PERIOD

Sonnenfeldt said that U.S. negotiators had agreed to extend to the Russians \$500 million in credit so the Soviets could buy American agricultural commodities over a three-year period. The U.S. was to charge the Russians interest at 6.5 per cent, the going rate charged by the USDA's Commodity Credit Corp.

He said the Russians at first objected to the interest as too high, but that they later agreed to pay it. Sonnenfeldt acknowledged,

however, that 6.5 per cent was less than the interest on borrowed money being paid at that time by the U.S. government.

Sonnenfeldt said that in his job as senior National Security Council adviser he did not assess the impact on the U.S. economy of the Soviet wheat sale. He said that task was left to others.

He said though, that the major increase in grain sales overseas, especially those to Russia, was "a totally new experience and our government was not adequately organized for this new experience."

Sonnenfeldt told the committee that U.S. officials have recognized their mistakes and that in future dealings with Russia and, possibly, with China, "precisely the kind of effects that you are disturbed by, and that I am disturbed by, will be assessed beforehand."

He added, "and these judgments will be made in a systematic way so that we will be negotiating with our eyes fully open."

Sonnenfeldt has maintained publicly that the National Security Council worked to negotiate only the credit arrangements for the Russians, and that the cash deal for wheat—including the millions in government subsidies—was arranged in private meetings between the Soviets and U.S. grain companies.

LEND-LEASE DEBTS

Sonnenfeldt also was questioned by Byrd on the U.S. decision, following talks last year with the Russians, to settle Soviet lend-lease debts with a loss to the U.S. of some \$300 million. Sonnenfeldt defended the agreement as the best that was possible for the U.S. to obtain.

He also was questioned concerning charges more than 10 years ago that he had passed classified documents to foreign agents. Sonnenfeldt denied the charges.

He said that in his new job at the Treasury Department he will concentrate on trade and economic relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

JAMES F. GILMORE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Racine, Wis., Unified PTA Council is dedicating its annual awards dinner on June 6, 1973, to Mr. James F. Gilmore, because of his service to the children of the Racine community. I would like to bring the following article to the attention of my colleagues. It highlights some of the accomplishments of my constituent, Mr. James Gilmore:

JAMES F. GILMORE

James F. Gilmore will retire from the Board of Education in Racine, Wisconsin, after devoting 34 continuous years of service to children and citizens of this area.

Since Mr. Gilmore was first elected to the Racine School Board in 1939, it is estimated that he has attended more than 4,000 committee, special and regular Board meetings. All hours devoted to the public good of the citizens of Racine have been without pay. Board of Education members have never received a salary in Racine.

Mr. Gilmore has served as president of the Board of Education five times and has served in all other offices and chaired all committees of the Board. Since the city of Racine's schools were unified with six other municipalities in 1961, citizens of the United District have okayed the sale of nearly \$25 million in school bonds.

Mr. Gilmore has been instrumental in searching for and selecting responsible, forward-looking educators to lead Racine's schools. Racine was chosen as a Gold Star School System, has an award-winning Instructional Materials Center, won two awards for school design, has had three presidential scholars, and continues to lead in areas of curriculum and individually guided education.

A Racine native, Mr. Gilmore is a 1930 graduate of Washington Park High School and a 1935 graduate of Ripon College. He was employed by Massey-Ferguson in Racine until his retirement early in 1971.

He has also served Racine as a member of the Park and Recreation Commission for 12 years. Mr. Gilmore is one of the founders and a charter member of the Racine Junior Chamber of Commerce, member of the Knights Templar, the Tripoli Shriners and the Wisconsin Consistory 32nd Degree Masons. He is a charter member of UAW local 244 and the Massey-Ferguson Quarter Century Club.

Mr. Gilmore and his wife Jane have two children and five grandchildren.

A MISSION OF MERCY BY THE U.S. AIR FORCE AND COAST GUARD

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, special commendation should be given to the crew of an Air Force "Super Jolly" helicopter, the crews of two Air Force C-130 aircraft and the crew of a Coast Guard cutter. Their heroic deeds constitute a dramatic story.

Many Members of Congress fondly remember Merritt "Mac" Clevenger who ably represented the California Cannerymen League for many years until his retirement. Recently he and his wife Joanne boarded an Orient Overseas freighter for an extended voyage at sea. Approximately 565 miles out of Honolulu, "Mac" suffered a fall in his cabin knocking him unconscious. His condition deteriorated until he lapsed into a coma. The ship's doctor felt that an immediate medical evacuation was necessary to save the patient. An urgent call for help was radioed to the U.S. Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard dispatched its Lockheed C-130 Hercules aircraft to pinpoint the location of the ship. After finding it, the location was radioed to the 76th Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron of the U.S. Air Force. The rescue unit sent two Air Force Lockheed HC-130 Hercules aircraft and one Air Force Sikorsky HH-53 "Super Jolly" helicopter.

It was the first time a helicopter was used for a mission involving so great a distance, a Coast Guard spokesman said. Usually a cutter is sent, but in this case it was necessary to use the fastest helicopter.

During the mission, the helicopter had to refuel in flight three different times. It was equipped with emergency equipment and had an Air Force flight surgeon, Capt. Gerald B. Pees, doctor on board. The HC-130 aircraft were used as escorts for the helicopter and carried

the extra fuel needed for refueling on the long rescue mission.

The helicopter, commanded by Capt. James T. Jewett, lifted off at approximately 9:20 a.m. Tuesday and reached the ship at 1:30 p.m. Because of the tall cargo booms on the ship, the "Super Jolly" was unable to move into a position in which it could transport the patient.

Finally a small life boat was lowered with the patient and his wife aboard. The helicopter then made the successful pick up and returned to Hickam at 8:30 p.m. The patient then was rushed to Tripler Army Medical Center where he underwent neurosurgery.

The copilots of the helicopter were Maj. Richard M. Bigelow and William A. Furst. The flight engineer was T. Sgt. Raymond A. Cook. Also on board the "Super Jolly" were two pararescue technicians, Chief M. Sgt. Clarence R. Boles, 41st ARR Wing, and S. Sgt. Michael E. Watts, 76th ARRS, and Sgt. David G. Lecompte.

It is interesting that the helicopter which bears the designation HH 53 C/Jolly 65 and bears the tail number 363 was a retired Jolly Green Giant used for rescue work in Vietnam and which had participated in the attempted rescue of prisoners of war in North Vietnam at Son Tay. It still bears the bullet holes incurred in that effort.

The crews of the Air Force C-130's also deserve special commendation. Following are the names:

Capt. Danny L. Berry, Capt. Joseph Ryan, Capt. Dennis Higuchi, Capt. David Flegel, Master Sgt. Herbert Anglin, S/Sgt. Gary M. Berger, Master Sgt. William Chapman, S/Sgt. Clarence Powell, S/Sgt. Gary Edwards, S/Sgt. Ronald Rosenow, Sgt. James W. Sargent, Sgt. Karl Froehlich, Major Joe F. Coughran, Capt. Monroe S. Sams, Jr., Capt. Ronald J. Sullivan, Major Walter S. Uchimura, S/Sgt. Norman F. Viveiros, S/Sgt. William J. Heydenreich, Jr., T/Sgt. Donald E. Dills, S/Sgt. James H. Hartman, Sgt. Thomas A. Montgomery, Sgt. David R. Harvey, Sgt. Dan K. Napuunoo, ATC Craig H. Ganson, and Capt. Keith J. Urbach.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that this is the first air refueling of a helicopter under such circumstances. The manner in which it was accomplished is a great credit to the Air Force and the above mentioned crew members. The fact that so many men risked their lives in a mission of mercy is a credit to the services and the country. As a friend of "Mac" and Joanne Clevenger, I wish to add my word of appreciation for a job well done.

UNRAVELING THE MYSTERY OF ENERGY SHORTAGES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a letter-writer to the editor of the Los Angeles Times has done a brilliant job of pinning contributory responsibility for some of the fuel and energy shortages now being experienced in southern California as the consequence of neglected opportuni-

ties to bear a helping hand to avoid them while they were developing. The letter follows, and I hope it will be generally helpful to editorial writers who hope ever to be both omnipotent and oracular:

"THE MYSTERIOUS FUEL SHORTAGE" IN AMERICA

Your editorial (May 9), "The Mysterious Fuel Shortage," asks suspiciously, "Can it be that the American oil industry simply failed to anticipate rising gasoline demand and to provide the refining capacity to meet it?"

Where was The Times when the oil industry was warning, as it did, that the state's failure to establish environmental standards and stick by them without continual changes was making it impossible to plan and design needed new refinery capacity? Did you investigate? Did you join in the warning editorially? Did you help any oil company get a site for a new refinery against environmentalists' opposition?

You point out that the Department of Water and Power has warned of potential electric power rationing in September. What did The Times do to help the department build a nuclear power plant at Malibu that wouldn't depend on unavailable low sulfur oil, which is necessary because of a natural gas shortage? Where is your voice today pointing out what that plant would have meant?

Where was The Times' editorial voice on the insoluble dilemma of power companies that would be excluded from coastal sites if Proposition 20 passed, and were forced to look inland for nearly unavailable cooling water? With Times support, it passed, and power companies, oil companies and every sort of productive enterprise needing ocean access are excluded from coastal sites.

H. L. McMASTERS,
Berkeley.

STUDY OF NATION'S CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM RECOMMENDS CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON LEGISLATION TO REPLACE EXECUTIVE ORDER 11652

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions during the past 2 years I have reported to our colleagues in the Congress by remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many of the revelations of abuses that have and are still taking place under the Nation's security classification system. That system is presently embodied in Executive Order 11652, issued by President Nixon on March 8, 1972. It replaced the almost 20-year-old Executive Order 10501.

The Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee and its predecessor Subcommittee on Government Information, headed for many years by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Moss), has studied the Executive Order classification system since 1956. It has held extensive hearings, conducted detailed investigations, and a number of reports dealing with weaknesses and administrative shortcomings of the security classification system, based on these studies, were

subsequently adopted by the full Government Operations Committee during the late 1950's and early 1960's.

Our subcommittee continued this series of studies by extensive hearings and other investigations that began during the so-called "Pentagon Papers" controversy in June 1971. Other hearings on the classification system were held in May 1972 as part of our overall study of the operation of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

I have reported on these studies periodically in the RECORD remarks. Last March, after news stories had appeared providing details of the draft of the proposed new Executive order on classification, I asked Mr. David Young—the National Security Council official responsible for the draft—for the opportunity for the subcommittee to informally review the draft and to make comments and suggestions on its provisions. Mr. Young refused our request. After the new order was issued in March, I directed the subcommittee staff to make a detailed analysis of its contents. This section-by-section analysis revealed some 11 major defects in the new order, which I reported and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part 7, page 9377.

During our hearings on the new order in May 1972, testimony of administration witnesses made it clear that there was a serious lag in preparing departmental and agency regulations to implement the new order, which was to take effect on June 1, 1972. I therefore urged President Nixon on May 3, 1972, to postpone the effective date of the new order to provide sufficient time for the NSC guidelines and implementing regulations. My urgings were ignored, and the predicted administrative time lag in fully implementing the new order did occur. I earnestly hope that this has not resulted in a compromise of vital national defense and foreign policy secrets and undermine the integrity of our entire classification system.

Any discussion of the Government's classification system, the subject of heated controversy during recent years, must be framed in the larger context of its relationship to our overall national defense and foreign policy operations and its application to existing criminal statutes.

From the earliest period of our Republic, the President and other executive branch officials have limited the dissemination of information affecting defense and foreign policy interests. Few argue that Government should not have such power to safeguard vital military and foreign policy secrets. It is likewise obvious that in a representative system the citizenry must be informed to the maximum extent possible of defense and foreign commitments made by their Government so as to make sound electoral judgments in the selection of public officials.

The classic dilemma is thus posed between the need for governmental secrecy in some vital areas, as weighed against the public's "right to know." This dilemma has been accentuated because America's leadership position in world affairs has imposed severe budgetary demands that require our citizens to

make very real human and economic sacrifices. Superimposed is the increasing difficulty which Congress has encountered in obtaining vital information from the Executive in the defense and foreign policy fields.

If the public has a "right to know," Congress has a constitutional "need to know" as the people's representatives, so that it can act intelligently and responsibly as a coordinate branch of government in investigating, legislating, and appropriating public funds for weapons systems, defense installations, and foreign policy programs.

The classification system, in whichever form it has taken, is an administrative mechanism, applying to Federal employees and military personnel, that assigns certain levels of security protection over various types of sensitive military and foreign policy information, equipment, devices, or other material, the disclosure of which—in the judgment of the classifier—would be in various degrees harmful to the national security. It is presently embodied in Executive Order 11652, issued by President Nixon in March 1972.

Since the Executive Order governing classification procedures does not have the force of law, except for internal administrative purposes, there are no criminal sanctions within the order itself for the unauthorized disclosure of classified information. The major deterrent to such unauthorized disclosure is contained in the criminal penalties attached to the Espionage Act of 1917 and a provision of the Internal Security Act of 1950. However, except for classified information dealing with cryptographic systems or communications intelligence, the Espionage Act provides for certain additional legal requirements to sustain an action for unauthorized disclosure of classified data. Legislation is now pending in Congress that would make it a Federal crime to disclose "classified information to an unauthorized person and to bar as a defense the question as to whether the particular document may have been improperly classified." Many experts feel that the enactment of this bill, as drafted by the Justice Department, would result in an American equivalent of the British "Official Secret Act."

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Government Operations Committee unanimously adopted our bipartisan report on the security classification system, based on our 1971 and 1972 hearings and studies. It is House Report 93-221 and is entitled "Executive Classification of Information—Security Classification Problems Involving Exemption (b) (1) of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552)." Because of the increasing attention being focused on this important subject, I commend it to our colleagues for careful study.

It traces the historical development of the current classification system to protect the Nation's military and foreign policy secrets from the pre-World War I period to the present. It also reviews the work of the Coolidge Committee and the Wright Commission as well as the investigations and recommendations of our committee during the late 1950's for improving classification procedures—recommendations which, for the large

part, went unheeded by the massive classification bureaucracy.

The report cites numerous examples of abuses of the present classification system, massive overclassification, the accumulation of hundreds of millions of documents bearing classification markings, and the resulting costs of well over \$100 million annually to safeguard, handle, store, transport, and declassify such material.

The report recommends that Congress consider and enact legislation to overhaul the classification system and to make it more effective and workable, to reduce its costs, and to preserve the integrity of truly vital state secrets.

Much of the committee's inquiry centered on Executive Order 11652, issued by President Nixon in March 1972, and labeled the "first major overhaul of the classification system since 1953." The report details "serious shortcomings and major defects" of the new order—"some inherent in the language of its provisions, and some in the procedural aspects involving its design, promulgation, and implementation." Among the specific criticisms directed at the new order in the committee's report are:

First. Lack of sufficiently strong penalties against overclassification;

Second. Lack of assurance to guarantee Congress the full authority to exercise properly its oversight and investigative responsibilities over the operation of the new order;

Third. Loopholes in the mandatory review provisions affecting the declassification of exempt classified material;

Fourth. Overly long-time periods affecting the downgrading and declassification procedures;

Fifth. Administrative time lag in the implementation of the new order;

Sixth. Conflicting interpretations of certain language in the new order by administration witnesses; and

Seventh. Shortcomings in procedures to make 20- to 30-year-old classified information available to historians and researchers.

In calling for the replacement of the Executive order approach to the security classification system, the committee said:

A statutory system should be established, perhaps as an amendment to the Freedom of Information Act, to make it clear that Congress intends a proper balancing between the safeguarding of information classified under strict guidelines to protect vital defense and foreign policy secrets (on the one hand), and the right of the American public to know how the affairs of their government are being conducted (on the other). Congress should also take this necessary action to assure maximum credibility of all citizens in our governmental institutions and in our elected and appointed officials.

NORTH CHICAGO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT KATZENMAIER RETIRES

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the great educators of the 13th Congress-

sional District, Arthur J. Katzenmaier, superintendent of school district No. 64, North Chicago, Ill., is retiring at the close of the present school year.

Since his appointment as school superintendent in 1944, the enrollments of students in the North Chicago school district have increased eightfold. In addition, the quality of education provided for this heterogeneous student body has improved through many innovative programs which Superintendent Katzenmaier has advocated.

An experienced schoolteacher and one who has remained in intimate contact with students and parents throughout his active career, Arthur Katzenmaier has earned the respect and admiration of the community he serves.

Mr. Speaker, I am suspicious that retirement from this position will not mean that Art Katzenmaier will retire from the scene. Instead, it is quite likely that he will continue an active life of service—utilizing his many talents and benefiting citizens, young and old—as he has in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to enjoy a close friendship with Art Katzenmaier and to have worked with him in behalf of education for the students of North Chicago during my service in the Congress.

I extend to Art Katzenmaier my congratulations on a job well done and wish for him and his wife, Genevieve, happiness and good health in the years to come.

CHEMICAL WARFARE (IV)

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the United States may have started something in Southeast Asia that nobody has foreseen to this day.

I now submit for the attention of my colleagues, an article that appeared in the April 6 Science magazine entitled "Herbicides: Agent Orange Stockpile May Go to the South Americans," written by Deborah Shapley:

HERBICIDES: AGENT ORANGE STOCKPILE MAY GO TO THE SOUTH AMERICANS

(By Deborah Shapley)

Since early this year, the U.S. government has been toying with the idea of giving or selling its surplus stockpiles of Agent Orange, a military herbicide that was withdrawn from use in Vietnam in 1970 after concern was raised about its teratogenic properties, to Brazil, Venezuela, Paraguay, and possibly other South American governments.

The U.S. Air Force has a surplus stockpile of 2,338,900 gallons of Agent Orange of which the original purchase price was \$16,540,000. Some of it contains as much as 28 times the maximum acceptable safety limit of dioxins, a chemical which is one of the most potent teratogens known. Apart from the returning prisoners of war, these herbicides are perhaps the most politically sensitive property the United States has retrieved from the Southeast Asia battlefield.

Now, thanks to two enterprising businessmen, the Agent Orange may be used to flood the Latin American herbicide markets in the name of international development and improving the U.S. balance of payments. Jerome

F. Harrington, president of IRI Research Institute, Inc., a New York firm and one of the two which have proposed the deal, says that the Agent Orange could be diluted and the barrels could be repainted (to conceal their old military markings) and then sold to farmers for prices as low as \$5 per gallon, or a third of the going price of herbicide there of \$15 per gallon. Even undiluted, the total military surplus would net \$11.5 million, more than this country's herbicide sales in South America in 1971. "It would be developing markets. . . . We're beating swords into plowshares," he says.

The implications of the plan are two. First is the fact that Agent Orange was withdrawn from Vietnam after reports of a possibly worrisome number of stillbirths and defective fetuses in provinces where the herbicide had been sprayed intensively. Since there may have been a threat to the South Vietnamese, presumably there may be some risk to the South Americans were it used there. A second implication is that despite its obvious agricultural utility as a brush killer, Agent Orange is also a proven military weapon. Sources admit that once sold, there would be little further control; there is a remote chance that the recipient countries could use it against guerrillas, or, in the case of Brazil, against the natives in the northwestern portions of the country which the government is trying to "clear" for development. (The Portuguese and South Africans already buy U.S. herbicides commercially.)

Agent Orange is not exactly milk or honey. It is made up of two chemicals: 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D. The former contains a manufacturing impurity called dioxin, which is highly teratogenic; 2,4,5-T is also somewhat teratogenic itself. In fact, after a lengthy controversy, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has banned most crop related uses of 2,4,5-T; and rangeland use may also be canceled. As for 2,4-D, the other half of Agent Orange, there is indication that this too is teratogenic, but the issue has not yet been resolved. Samuel S. Epstein of Case Western Reserve University Medical School and an environmental toxicologist who has written on dioxin problems, says of the proposed Latin American deal: "This is a perfectly preposterous idea."

At the moment, the main thing standing in the way of the transaction is EPA action on an Air Force application to register most of its Agent Orange for domestic U.S. use. The State Department has ruled that it will not consider foreign sales unless EPA approves the registration. So far the Air Force has encouraged the two businessmen with the proviso that the recipients accept the herbicide "with open eyes" as to the dioxin problem. One reason for the Air Force's friendliness to the plan is that the stocks, of which 1.5 million gallons are in the open air in Johnston Island in the North Pacific and the remainder largely in Gulfport, Mississippi, are in barrels that are rusting and cost up to \$400,000 yearly to maintain. Hence the hurry. (Last year, the Air Force filed a draft environmental impact statement proposing to incinerate the stocks at Saugey, Illinois, and Deer Park, Texas. But the plan ran into opposition as being technically unsound, environmentally dangerous, and expensive. It was eventually dropped.)

In January of this year, Air Force Deputy for Supply and Maintenance Lloyd K. Moseman, II, was approached by Arnold Livingston, chief officer of Blue Spruce International, a firm in New Gretna, New Jersey, with a proposal that the Air Force turn over the Agent Orange to him and he would distribute it in South America. Moseman says he told Livingston that the Air Force could not hand over its property to a private concern. Livingston then approached Harrington of IRI, a nonprofit firm which was founded with Rockefeller family money in 1950 and which runs experimental agricultural pro-

grams in South America. Harrington and Livingston apparently then made a variety of proposals, including trying to get officials in Brazil, Venezuela, and Paraguay to express interest directly through U.S. government channels. The Agency for International Development (AID) also was involved in the discussions.

"I said yes, that, if the countries wanted it and have open eyes as to the dioxin content, we would be amenable because it would be a heck of a lot cheaper" than incineration, says Moseman. "I said we would be amenable to requests on the basis."

However, Moseman also decided to seek the advice of the State Department—through Thomas Pickering, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs—and of the EPA by filing an application to register the Agent Orange for commercial use in the United States. The State Department keeps a list of munitions whose export is considered sensitive and which includes "any chemical agent adapted by the military for use against plants."

Pickering ruled in early February that State would not formally take up the Agent Orange export problem until after EPA had ruled on the application for domestic use. "We would never do overseas anything we were not prepared to do at home," said a State Department official. "Until the EPA thing is worked out we are not in a position to decide. I regard this as a nonproblem for us."

Thus, whether Harrington and Livingston succeed in making a deal now depends on EPA's Associate Director of Pesticide Registration, Douglas Campt. His office is studying the application, which covers Agent Orange formulations having 0.4 part per million (ppm) dioxin content. The stockpile of 800,000 gallons at Gulfport ranges from 0.4 to 14 ppm in dioxin: that at Johnston Island is not labeled barrel by barrel, so the Air Force does not know its dioxin content. A random sampling, however, showed an average dioxin content of 1.9 ppm. Moseman admits each barrel would have to be sampled separately.

At present, EPA has banned virtually all uses of 2,4,5-T, except for rangeland, pastures, and right-of-way clearings. Permitted dioxin concentrations are 0.1 ppm for new herbicides and 0.5 ppm for stocks already manufactured.

AGENT ORANGE'S IMPACT

Epstein and others were queried about the possible environmental and teratogenic effects of spraying. Agent Orange, as Harrington has proposed, by diluting it with diesel oil and using it only to keep existing rangeland cleared. Harrington says it would increase Brazil's beef production by \$400 million per year, and open new inroads for U.S. chemical firms on the Latin herbicide market, where German and Japanese firms compete with the United States. Harrington indicated that to keep rangeland clear, repeated applications would be needed. (Interestingly, EPA's current rule permitting rangeland uses for 2,4,5-T in this country carries the following warning: "Do not graze meat animals on treated areas within two weeks of slaughter.")

As to the utility of the 2,4-D in Agent Orange, the Dow Chemical Company's Ag-Organics Department spokesman, James Hansen, said 2,4-D was highly effective. "You can just stand in a vineyard and think of 2,4-D and the leaves will wither," he quipped.

Epstein, however, listed a variety of problems, of which the possibility of human birth defects was the most obvious, if the herbicide concentrates in human food or water supplies, either inadvertently or through misuse. Dioxin, he said, is highly stable in the environment and would persist "up to a year or so." It is known to be picked

up by plants such as soybeans and oats. There would also be the possibility of contamination of watersheds in range areas. Finally, Epstein noted that, in primitive agricultural situations, burning is a common technique for clearing land. "You have to assume that anything released into the environment will be burned," he said. Combustion of shrub or brush sprayed with herbicides containing 2,4,5-T, may produce additional dioxin in the surrounding environment, he says.

Proper application of the Agent Orange could be insured, according to Harrington, by an IRI of AID program of "education and demonstration" to the farmers. But the Dow spokesman admitted that, in general, "Once you sell anything you lose control. . . . Only education and reformulation," could prevent misuse. "All these chemicals are possibly misused," he admitted.

The difficulties of controlling agricultural uses of the Agent Orange obviously are small compared to the problem of prohibiting the material from being appropriated by the military in recipient countries and used as weapons of war. One herbicide expert, who asked not to be named, pointed out that the Brazilian government is currently carrying out what in his view is "one of the largest paramilitary operations against an indigenous people anywhere in the world," in its efforts to "open" the Amazon Basin in northwestern parts of the country and relocate the native populations who live there.

He said that, originally Agent Orange was developed in World War II specifically for crop destruction and used for this purpose both by the British in Malaysia and by the United States in Vietnam. Hence, it is historically suited to the Brazilians' "paramilitary" activities.

Epstein also expressed concern about the possible military uses of Agent Orange and the world example the United States would be setting in transferring the weapon to foreign nations.

Clearly we would be turning over to other countries materials which can be used for a wide range of purposes, including some military ones.

It is tantamount to the encouragement of chemical warfare. It is tacitly permitting the very, very critical possibility that in the hands of foreign countries it will be used by the United States in Vietnam.

One cannot exclude the the significant possibility that the example of the United States in Vietnam will be mimicked. I view the whole thing with horror.

Overshadowing the possible South American sale, as well as even the forthcoming EPA decision on domestic uses, is Agent Orange's prior history in Vietnam. Moseman warned in an interview, "Don't forget Vietnam. Never forget that. It's the overriding issue that clouds this thing. Anything that has to do with it is suspect." The State Department spokesman said the same thing, but in State's departmentese: "The political and psychological concerns associated with its use in Vietnam are very real."

Harrington, who is hopeful for an agreement with the Air Force, ultimately, was asked whether he felt sensitive about the fact that the herbicide was used in Vietnam. Citing his personal experience as a platoon leader in World War II who "used to clear out the woods after the tanks," Harrington said he thought the herbicide had been used in Vietnam to "save American lives." He cited the reaction of a South American government official who was asked whether he felt the Vietnam connection was a drawback and retorted: "What do you mean war materials? . . . The only thing we're fighting is the brush."

Mr. Speaker, we must immediately move in the direction of effectively controlling our poisonous chemicals. I will

soon introduce in the House of Representatives two proposals designed to do so.

The Herbicide Export Control Act of 1973 will halt the exportation of 2,4,4-T herbicides, the main ingredient in Agent Orange.

The Chemical Warfare Prevention Act of 1973 will ban the exportation of all herbicides to Portugal and South Africa. These two nations are conducting chemical aggressions against the African citizens of Angola and Mozambique.

I welcome the support and cosponsorship of my colleagues in these legislative efforts.

THE DYING ORPHANS OF VIETNAM

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation to facilitate ending the redtape now required in the adoption of American-fathered Vietnamese orphans. Many thousands of these American orphans face death in crowded, filthy conditions in Vietnam.

They need our help now or they may not survive. On January 29, 1973, I reintroduced H.R. 3159. This legislation has 32 cosponsors as indicated on H.R. 6793, H.R. 6794, and H.R. 7566. These bills would authorize special immigrant visas for Vietnamese orphans, one of whose parents is an American. This would clear away much of the existing redtape that has stymied efforts of American families to adopt these children.

The May 28, issue of Newsweek contained informative articles on the tragic plight of "Vietnam's War-Torn Children." I wish that my colleagues could all see the accompanying photographs of these children living in squalid orphanages. While that is not possible, I am inserting the articles in the RECORD to help draw attention to the need for congressional action on behalf of these innocent victims of an unhappy era. Many American families want to extend a hand of love and consideration. I hope that the Congress will act quickly to make this possible.

The articles follow:

[From Newsweek magazine, May 28, 1973]
VIETNAM'S WAR-TORN CHILDREN

(By Loren Jenkins)

She was 13 years old, a frail and shy child named Huynh Thi Chi. Along with her parents and six brothers and sisters, she lived in the village of Dien Bang where she tended the family vegetable patch, helped her mother clean house and, on occasion, plowed the rice fields with her father's water buffalo. Then, on a hot and steamy day in 1968, the tranquil world of Huynh Thi Chi vanished in a blinding flash. Artillery shells began to fall as Chi was working in the fields, and when the barrage ended she lay in the paddy, bleeding and paralyzed from the waist down. Last week, with the aid of stiff metal braces and crutches, Chi stood on the veranda of a Saigon home where she lives with a dozen other paraplegic children. Casting her coal-black eyes to the ground, she whispered: "I do not even know which side fired the shell

that left me like this. All I want and hope is to try to live again."

Hope is a rare quality in today's Vietnam—almost as rare as a child who has not been scarred, one way or another, by the war. Unlike conventional military conflicts, the Vietnamese war knew no fixed boundaries or front lines, and it made little distinction between soldier and civilian, adult and child. Although the pain the war inflicted upon the children is impossible to calculate statistically, the estimates are immense.

Foreign medical experts say there are hundreds of thousands of maimed and crippled youngsters like Chi, children who not only suffer their physical agony but face a life of isolation in a society that has traditionally turned its back on the weak and disabled. At least 800,000 children—and possibly as many as 1.5 million—have lost one or both of their parents to the war. While some have been taken in by relatives, countless others have been cast adrift in festering refugee camps, jammed into filthy and overcrowded orphanages or simply left to wander the streets and beg or steal. As one American doctor says, "It is a tragedy of life and limbs whose magnitude we simply will never know."

Some 8 million Vietnamese—nearly half the nation's population—are under the age of 15, yet the government in Saigon allocates only 1 per cent of its national budget for the care and rehabilitation of its crippled, diseased or orphaned children. "Orphans are not producers," Maj. Gen. Pham Van Dong, Minister for Veteran Affairs, explains. "They are spenders at a time when we need productive returns on our investment." The American Government is also niggardly when it comes to contributing funds for the children of Vietnam—despite the fact that many of those children fell victim to U.S. bombs and others are the illegitimate offspring of American servicemen. Some private American agencies have tried to ease the burden by arranging adoptions of Vietnamese children.

For the children injured by the war, medical facilities are antiquated and inadequate. The country suffers from a woeful lack of trained doctors—only one for every 8,000 hospital patients. "Some of the hospitals here," one U.S. official in Saigon said to me, "would make Dr. Schweitzer's African clinic look like Walter Reed hospital. As for doctors, the Vietnamese Army has drafted many and hundreds of others have gone abroad either to avoid military service or because the money is much better."

One bright spot in the medical picture is the modern 54-bed plastic-surgery hospital in Saigon set up by Dr. Arthur Barsky, a physician noted for his successful treatment of disfigured survivors of the Hiroshima A-bomb. The second-floor ward of the Barsky hospital is crowded with children, either waiting for their operations or just recovering from them.

Fourteen-year-old Le Thi Ut, a tiny girl with a body seared by flame and torn by shrapnel, is about to undergo yet another of the dozen operations she must have. She sits in bed with her right leg and left arm in splints and scarlet-red graft scars still healing on her thighs and hips. "I was out working in the fields," she told me, "when I found some bullets and grenades lying around. I wanted to get rid of them because I did not like war. I threw them into the fire but they exploded." Le Thi Bo, 13, was playing in her home in Saigon when a bullet tore her chin away. When I say her she had just been wheeled out of surgery after the seventh operation to graft a rib onto her jaw to rebuild her chin. "It is horrible what has happened to some of these children," says Dr. Caesar Arrunategui, "but you would be surprised at how much we can do to fix

them up so they will not have to go through life thinking they are freaks."

FLOTSAM

Not all the children can be fixed up. One needs only to step outside the door of the venerable Continental Palace Hotel in Saigon to see the youthful human flotsam that the last decade of war has cast adrift. Ragged children of all ages and sizes—some orphaned, some maimed—swarm through the streets scraping a pittance by shinning shoes or washing cars or selling garlands of jasmine. Some just beg; others steal or become prostitutes—and some, even the youngest, have turned to pushing drugs.

Cau is a veteran of the streets, a tiny 8-year-old who has been selling peanuts at the Continental Place's veranda bar since she was 3. For Cau there has never been a childhood, and it shows in her hardened face and eyes which hardly ever reveal even the hint of a smile or a sign of warmth. She does not know her surname—when I tried to ask her about herself and her life, she just shrugged, looked blank and said in nasal English: "Buy peanuts, Joe?"

Among the forlorn pack of street urchins, there is a sad and haunting unwillingness to talk about the past—if they remember it. To many, the past is only something to erase from their minds; to forget is to escape. Ten-year-old Doung would only tell me his name and age. He would not say how he had lost one leg, or how he got the napalm burns that scar his remaining leg and both his arms. He lives on the street and sleeps on the sidewalk, hoping that the horde of rats that infest Saigon will not bother him. When I asked Doung how he was wounded, he choked back tears and said, "I do not want to talk to anyone about it."

Other children have been so traumatized by their experiences they cannot recall what made them what they are. Nguyen Thanh Son is a tall, handsome boy of 12 whom I saw one day standing by himself at the tawdry Go Vap orphanage in the town of Tu Duc, gazing at the world through his one good eye. The other is just a gaping socket. At first, he would not reply at all to my questions, but finally he kicked the dirt and said, "I don't know what happened. I have been this way since I was 2."

As Son and I talked, other children among the orphanage's 200 charges sat in the dusty courtyard unattended. There are supposed to be six nuns to care for the children at Go Vap, but the only person around when I visited was the housekeeper. The children, most of them barefoot and in rags, many with sores or obvious maladies, simply wandered aimlessly with no guidance. In the nursery, emaciated and malnourished babies lay in the cribs in diapers made from old sacks, once used to hold rice donated by the U.S. Go Vap is not unique; almost all of the 133 "approved" orphanages are squalid, poorly equipped, understaffed and overcrowded—worse than any Charles Dickens described. "The state some of the babies are in when they are brought here is simply incredible," said a nurse at one orphanage. "And we have only enough staff to change their diapers and feed them." Too often, the children seem to be little more than swollen bellies carried on stalks of legs—and the mortality rate ranges between 50 and 70 per cent.

BURDEN

In part, the tragic condition of Vietnam's orphanages stems from an Oriental belief that it is the responsibility of relatives—not strangers—to care for parentless children. "We intentionally do not want to build more orphanages," says Tran Ngion Phieu, the Minister of Social Welfare, "because we want the people themselves to take care of the children." Many orphans are indeed being tended by relatives—but U.S. Agency for International Development officials say that

at least 150,000 of these are living in "severely disadvantaged" conditions and urgently need the kind of care and medical attention that impoverished relatives cannot provide. However laudable the government's child-care philosophy may be in principle, the fact remains that in Vietnam today the people cannot—or will not—assume the extra burden of caring for the children who need help.

Perhaps the children who suffer the most as a result are the 25,000 mixed-blood babies, mostly the offspring of American GI's. (Again, accurate statistics are not available; one American foundation official told me there could be as many as 100,000 such children.) "These are the forgotten souls of the Vietnam war," says Robert G. Trott, director of CARE in Vietnam. "When the soldiers left, the money that these children's fathers—or friends of their fathers—had provided left with them."

Many of the mixed-blood babies are half-black and, despite the Saigon government's official insistence that discrimination does not exist in Vietnam, Vietnamese readily admit that they consider the black babies "inferior." Even those who love and take care of the black babies worry about their future in Vietnam. Mrs. Vo Thi Nen, who has cared for her daughter's black baby since the child's mother died, told me: "He is too different from the other children in our community. I think he would be better off in the United States."

RESCUERS

The Saigon government does not agree. Vietnamese policy is to discourage adoptions by non-Vietnamese—a policy that Saigon implements by entangling adoption papers in mounds of red tape. The feeling that Vietnamese children should be raised in Vietnamese society certainly has merit. But as Elsie Weaver, of the World Vision child-care agency in Vietnam, notes, "The question is not whether a child will be better off being raised in his own culture. The choice is not there. I see so many babies in orphanages who are simply going to die unless somebody rescues them." The ideal rescuers, the Vietnamese, do not seem to be up to the task—in part because of their own poverty, in part because of their demoralized state of mind. "To survive, Vietnam has had to rely on negative values: corruption, graft, self-interest," says Dr. Olivetti Nikolajczak, the only child psychologist in Vietnam. "Morality has simply disappeared in much of the society."

To be sure, Washington has funneled massive amounts of aid to Saigon, and Nixon Administration officials point out that the U.S. is spending some \$20 million this year on "children-related programs." But virtually all of that money goes for general-welfare programs, with only \$1.1 million used directly to benefit the neediest children—the orphans, the crippled, the maimed. And that sum is considerably diluted as it trickles down through the corruption-riddled Vietnamese bureaucracy. "What surpasses surprise is the insensitivity of our government," said Dr. James R. Dumpson of Fordham University, who recently completed a visit to Vietnam to study postwar humanitarian problems. "There are simply a large number of children for whom [Americans] share a responsibility—who desperately need our help—help which is not now forthcoming." If that help does not come from the United States, it may not come at all.

A NEW FAMILY FOR DUONG MUOI

(NOTE.—Shortly after he arrived in Saigon in late 1969 to join the Newsweek bureau, correspondent Paul Brinkley-Rogers and his wife, Kathleen, began to explore the possibility of adopting a Vietnamese war orphan. Now reporting from the magazine's Tokyo bureau, Brinkley-Rogers filed this personal ac-

count of the Americanization of Duong Muoi, who has since become Sarah Brinkley-Rogers.)

(By Paul Brinkley-Rogers)

A hundred ragged kids surged toward us as Kathleen and I entered the Viet-Hoa Sino-Vietnamese Orphanage in Saigon. They broke into a rhythmic chant that we couldn't understand. Some of the nimble ones clawed their way up my trouser legs and wiggled onto my back and arms; in a moment, I was immobilized by a half-dozen kids clinging to me. They knew exactly why we had come to Viet-Hoa: to adopt a child. We could see desperation in their faces. None of them smiled but their eyes pleaded: "Take me, take me."

We went up and down the rows of metal-ribbed cribs and saw scores of infants lying sick and injured. "How about this one?" we asked Sister Robert du Sacré-Coeur, the dedicated and determined Vietnamese nun in charge of Viet-Hoa. "Polio," she replied. "And this one, Sister?" "Retarded." "This cute little boy?" "TB." Twenty-five children are abandoned there each week, and we wondered why the orphanage was not inundated with kids. "God is fair," the sister said quietly. "The same number of children die here each week."

Then we saw Duong Muoi, age eleven months. She was flopped over on her face, as if she had no spine. She could neither sit up nor grasp anything with her hands. We were told that Duong Muoi had been brought to Viet-Hoa nine months earlier by her mother, who already had twelve other children. Because the baby was very ill, the orphanage sent her to a Saigon hospital. She remained there, half forgotten, until she was covered with bedsores and rat bites. When Duong Muoi returned to Viet-Hoa, she bore a wicked-looking 2-inch scar on her backside from rat bites, large indentations from wounds in both legs and a host of tiny pits and scars all over her body. When we first met, her face was completely expressionless—except for a pair of huge, brown eyes that followed us as we moved around the nursery.

Less than a week later, Kathleen returned to Viet-Hoa and brought Duong Muoi home. We put a pink ribbon in her hair, dressed her in a smock and tried to sit her up on our couch. She fell over. But with Kathleen filling Duong Muoi with U.S. baby formula supplied by an American doctor, and our Chinese maid and Vietnamese cook filling the baby with protein-rich fish sauce, Duong Muoi was sitting up in a few weeks. Soon, she was smiling too.

LUCKY BREAKS

But our efforts to adopt Duong Muoi turned into a nightmare of complexity. It took months to obtain the adoption papers, then a passport and exit visa for Duong Muoi and then a U.S. entry visa on top of those. We had some lucky breaks. By chance, we were in Guam when a special U.S. Federal court was holding naturalization hearings. Without going through a customary five-year waiting period, Duong Muoi was made an American citizen on the spot.

We gave our daughter the name Sarah, which to our minds seemed to fit her friendly and inquisitive nature, and the Vietnamese middle name Thuy-Nga—"beautiful moon"—which fitted her Vietnamese soul. She seemed to possess a desperate need to learn and was talking before she was standing. When she began to stand, we discovered that she could not put her left heel to the ground because wounds had shortened her calf muscle. A British medical team in Saigon did a muscle-lengthening operation. And last week in a Tokyo hospital, Sarah underwent a second operation. She is doing fine, though she now faces the unhappy prospect of several months in and out of casts.

Friends sometimes ask us if we feel differently about Sarah than we do about Chip, our own natural son who was born after we adopted Sarah. Our immediate response was "no," and it still is. No one has ever asked us if adopting Sarah has given us any kind of special satisfaction. It has. But we remember the orphanages of Saigon, where there are still thousands of kids like Sarah who have been abandoned because of the war. That memory doesn't give us any satisfaction at all.

HOW TO ADOPT A VIETNAMESE

Last year, almost a thousand Vietnamese children were adopted by non-Vietnamese families. Of this number, fewer than 400 were adopted by Americans, chiefly because of the complexities involved in the adoption process on both sides of the Pacific. Nevertheless, an increasing number of Americans are interested in adopting a Vietnam war orphan. Here is a guide to how to go about it:

CHILDREN

There are some 20,000 children in licensed orphanages in South Vietnam. There are also an estimated 100,000 parentless children in refugee camps, resettlement sites or roaming the streets of Saigon and other cities. Not all of them are available for adoption, however, and in every case surviving relatives must be given the first chance to adopt the child.

ELIGIBILITY

Americans who wish to adopt a Vietnamese child must satisfy South Vietnamese, U.S. and state adoption laws. The South Vietnamese laws are particularly stringent, requiring that both parents be over 35, have been married for at least ten years and have no children. However, a loophole allows President Nguyen Van Thieu to waive the requirements of the law—and he has done so on quite a few occasions in the past. Many of the orphanages in South Vietnam are Roman Catholic and are reluctant to turn over children to families of other faiths.

PROCEDURES

Local adoption agencies in the U.S. investigate applicants to determine whether they are suited to become adoptive parents. These agencies then make recommendations to three American agencies authorized by the South Vietnamese Government to handle such adoptions: Travelers Aid International Social Service of America, New York City; the Holt Adoption Program, Eugene, Ore., and Friends of Children of Vietnam, Boulder, Colo. Only these three agencies can make all the necessary legal arrangements in South Vietnam, handle the paper work required in the U.S. and—if all goes well—arrange to transport the child to its new home in the U.S.

COST

Fees vary from agency to agency and according to the income of the prospective parents. But the average cost—which includes the agency's processing fee, the legal fee and the price of air transportation—is a bit more than \$1,000. Some of the agencies charge low-income families only minimal fees.

WAITING TIME

Due to red tape in Saigon and archaic South Vietnamese adoption laws, it used to take an average of two years to complete the adoption process. Things have been speeded up somewhat in recent months, but it still takes a year in most cases. For those Americans who wish to adopt half-black children, the process is considerably easier, since the agencies are finding it difficult to find adoptive parents for them. Families willing to adopt a handicapped child automatically go to the head of the line.

THE CONDITION OF FARMWORKERS AND SMALL FARMERS IN 1972

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the National Sharecroppers Fund recently published a report by its executive director, James M. Pierce, entitled "The Condition of Farmworkers and Small Farmers in 1972."

The report is factual, concise, and revealing. It presents evidence of the systematic phaseout of small farms in favor of the large corporate agribusinesses. It catalogs a dismal record of disservice by the Federal Government to the small farmers and farmworkers—a record including labor exploitation, rampant racial discrimination, abuse of farm children, and inadequate housing, health, and educational services. The report also discloses how Federal agricultural policies are primarily for the benefit and growth of the huge corporate farming operations.

I commend this report to the Members of Congress, and urge that special attention be given to its recommendations for comprehensive legislative solutions to the problems faced by small farmers and farmworkers. As the report concludes:

A continued push can break the dominance of agribusiness and agrigovernment, preserve rural life as an option for all Americans, provide an abundance of food produced in harmony with sound environmental practices, and contribute to a better rural and urban America.

Following are excerpts of the report:

THE CONDITION OF FARMWORKERS AND SMALL FARMERS

(Report to the National Board by James M. Pierce, executive director National Sharecroppers Fund and Rural Advancement Fund)

"Had me a farm sitting pretty on the hill. But, if you look, you'll see it ain't there still."—The Pigeon Song "America"

In early January, 1973, a United States Congressman, reflecting on the latest incursions of agribusiness and the overall state of American agriculture, called for legislation protecting the family farmer as an endangered species. As in every year since 1940, the number of family farmers decreased—by 44,700 in 1972. Over 850 a week went out of business in 1972, and for every six or seven farms that folded, one small rural business closed its doors. Farmland communities across the nation disappeared as 800,000 Americans left rural areas in 1972 for urban and suburban life. For those left behind, the millions of migratory workers, small farmers, and hired farmworkers, it is more of the same—low wages, high unemployment, shabby housing, and poverty.

Nationally, some 60 percent (4.8 million units) of all substandard housing is in the countryside. Yet, because of current preoccupation with urban problems, less than 25 percent of all federal housing has gone to rural areas.

Fifty percent of the nation's poor live in rural areas, and 70 percent of the rural poor struggle to survive on less than \$2,000 per year. Some 1,072,000 small farmers, almost half of America's 2.7 million farmers, earned less than \$2,500 in 1972. The average annual wage for 270,000 migratory laborers was \$1,-

830, while the average hired farmworker earned \$3,170. All these earnings figures are well below the federal poverty standard.

These are the human costs of the complex \$130 billion-a-year American food industry—the nation's largest employer, employing one out of every seven Americans.

"Agricultural policy should be directed toward maintaining agriculture as a viable industry and not as a way of life."—Young Executives Committee of USDA, 1972.

Sitting atop America's largest industry in the United States Department of Agriculture—83,000 employees spread across the land, in 16,000 offices, with an \$11 to \$12 billion annual budget. Within this bureaucracy is a group of young USDA officials called the Young Executives Committee, established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1727 of April 26, 1971. Late in May, 1972, a strategy paper, *New Directions for U.S. Agricultural Policy*, prepared by the Young Executives Committee, surfaced in Washington and gave nightmares to many a farm leader.

With computer-like indifference, the Committee concluded that "the number of farms or the farm population is irrelevant except as these influence performance of the agriculture industry." The study further recommended a phase-out of all farm price-support programs, including loans and purchases. As a result of this phase-out, a \$6 billion decline in farm income was forecast. To meet the food and fiber requirements of the nation in a more effective and efficient fashion, the Young Executives speculated on the reduction of America's farms from 2.7 million to 600,000. These 600,000, of course, would be highly mechanized efficient business operations, while the other 2.1 million presumed inefficient ex-farmers would be shunted off to non-farm employment or perhaps provided for by a family assistance plan for busted farmers.

Although Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Richard Lyng stated that the report had "no official status," its proposals are markedly similar to the phase-outs and cutbacks ordered by Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz in late December, and to the Administration's proposed 1973 agricultural budget.

"If rural revitalization is to be achieved, a comprehensive federal policy must be established and implemented..."—Senator John L. McClellan.

In the absence of a coherent comprehensive rural policy, the federal government provides a range of services, or disservices, to small farmers and farm laborers. On the one hand the federal government offers price support and crop subsidies, and yet, through a federally-funded 38-state network of farm labor offices, workers are knowingly referred to farms that violate minimum federal standards for housing, sanitary conditions, and wages. Even those federal programs specifically charged with the responsibility of improving the lives of migrant and seasonal farmworkers have been found wanting.

A General Accounting Office report published in February, 1973, declared the programs of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity had had little appreciable impact on the lives of millions of farmworkers. The report noted that while the government had spent in excess of \$650 million in grants and loans to individuals and organizations working with migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the areas of housing, health, manpower training, and education, the farmworkers themselves were for the most part still ill housed, poorly educated, and untrained and received inadequate medical treatment.

Despite a Department of Agriculture estimate that 800,000 fewer farmworkers will be required by 1975, the report noted, federal efforts to retrain workers for non-agricultural

employment, where such programs existed, were not effective; for the most part, retraining projects did not exist at all.

Incredibly, in fiscal years 1966 through 1971 the Farmers Home Administration spent only \$17 million of the \$66 million authorized for its housing loan program. And, during the same fiscal years, the Farmers Home Administration spent only \$15 million of the \$19 million of grant funds appropriated for housing. When questioned by the Government Accounting Office as to why the money was not spent for housing, Farmers Home administrators, at both county and national levels, stated that they made little or no effort to promote improvement in farmworker housing; it was up to the community to seek out the Farmers Home Administration programs, and no funding initiative was taken until a sponsor requested a project.

If the housing, education, health, and job training programs have had limited impact in the past, these programs will be fortunate to survive in the future. Beginning in late December, 1972, the Nixon Administration announced sweeping budget cutbacks aimed at dismantling much of the social legislation of the 1960s. All housing subsidy funds for the Farmers Home Administration and Housing and Urban Development have been frozen; the Office of Economic Opportunity is to be abolished; job training programs are reduced; farm subsidy payments are phased out. The elimination of the Office of Economic Opportunity alone will eliminate 184,000 jobs at the local level throughout the nation. The Administration's budget seriously neglects, in general, the needs and aspirations of many American people; it is particularly neglectful of the needs of the rural poor.

In 1972, only 535,000 of the estimated 2.5 million farmworkers were covered by the federal minimum wage. It is estimated that 800,000 children are employed in commercial agriculture. However, growers employing migrant and seasonal farmworkers seldom comply with federal and state laws prohibiting employment of children during school hours or in hazardous occupations. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare found that 800 deaths and 800,000 injuries occur annually from the use of agricultural pesticides.

Department of Labor statistics show that agriculture ranks second only to construction in the number of job-related deaths. Yet farmworkers constitute the largest population group that is mostly excluded from coverage under state workmen's compensation laws. Every major job classification in private industry is covered by unemployment insurance, except farmwork.

In 1972, America's farmworkers continue to be consistently and systematically excluded from the protection of labor laws afforded to other working people. There is something ironic about a national policy that provides price supports, tax write-offs, and free technology to the landed and then denies basic rights and equal protection to those who harvest our food. Despite ineffective government programs, inadequate legislation, and poverty wages, less than nine percent of migrant families apply for welfare.

"... integration from seedling to the supermarket."—Report to the Stockholders, Tenneco, Inc.

A classic scenario of agri-government which critics have called "The Great American Grain Robbery" was played out in the summer and fall of 1972. It was the American-Russian wheat deal. In September, 1972, CBS News revealed the details of how six large grain companies, with inside knowledge of

the Soviet demand for American wheat, pocketed some \$129 million in extra federal subsidies, while the small wheat farmers of the Southwest lost between \$68 and \$100 million in federal subsidies because they sold their wheat before the Soviet deal had pushed up the price of wheat. The CBS investigation also pointed out that Clarence Palmbly, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs and intimately involved in the negotiations with the Russians, resigned from the Department of Agriculture to accept a vice presidency with Continental Grain Company. In less than thirty days after Palmbly joined Continental Grain, the company sold 150 million bushels of grain to the Russians, the largest single transaction of the entire wheat deal.

It is not the small farmer and farm laborer who benefit from the grain decisions of agribusiness. It is agribusiness. While the Department of Agriculture is quick to point out that corporate farms constitute only one percent of all commercial farmers and control only an estimated 7 percent of the land, it is now believed that .09 percent of the nation's farms account for up to one-third of all farm sales. If the Department of Agriculture has its way, this share of the market will increase.

At a Department of Agriculture Conference on Agricultural Trends to 1985, a USDA spokesman estimated that by 1985 those farms with gross sales of \$20,000 or more will capture 90 percent of the market. In 1972, only 12.2 percent of America's farms fell into this supersize category. In the Alice-in-Wonderland world of agricultural planners, the American farm is transformed into ten-mile long fields, leveled by nuclear explosions, planted by computer programs, and harvested by plants genetically altered to yield their crops onto conveyor belts. The family farmer and the farmworker do not fit into the agribusiness configuration. This type of farming is big business requiring massive infusions of capital, concentrated marketing, and up-to-the-minute technology.

1985 is not too far away in some parts of the country. In California, Texas, Arizona, Florida, and to a lesser degree other parts of the nation, vertically integrated corporate agriculture is a fact. Such industrial giants as Boeing, Dow Chemical, Tenneco, Coca Cola, and Standard Oil exercise considerable corporate control of the marketplace. Green Giant claims 25 percent of all U.S. canned corn and peas; Ralston-Purina sells 14 percent of all livestock feed. Ninety-five percent of the broilers, 75 percent of processed vegetables, 70 percent of citrus, 55 percent of turkeys, 40 percent of potatoes, 33 percent of fresh vegetables are grown under vertically integrated contracts to major U.S. corporations.

For those farmers who, in the words of Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, do not "adapt or die", the option is to be reduced to being contract laborers. Secretary Butz, who has spent a lifetime jumping back and forth between positions at land-grant colleges, on agribusiness boards, and in the upper echelons of USDA, argues that America needs agribusiness to supply more food at lower costs. Agribusiness, with its technological gadgetry, is presumed more efficient, yet even the government's own studies show that family farms ranging from 60 to 100 acres, depending on crop and location, are every bit as efficient as larger-sized farms. Certainly, this presumed efficiency is not reflected at the checkout counter. On the contrary, a recent Federal Trade Commission inquiry found that American consumers are overcharged by 20 percent for their breakfast cereal, 90 percent of which is produced by four giant companies—General Mills, Kellogg's, General Foods, and Quaker Oats.

If, then, agribusiness is not the model of efficiency, perhaps its virtue lies in producing better quality. But even the USDA admits

that the average American eats a less nutritious diet than fifteen years ago. The same folks who brought us the genetically rebuilt, mechanically harvested tomato are now busily attempting to put back the flavor and nutrients.

Even the farm subsidy payments designed to bolster the income of farmers are diverted to the corporate giants. In 1972, federal subsidy payments under the feed grain program jumped 77 percent over 1971 to \$1.8 billion. Despite Congressional reform of the program, distortions in federal subsidy payments continue; only 7.1 percent of the nation's farms—those with sales of over \$40,000 a year—collected 40.3 percent of the farm subsidies, while 41.2 percent of the farms—those with sales of less than \$2,500—received 5.3 percent of the federal subsidies.

It is not only money that flows from rural America. With 70 percent of the population packed into 2 percent of the land, rural America is being transformed into a wasteland of dying towns, shabby houses, and boarded-up businesses.

In May, 1972, one of agriculture's sacred cows, the land-grant college complex, was led to slaughter. In a book-length report, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*, the research-oriented Agribusiness Accountability Project charged that the land-grant colleges are diverting millions of dollars of tax money, intended to help the entire rural community, to support of research and service activities that principally benefit agribusiness. The pressing needs of small farmers, farm laborers, and other rural residents are ignored. Today's urban crisis, the report charges, is a consequence of failure in rural America, and no single institution has "played a more crucial role in that failure" than the land-grant college.

As examples of the distorted priorities of the land-grant college system. *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times*, cites the following:

"The complex has been eager to work with farm machinery manufacturers and well-capitalized farming operations to mechanize all agricultural labor, but it has accepted no responsibility for the farm laborer who is put out of work by the machine. It has worked hand-in-hand with seed companies to develop high-yield seed strains, but it has not noticed that rural America is yielding up practically all of its young people. It has been available day and night to help non-farming corporations develop schemes of vertical integration, while offering independent family farmers little more comfort than 'adapt or die.' It has devoted hours to create adequate water systems for fruit and vegetable processors and canners, but 30,000 rural communities still have no central water systems. It has tampered with the gene structure of tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, and other foods to prepare them for the steel grasp of the mechanical harvesters, but it has sat still while the American food supply has been liberally laced with carcinogenic substances."

Throughout interviews with USDA officials and professors at land-grant universities, the Agribusiness Accountability Project people were told that multimillion-dollar agribusiness could not perform its own research and development. Thus, the industry must turn to tax-supported universities. For the large and the powerful in agriculture, public research is an investment; for the small farmer, the farm laborer, and the poor, public research is welfare.

"Discrimination in the Extension Service remains a major problem on the Department of Agriculture's docket."—U.S. Civil Rights Commission, January, 1973.

Although the Department of Agriculture took major steps in 1972 to implement goals and timetables for minority participation in its programs, discrimination appears to con-

tinue in the Extension Service. In the 1973 Budget hearings, it was noted that minorities constituted approximately 8 percent of the more than 11,000 county and area extension agents; slightly less than 2 percent of the more than 4,200 state and area specialists; and slightly more than 2 percent of the more than 1,000 administrative and supervising personnel. The Civil Rights Commission has repeatedly criticized the Extension Service for its failure to take action against states found in noncompliance, but the pattern continues.

Discrimination in the Department of Agriculture and in the land-grant college system is particularly damaging—for it often means that black farmers are denied basic information that might otherwise be available. It may mean, too, that the quality of financial and technical assistance provided may be inferior to that furnished the white farmer. In the case of the colleges of 1890, it clearly means that, until 1972, the discriminating allocation of USDA funds greatly inhibited the ability of these colleges to perform. In any event, discrimination is alive and well down on the farm.

"I never saw a banker yet who didn't have a keen eye for opportunity—and Rural Development is ripening day by day."—Earl Butz, October 10, 1972.

Skyrocketing food prices, typhoid outbreaks in migrant labor camps, a concern for clean environment and wholesome food, and a Presidential campaign served to focus America's attention in 1972 on rural America. Beyond the heat and rhetoric, the real question remains—who will control rural America in general, and farming in particular? Secretary of Agriculture Butz claims to be an advocate, a protector, of the family farm; yet, the efforts of the Department of Agriculture appear to bolster agribusiness at the expense of the rural population.

The much-touted billion-dollar effort—the Rural Development Act of 1972—signed by the President in August, 1972, and acclaimed by Senator Humphrey as the Magna Carta for rural America, has turned out to be a \$333 million limited-ceiling program to "test policies, criteria, procedures, and coordinating mechanisms during fiscal year 1974." In many respects rural development remains a political slogan as it fails to deal with the fundamental issue of farmers' income—the critical factor in a revitalized rural America.

Political slogans and a piecemeal approach to the problems of small farmers and farm laborers are nothing short of cruel deception. Rural life need not be marked by extreme poverty and hardship. The technology which now benefits corporate giants and many urban areas can be adapted to rural America, provided a national commitment is made. The remedies and technology exist. It is the policy that is missing—a policy supported by legislation that would:

Bar giant corporations from agriculture. Provide adequate and equitable labor legislation for farmworkers.

Return the crop subsidy program to its original purpose of helping small farmers and farmworkers to stay on the land.

Close tax loopholes which encourage tax-loss farming and corporate giantism.

Encourage and assist cooperative development.

Require USDA and land-grant colleges to extend research, technical assistance, and financial assistance to small farmers and cooperatives.

Enforce the 160-acre limitation and residency requirements in federal land-reclamation areas.

Develop comprehensive land-use and zoning plans for rural America.

Increase the minimum wage for farmworkers and extend its coverage.

Develop alternative land redistribution policies.

There are many organizations now at work on one or more of these solutions: *Cooperativa Campesina* in California is a successful strawberry cooperative organized by a group of Mexican-American farmworkers; New Communities, Inc., in Lee County, Georgia, has formed a 5,700-acre land trust; cooperative food-buying clubs have sprung up in many urban areas, many of them buying directly from farmer cooperatives; the National Farmers Organization has been quite successful in negotiating production contracts with food processors; the National Coalition for Land Reform is working for policy changes necessary for fundamental land reform; environmental organizations are fighting the spread of concrete and pollution; the National Sharecroppers Fund is active in developing and promoting rural cooperatives and in working for legislative change.

All these things and many others are in motion, and while the Jeffersonian view of rural America has irretrievably vanished, a continued push can break the dominance of agribusiness and agri-government, preserve rural life as an option for all Americans, provide an abundance of food produced in harmony with sound environmental practices, and contribute to a better rural and urban America.

BOB CROWN OF CALIFORNIA— COURAGEOUS LIBERAL

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, tragedy struck in California when Assemblyman Bob Crown, one of the country's brightest legislative lights was struck and killed by an errant motorist.

Again a callous negligent act for which there can be no real retribution will change the face of a State. Bob Crown, my first friend in the California Legislature 13 years ago, will simply not be replaced. Bobby Crown, we grew to know you and we liked you. You will be missed by generations of Californians.

California papers ran two descriptive Crown epitaphs as follows:

ROBERT CROWN: A COURAGEOUS LIBERAL

The shocking news of the death of Assemblyman Robert W. Crown, Democrat of Alameda County, leaves a void in the legislature which will be difficult to fill.

The 51-year-old lawmaker, attorney and physical fitness advocate, was struck by an automobile while he was jogging through a crosswalk in Alameda, where he lived.

Crown was no ordinary assemblyman. He was one of a band of decent, able men from Northern California—men who rightly insisted during the days when "cut, squeeze and trim" were watchwords in the legislature that the state operations be kept in line with what Crown termed "the consistent needs of the people."

Undoubtedly, the high point of Crown's career was as head of the powerful Assembly Ways and Means Committee from 1962 to 1969. His astuteness, self confidence, courage and determination were displayed consistently as he presided over tedious committee budget sessions. He showed an amazing working knowledge of literally hundreds of complex budget items, and with an instinctive feeling for detail, he was able to keep track of them.

He must be given a large share of the credit for providing the financial backing for many of the forward-looking, liberal, people-oriented programs adopted during Gov. Edmund G. Brown's administration.

Crown was elected to the Assembly in 1955 after serving as an Assembly reading clerk. His political courage was displayed early when he provided the key votes for expanded educational opportunities, scholarship and health and welfare needs for young people, the elderly and the handicapped.

Crown's interests extended into the fields of world trade. In recognition of his leadership in this field, in 1964, he received the Wilton Park Fellowship awarded by an international conference of leading scholars and officials meeting in England.

The California dreamed of by men of vision came into being while Crown was in the legislature. He was one of the state's honored builders. His vote for decency, humanity and progress will be greatly missed in the State Legislature.

ROBERT CROWN OF CALIFORNIA

(By Tom Arden)

Assemblyman Robert W. Crown, 51, one of California's leading lawmakers, died early today of injuries suffered when he was hit by a car in Alameda.

Ironically, Crown, a devotee of physical exercise, was jogging at the time. He was struck by the vehicle Sunday night while he was running through a crosswalk and died in the Alameda Hospital.

The police reported one auto had halted at the intersection and another, driven by Charles E. Shuler Jr., 41, of Alameda, went around the stopped car and hit Crown. Officers said Shuler was issued a citation and a further investigation is being made.

Almost from the time he was first elected to the Assembly in 1956 Crown emerged as an influential Democratic lawmaker. He was chairman of the Assembly Elections and Reapportionment Committee when the important 1961 reappointment legislation was passed.

Later he became chairman of the powerful Assembly Ways and Means Committee during the reign of Jess Unruh as speaker. When the Republicans gained control of the Assembly in 1969, Crown became vice chairman of the committee.

This year Crown was named chairman of the Assembly Criminal Justice Committee and his other assignments were on Ways and Means and Reapportionment Committees.

LOSES BID

When the Democrats returned to power in the Assembly in the 1970 election, Crown made a bid for the speakership but lost to his fellow Democrat, Bob Moretti of Los Angeles County.

Crown's first taste of politics was as an Assembly reading clerk in the 1951 session of the legislature. He ran for Assembly in Alameda County in 1954 but was defeated. But in another bid two years later he was successful and had been re-elected every two years since.

A liberal politically, Crown was so popular in his district, comprising the Cities of Alameda and San Leandro, portions of the City of Oakland and the unincorporated community of San Lorenzo, he was re-elected without Republican opposition.

Born in San Francisco, Crown was reared in Alameda. He served during World War II as an enlisted man, subsequently being commissioned as an infantry combat officer. After returning to civilian life he gained a law degree at the San Francisco Law School.

EFFECTIVE SOLON

Crown has been singled out by the Capitol Press Corps as one of the most effective members of the Assembly. He consistently demonstrated his courage by voting on liberal is-

sues which may have been unpopular at the time to a majority of his colleagues.

He championed the cause of civil rights at all times, including providing a key vote on the Rumford Act to assure equal opportunities in housing for minority groups.

Crown, a bachelor, was known for his efforts in the field of providing every possible state help for medical care of crippled and handicapped children, fighting the battle at times when Republican Gov. Ronald Reagan was against him.

When Reagan vetoed a bill by Crown for additional funds for crippled children with the statement "it is inappropriate to expand the program when the state has a budget deficit," Crown called on the Assembly to override the veto:

"From a humanitarian standpoint, I plead with you to vote aye. If there is only one child in need, we should help him."

But Republican legislators who originally voted for the bill upheld the action of the governor.

The news of Crown's death saddened the hundreds of persons employed in the Capitol, where the legislator was popular with everyone.

Among the mementos treasured by Earl Reeves, who operates the shoeshine stand in the Capitol, are postcards sent to him by Crown from various parts of the world.

Flags at the capitol and all other state buildings were lowered to half staff in memory of the assemblyman.

"Although Bob and I disagreed on many issues over the years," said Gov. Ronald Reagan, "we were always able to sit down and discuss them without acrimony. He was a dedicated public servant and an articulate spokesman for his point of view."

MACKENZIE PIPE DREAM?

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the following column from the "op-ed" page of the New York Times May 22 issue. The column presents a balanced view of the matters at issue in how to get Alaska's North Slope oil to the lower United States. A number of innovative suggestions are made which might overcome the reservations that some environmentalists have about an Alaskan pipeline.

I believe that the important thing is to do something as soon as possible to help alleviate the growing shortage of oil in this country. The column follows:

MACKENZIE PIPE DREAM?

(By Robert Bendiner)

OTTAWA.—The best hope of forestalling an oil pipeline across the state of Alaska—a project long anathema to most environmentalists—has been the discovery of an acceptable alternative. For many months that alternative has been widely thought to lie in the valley of Canada's Mackenzie River, some 300 miles east of the great oil fields on the Alaskan North Slope. But, judging from the atmosphere here and in Toronto—and for reasons political, economic and environmental—that hope is exceedingly dim.

It is apparent that the enthusiasm of Canadians for a Mackenzie Valley oil pipeline by no means matches that of American environmentalists. Reflecting the economic nationalism which runs through Canadian politics these days, the New Democratic party,

by whose grace Mr. Trudeau's Liberal minority now governs, opposes the project on the formal ground that not enough research has been done and on the informal ground that it is not prepared to support something just because it might serve the interests of the United States, much less those of some oil companies.

Financial and economic objections run through all the country's major parties. Donald S. Macdonald, the Minister of Mines, Energy and Resources, who leans toward the project, indicates that his Government would expect the oil pipeline to be at least 51 per cent Canadian-owned. But the job of raising that kind of money—at present costs, some \$8 billion—would be forbidding if not impossible. And if it were raised, there are fears that it would tie a large part of the country's savings to the energy needs of the United States. If, on the other hand, American capital were to do the job, or most of it, the impact could be dangerously inflationary.

But it is the potential effect on the environment that draws the wriest comment from Canadians. Unlike their American colleagues, who in their legitimate fear of the Alaskan route tend to play down the disadvantages of the Mackenzie Valley proposal, Canadian environmentalists are keenly aware of its far greater length, much of it over permafrost, the twelve dangerous river crossings it would require and the wilderness it would destroy.

Ironically, some of them are sold on a plan to carry the oil along much the same route but by railroad. Of all proposals, this is surely the most astounding to come from environmentalists. In Alaska itself, the line would most probably have to go through the heart of the National Wildlife Refuge. To get out the same volume of oil as the pipeline, 22 trains a day would be required, each carrying 168 cars, with another 22 trains deadheading back—roughly a train every twenty minutes over eleven hundred wilderness miles from Prudhoe to the border of Alberta. What a schedule like that would do to wildlife attracted to a cleared right of way, can be imagined.

Given this intensive disruption to the natural surroundings and occasional damaging derailments, traffic of such dimensions can still be justified by those who are primarily eager for the swift opening up of the Canadian Northwest but hardly by environmentalists.

If the Mackenzie Valley does not offer an alternative that is economically feasible, environmentally sound and politically likely where does that leave opponents of the trans-Alaska pipeline? They have already achieved a great deal in insuring that if the line is laid from Prudhoe south to Valdez, it will be done with far greater scientific skill and environmental care than any pipeline ever built. But there is still the question of that parade of tankers which Canadians rightly see as a threat to their west coast.

On this score the problem is not so much the southward parade of tankers close to the shores of British Columbia. That danger could be counteracted by a rigid commitment to keep the carrier a safe distance out to sea. The nub of the matter is the prospective passage tankers on their final stretch through the Juan de Fuca Strait and Puget Sound to the Cherry Point refinery in northwest Washington, just south of the Canadian border. That inland voyage endangers the shores of Canada's Vancouver Island and a score of tiny islands in one of the most beautiful bodies of water in either of the two countries.

Present plans call for only one medium-sized tanker to this location every four days. But the very meagerness of the volume argues against the risk. The entire Alaskan production will probably represent from 10 to 12 per cent of American requirements by 1985, and the deliveries to Cherry Point less

than 10 per cent of the Alaskan oil, the rest being destined for San Francisco and Los Angeles. That is not enough, surely, to warrant either the potential threat to the Puget Sound islands or a continuing irritant to Canadian sensibilities.

Yet with the prospect of a national fuel shortage, a rising trade deficit and the undesirability of future dependence on the Middle East for a sizable share of this country's oil imports, the daily addition of 2 million barrels of oil from the North Slope cannot indefinitely be scorned. The time has come, perhaps, to shift from a last-ditch and probably futile opposition to the Alaskan line as such, to an insistence that, by eliminating the Puget Sound terminal and directing all oil traffic to ports further south on the Pacific coast, the sea-leg of the route, like the engineering of the pipeline itself, be made as safe as technology and good will can make it.

DR. HENRY KISSINGER

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, two of journalism's most perceptive observers of the political scene, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, have surmised in the attached reprint from the Washington Post, May 24, 1973, that Dr. Henry Kissinger "might simply resign as public opinion unfairly dragged him ever closer to the Watergate disgrace." They go on to report that "security probes grew so onerous in 1971 that intimates say he considered quitting."

Dr. Kissinger's loss from world affairs would be a tragic waste. He has earned the respect and admiration of men and women the world over. His abilities to comprehend intricate international problems, to negotiate with both fairness and strength, and to work for a more peaceful world are unsurpassed.

The article follows:

THE INNOCENCE OF DR. KISSINGER

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

When the FBI last week revealed the existence of 17 or more telephone taps to uncover national security leaks, Dr. Henry Kissinger's aides suspected one of those taps was on Kissinger's own phone—reflecting the morbid suspicions between Kissinger's National Security Council (NSC) staff and the Haldeman-Ehrlichman palace guard.

In fact, Kissinger's White House telephone was spared an FBI tap, at least in that particular phase of the running investigations by the FBI and other federal investigators of the NSC staff, ordered by the suspicious Ehrlichman-Haldeman "Berlin Wall."

Whether Kissinger's telephone was spared in all other probes of the NSC is still not absolutely certain. In mid-1971 domestic policy chief John Ehrlichman was ordered by President Nixon to take control from the FBI of a complete new probe of leaked military and foreign policy secrets regarded by both Mr. Nixon and Kissinger as dangerous to national security. At that point, Ehrlichman launched a second secret investigation of Kissinger's NSC—without asking Kissinger's approval.

Ehrlichman's second probe, moreover, was completed and filed without Kissinger being informed what, if anything, turned up.

In addition, there are unproved indications that members of Kissinger's staff were under occasional secret surveillance from non-

civilians in the Pentagon's security apparatus.

In the public mind, these security probes of Kissinger's staff—and perhaps Kissinger himself—have falsely linked Kissinger to the Watergate scandal. In his latest statement issued Tuesday night, President Nixon sought to break this linkage.

One clear reason for this presidential statement: growing speculation that Kissinger, Mr. Nixon's prize exhibit throughout his White House tenure, might simply resign as public opinion unfairly dragged him ever closer to the Watergate disgrace.

The relationship between the Kissinger operation, on the one hand, and the Berlin Wall of Ehrlichman and chief of staff H. R. (Bob) Haldeman on the other was always strained, distant and suspicious. As we have reported, Haldeman denied Kissinger aides normal White House perquisites, such as access to the White House mess and transportation.

Beyond that, Kissinger and his staff were regarded as virtual enemies by the crewcut bully boys manning the Haldeman-Ehrlichman offices.

The reasons are obvious. Kissinger was the only top White House aide with powerful ties outside the White House, both to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York and to Eastern establishment intellectuals. The direct reason for the repeated security probes was Kissinger's deliberate selection of some Kennedy-Johnson holdovers for the NSC staff, including liberal intellectuals who had difficulty getting maximum security clearances long before Mr. Nixon became president.

Added to this was Kissinger's love of the spotlight—and the spotlight's love of him—and the fact that he, not Haldeman or Ehrlichman shared Time's 1972 Man of the Year award with Mr. Nixon.

Thus, besides a genuine desire to cork security leaks, Kissinger acquiesced in wiretaps on his own staff because he felt highly vulnerable to repeated Ehrlichman-Haldeman slurs that his staff was responsible for the leaks. Nevertheless, these security probes grew so onerous in 1971 that intimates say he considered quitting.

His dilemma now is far greater. Having lost the support of the liberal intellectuals who attack him today with indecent relish, he has no intention of trying to exonerate himself by a public proclamation of innocence. That, say Kissinger intimates, would indicate a sense of guilt he does not feel.

Kissinger could and did defend his suspect liberal aides, particularly Morton Halperin, whose 9-month stint as a top Kissinger aide ended in September 1969. But he may have too much pride to publicly defend himself.

The irony is painful. Kissinger, collaborator with the President in most of what is fruitful and valuable in the Nixon administration, is being smeared with the muck of Watergate, an affair with which he had no connection. If he should now reach the point where he loses his effectiveness, or decides to quit, Watergate will have devoured its first innocent victim.

BENEFIT PROGRAM UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD BE EXAMINED

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues in the Congress some unusually thoughtful comments written to me by a constituent, Mr. H. C. Barrigan, of Wenatchee, Wash.

Mr. Barrigan recommends that we, in the Congress, seriously examine the benefit program provided under social security, to the end that we may wish to propose and support amendments through which the program may be made more fair to many Americans who have, throughout their lives, contributed either directly or indirectly to the program.

I submit herewith Mr. Barrigan's letter with the suggestion that all Members of Congress might consider his comments seriously:

WENATCHEE, WASH.,
May 9, 1973.

HON. MIKE McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: To the best of my knowledge, any amendments to the Social Security Act have only been considered by Congress upon Presidential request such as in his address to Congress on March 23, 1972. It would appear that they could care less about problems of the elderly. As presently written the Social Security Act contains articles that badly need amending and it occurs to me that a good opportunity will prevail when this session of Congress considers legislation to correct existing faults with private pension plans.

As you well know, all Federal and State pensions are vested on "Years of Service" ranging from twenty, but never over thirty, years and includes those we employ to administer the Social Security Act. In spite of the fact that we are their employers they tell us that we cannot enjoy this same privilege. They tell us that WE must be old men and women in the high mortality range before we are entitled to benefits.

For example, take the case of the millions of youngsters who, through no fault of their own, are compelled to earn a living upon graduation from high school at eighteen years of age, many sooner. They pay Social Security premiums for 47 years before attaining eligibility. Those who can afford higher education have an advantage of four to eight years in eligibility. Ironically they are usually eligible for higher benefits because of their qualifications for higher paying positions.

The requirement for benefits should definitely be amended from "age" to "years of covered employment" and should not exceed 30 years.

Another section of the act dealing with survivors benefits is highly discriminatory. As an example—it is quite normal for a wife to be her husband's junior by from two to ten years. A woman is widowed when she is 57 years old. Naturally at her age she has no dependent children. She is too old and most likely inexperienced for gainful employment. Raising and educating a family has been a struggle for low and medium income families and any appreciable savings has been impossible. This widow is ineligible for benefits, so you drive her to welfare.

This same injustice applies to the widow of the retired worker who has been drawing benefits. This pension has been their livelihood, but because she is under 60 years old, the benefit ceases. Alternative—Welfare.

In contrast, take the example of a young widow of a husband far too young to be drawing benefits when he died. Because she has children, she receives a liberal dependents allowance for each child and also 75% of her late husband's benefit, regardless of her age or the age of her husband when he died. She, in contrast to the 57 year widow is sufficiently young as to be employable, or re-marry, which is usually the case. This section of the act is badly in need of amendment to allow benefits to a widow regardless of age and dependents.

You and your fellow legislators are our only means of redress, and I ask you to carefully consider the above proposals and give them your full support.

Respectfully submitted,

H. C. BARRIGAN.

THE GIVEAWAY MADNESS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I trust this Congress in its concern for the future of the Nation will chop, to an irreducible minimum, President Nixon's new request for foreign giveaway funds and also set in motion the measures required for an eventual termination of this bankrupting program.

It is difficult for us, I submit, at this late date to remember back when free dollars from Uncle Sam were unknown throughout the world. True, U.S. money went abroad in generations past, but it did so mostly through private channels and as well-secured loans and investments. Conversely, foreign capital came here in like circumstances and helped greatly in financing our country's early progress.

This borrowing, lending, and investing on a strictly business basis served our Nation well in those bygone eras and the arrangement ought to stand now as an example for countries currently in the development process. Have we helped them by our insistence on showering gift dollars upon them, or have we in reality made them dependent while diminishing the need on their part for enterprise and responsibility? This is a question which troubles many thoughtful Americans.

As a matter of pure generosity, our giveaways are without precedent in all of world history. The total cost to us since the practice began with the old Marshall Plan is impossible to reckon today with any degree of accuracy because of the multiplicity of accounts and titles which have been used. It suffices to say that a major part of our staggering national debt reflects the billions which have been extracted from the pockets of our people without their direct consent and then given blissfully to others who have shown little appreciation in return.

Today our dollar is in serious trouble internationally because so many of them have been stored up in foreign accounts and public treasuries that two devaluations already have been compelled. Meanwhile, they remain uncashed as claims upon the future earnings of this American generation and others yet to come. Concurrently, the Federal debt figure keeps rising as deficit follows deficit year after year because the Government spends more than it has found means to collect.

And still, despite all this, Congress is asked again by the President to keep the giveaways going at full tilt. He wants \$2.9 billion more for the coming fiscal year, an amazing \$300 million increase over the current rate. What is more, he informs us he may be back for even ad-

ditional funds to give North Vietnam if that erstwhile enemy country ever gets around to obeying the terms of last January's cease-fire agreement.

Is all this madness—madness in a nation which persists in giving away its substance while running up an enormous debt, struggling with a weakening currency abroad and seeking ways to arrest a threatening inflation at home, caused largely by excess Federal spending? Have we become so inured over the years to the giveaways that we no longer think to ask ourselves this potent question? Well, I can assure you my constituents are asking it and with an increasing vehemence in "workshop" meetings I have conducted at home and in letters they have sent me here.

Rather than responding agreeably to the President's assessment of new giveaway needs, this Congress should assume the task—and it will not be an easy one—of getting this crippling burden off the backs of our people. A reasonable level might be found on which this Nation can be generous with others without hurting itself. But we are far above this today. In effect, we are borrowing money at high interest cost so that it can be given away. How much longer can this be rationalized?

AN INSENSITIVE APPROACH TO THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, thousands of medicare beneficiaries in the Fifth Congressional District of Florida, which I am pleased to represent, and millions more across the country will face financial disaster unless the Congress moves immediately to reject cuts endorsed by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger.

In Orlando, St. Petersburg, and Tampa the contemplated changes would mean that social security recipients who live on tight, fixed incomes will be asked to pay an average increase of 80 percent for hospital care. In addition, under the Weinberger plan, there will be increases in the percentage the recipient pays toward doctor bills.

To counter these insensitive proposals, I have today introduced a "sense of Congress" resolution which says, in plain language, that the administration not waste its time or the time of the Congress on these ill-advised measures.

On March 5, in an appearance at oversight hearings before the Senate Special Committee on Aging, the Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary described in some detail the proposed medicare changes which have yet to reach the Congress in legislative form.

Under existing law, the elderly pay \$72 for the first day of hospitalization and pay nothing from the second through the 60th day. Weinberger said the administration seeks to charge medicare recipients full room and board and 10 per-

cent of any other charges the first day and 10 percent of all charges for each additional day. The intent, said the Secretary, is to reduce financial burdens of lengthy hospitalization and to provide economic incentives to curb the use of medically unnecessary services.

The practical effect, however, is to charge a part of society least able to bear additional financial costs approximately \$516 million more a year for medical care.

Social security beneficiaries are the first to feel the effects of inflation because they live on fixed, strictly budgeted incomes. The administration appears to be proposing that they bear the brunt of rising medical costs as well. It is ironic that this is the same administration whose strongest support in the last national election came from a segment of society it now asks to bear new hardships.

There are many, Mr. Speaker, within the agencies who would be charged with implementing these changes who do not like them one bit. One individual in a position to know advised that the most ardent proponents within the administration, other than the Secretary, possibly, were John D. Ehrlichman and H. R. Haldeman, of late former domestic affairs advisers to the President.

While the administration's proposals, admittedly, would result in some savings to medicare recipients hospitalized for more than 60 days, these benefits are outweighed by the shocking increases proposed for the 99 percent who are out before then.

In practical terms, here are what the increases would mean to the people of my district as best I can deduce:

Since the average stay of a medicare recipient in a hospital is 12 days, this would mean that the patient's share of hospitalization expenses in the Orlando, Fla., area would jump from \$72 to \$127.95—on the average—and from \$72 to \$130.53—on the average—in hospitals in the Tampa Bay area.

For those hospitalized a month or more the costs are even more prohibitive. An average 30-day stay in an Orlando area hospital would cost the patient \$259.04 instead of \$72 and in Tampa-St. Petersburg the cost would approximate \$269.93.

For the average social security recipient who receives \$164 a month in benefits, prolonged illness of up to 60 days would be an extreme financial hardship. In Orlando 60 days of care would average \$477.53 and in Tampa-St. Petersburg the figure would be approximately \$502.25.

Bad as these proposals are, there are other ill-advised recommendations. Under changes contemplated in part B of medicare, the patient would have to pay the first \$85 of a doctor bill and 25 percent of the remaining fee. This is \$25 more for deductible charges and an additional 5-percent hike in the patient's share of the remaining bill.

Medicare beneficiaries absorbed additional costs as recently as last January. These went to pay for an increase from \$5.80 to \$6.30 in monthly premium charges for doctor fees and a raise from \$50 to \$60 in the amount the recipient

must pay his doctor before medicare begins paying benefits.

To come again so soon and ask for more increases is indeed a callous act. Instead of hiking costs, the administration should be spending its time proposing solutions to the problems of delivering and improving health care to the elderly.

The Congress should not take up its time considering such insensitive measures as expressed by Secretary Weinberger. I am proud to join with Congresswoman ELLA T. GRASSO of Connecticut, a leader in this effort, and the 50 other Members who are registering their objections to the administration's proposed medicare changes.

ALL FOR WHAT?

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most essential needs of the Congress and our citizenry today is perspective. First, of course, we need truth concerning the operation of our Government, including the executive and legislative branches, but the exposure of facts should be for the purpose of developing a true picture. We need accuracy and perspective as well as exposure.

Sometimes we in Washington are too close or too involved or too partisan or too anxious for attention or too eager to make a headline to sort out the facts and keep perspective.

Like most citizens I have little more knowledge than what I can glean from the mass media. Like most citizens I have an obligation to reserve judgment and to try to sort truth from fiction and to maintain perspective.

One of my constituents, Mr. R. A. O'Neill of Felton, Calif., in a letter to the editor which appeared in the May 20, 1973, issue of the Santa Cruz Sentinel presented his views on perspective. He obviously is knowledgeable and has given a good deal of conscientious thought to the matter of the "Pentagon Papers" and "Watergate." I am pleased to share his views. I insert his views in the RECORD at this point:

ALL FOR WHAT?

EDITOR: After months of self-righteous howling on the part of politicians, large and small, plus the smirking trial-by-publicity sponsored by the press and television, is it now time to take a citizen's look at basic facts?

Watergate: The campaign cell of one political party listened in on the "smoke-filled room" of the campaign cell of the other party.

Pentagon: A man signed the U.S. Secrecy Agreement whereby he swore to protect all secrets of the United States that might become known to him. He did this as the normal commitment made by all government employees who have access to sensitive information. He signed it as a condition of employment.

Government documents are given security classification under the authority of laws written for the purpose of preventing such data from reaching the hands of our enemies.

This man stole documents that were legally classified "secret".

He violated his oath and the terms of his employment.

He delivered those documents to a newspaper.

That newspaper defied the "secret" identification on the documents and published them.

The man violated laws of the United States.

The newspaper violated laws of the United States.

Now, six months later, millions of dollars worth of newspaper space and millions of dollars worth of prime television time have been devoted to calculated distortion and the results crammed down the throats of the American people.

Six months of noise and confusion have not changed the basic facts one iota:

Watergate: A bunch of politicians peeked into the affairs of the opposing bunch of politicians.

Pentagon: A man and a newspaper violated provisions of federal law.

Six months of noise and confusion have achieved these results to date:

Watergate: Wasted millions of dollars of taxpayers funds, belaboring the subject.

Wasted untold millions of man-hours in high government offices.

Elevated the age-old practice of political intrigue to a significance out of all justification in the eyes of anyone but dishonest politicians.

Convicted the "peeping Toms", fined them, thrown them in jail. By the way, what is the normal jail sentence for "peeping Toms"?

Saturated our elected branches of government with this flood of hog-wash to the extent that all branches are neglecting their normal obligation to provide guidance for the future of the greatest nation in history.

Descredited the United States before the whole world.

And all for what? Listening in on the secret plans of a gaggle of super-selfish politicians.

Six months of noise and confusion have achieved these results to date:

Pentagon: A man broadcasts secret data of the United States government and the howling mob seeks to make him a hero.

Newsmen shout their "rights" to subvert the laws of the United States.

Summary: It does not matter whether the secret Pentagon Papers merely stated that "two times two equals five", they had been classified "secret" legally.

If this man is made a hero it opens the flood-gates on every technological breakthrough achieved by this nation. The popular cry "the people have a right to know" is a phony cry.

The most vicious subversives in this country are meticulously documented "citizens" of our country, but all their allegiance is to nations devoted to the ultimate destruction of our country.

The writer speaks from experience.

For 18 years I worked under the obligation of the United States Secrecy Agreement, and adhered to its terms.

During the development of the Polaris Missile, in a period of extreme hazard to our country, a card-carrying subversive was apprehended by the FBI, from his place at the desk adjoining mine. That man had impeccable credentials in everything but his allegiance.

It is my hope, as one loyal to this great nation, that every governmental official, and every politician, who has devoted more than ten per cent of his time to the distortion of the facts surrounding Watergate and Pentagon papers, will be thrown out of office at the next election.

R. A. O'NEILL.

WATCH WHAT WE DO, NOT WHAT WE SAY

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, those words were spoken at the commencement of the first Nixon administration. We have had good reason in recent weeks to recall them. We have been able to apply that quote to a number of activities of this administration. The latest one deals with the summer job program for disadvantaged young people.

Let me offer still another memorable quote, this time by the President himself, and uttered on March 24 of this year:

The summer of 1973 is to be a time of expanded opportunity for young Americans. Today I am pleased to report that a total of \$424 million in Federal funds will be available this summer for youth programs, \$3 million more than last year.

Last year such funds were available through the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This year, however, the President has requested no moneys. He suggests instead that communities and cities use some \$300 million of their Emergency Employment Assistance Act funds for summer jobs. Note how this contrasts with the President's own words of March 24.

My constituency is totally urban, being a part of the massive New York metropolitan concentration. It does not take an expert to predict that we are on the verge of upheaval, because of the administration's double-talk and cynicism. There is obviously no White House commitment to summer employment opportunities and programs for disadvantaged youth.

At least 1 million youngsters nationally are in desperate need of such employment. Some gainful employment and a few dollars in their pockets would alleviate escalating pressures in our cities.

Obviously some one has not done their homework. Use of Emergency Employment Act money for the purpose the President suggested was never intended. Further, it would be improper to attempt to use them in such a manner.

The Emergency Employment Act requires that subsidized jobs lead to permanent unsubsidized jobs in the public or private sector. The Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps emphasizes return to school.

Next, the EEA has the dual purpose of employing the jobless and meeting governmental service requirements. The NYC program is geared to providing earnings from employment for unemployed youth.

Again, the EEA demands special consideration for Vietnam-era veterans and fair allocation of available jobs. The NYC focuses entirely upon poor young people.

If EEA funds are used to provide some 700,000 jobs for youth, it would mean that out of a cumulative total of one million jobs supported under the act, almost three-fourths would go to young people. Percentage of jobs going to veterans would drop from the current 41 percent to about 10 percent.

Senator JAVITS stated the equation succinctly when he noted that in order to hire the son or daughter for the summer, the city will be forced to fire the father or mother.

In New York City, we are confronted with a desperate situation. The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have made available ominous figures. This summer in my city we shall have only the Secretary of Labor's discretionary money available for hiring some 18,000 youngsters. This compares most unfavorably with last year's employment level in the city of 54,000, and to an earlier estimate of need for this coming summer of 77,500 jobs.

Volunteer organizations, such as the National Alliance of Businessmen plus State employment division are earnestly seeking youth jobs. Their efforts, although welcome and valiant, are just a drop in our national bucket.

Most mayors are enormously reluctant, and understandably so, to commit emergency employment funds for summer youth jobs.

Last year, 740,000 job opportunities were provided under a \$318 million budget for the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps. For this summer, the administration sought \$239 million. That money was provided by the House. The President then signed the first supplemental appropriation measure for fiscal year 1973 in which it was contained. But in his January budget submission, the President, again doing rather than saying, asked that these funds be rescinded. The House Appropriations Committee correctly rejected the President's request.

We know the Senate has followed the House's lead and rejected rescission. These moneys, then, have been appropriated, and must be spent.

Ironically, even if that is done, it will not be enough. At least 1 million summer jobs are needed. Some estimates note that as many as 1.7 million young people will be on the streets seeking gainful employment in a matter of several weeks. In order to accommodate anywhere near that number, we shall require twice that sum.

It is incomprehensible that in the midst of today's turmoil this administration can act in such a manner.

Certainly this latest action by the President is another classic illustration of the truth and farsightedness of that memorable remark:

Watch what we do, not what we say.

We are, we are.

THE WATERGATE CRISIS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate, I think, if I did not make some passing comment on the Watergate crisis. Particularly so in light of the recent criminal indictments in New York of former Attorney General

John Mitchell and former Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans.

None of us, of course, can or should pass judgment on the guilt or innocence of these men or any others mentioned with what is generally termed the Watergate case.

The inexorable judicial process will in due course—if independent and thorough—convict the guilty and clear the innocent. And that is how it should be.

While many of us have our own private opinions based on known facts, our private opinions by themselves prove nothing.

It is, however, both proper and necessary to address the Watergate situation within the limitations mentioned above because we are at this moment facing a crisis in our Federal Government of unparalleled dimension.

Despite the claims to the contrary, the top level of the executive branch of Government is still virtually paralyzed, and as the case unfolds we must brace ourselves for possible new revelations that we may find very difficult to believe or accept. But I feel the responsibility to sound the caution that we are still only in the beginning stages of this inquiry and all implications are that there are more shocking disclosures to come.

However unpleasant, we must face them and deal with them. We can and will, if our citizenry will rally to the need to reform and rebuild our badly damaged political process. So while we face some hard days ahead, things are not hopeless or beyond repair. We must have the courage to find and face the truth, take all the corrective steps that are necessary, and then move ahead. The welfare of our people requires that we pull ourselves together and go on. I am determined to do so and I trust that all of us want to.

All of us then have a personal responsibility to involve ourselves in strengthening and improving our Government. Each of us can do more and each of us must do more. Government is not inherently evil, just as man is not inherently evil—but if we do not root out evil when we find it in Government, it will grow until it consumes us all.

In our political history, the Watergate case is the exception, not the rule. In fact, it is without precedent. What we are witnessing is a true national tragedy—and it should fill us all with sadness, with determination that it will never be allowed to happen again, and with some sense of charity toward those men whose lives and careers have been destroyed by their own hands.

A human tragedy of this kind is a tragedy for all of us. Let us hope that when these dark days pass, we will never again witness a situation like this one.

THE BATTLE FOR DAY CARE

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are presently over 5 million children in the United States who are in need of full

or part-time day care services; yet there are only 700,000 spaces in licensed day-care facilities. One of every three working mothers has children under the age of 6; many of these mothers are the sole financial supporters of their families. It is time that this Nation make a fundamental commitment to the needs of working mothers and their children by providing them with needed day-care facilities.

"The Battle for Day Care," an article written by Elinor Guggenheimer for the Nation, presents the history and the issues involved in the continuing fight to obtain adequate day care facilities in the United States. I would like to share this excellent summary with my colleagues:

THE BATTLE FOR DAY CARE

(By Elinor C. Guggenheimer *)

The day care battle in this country may well exceed, in length if not in bitterness, our involvement in Southeast Asia. On one side are those of us who are convinced that American children are being neglected, that the rise of child-abuse cases indicates a kind of national sickness, that the failures and drop-outs of the school systems can be traced to the earliest years, and that mothers of young children, in increasing numbers, will be working full time outside the home.

On the other side are those who believe profoundly in the American family. What they believe in is not so much the family portrayed by the census data but that of the Kodak advertisement—hard-working, eager young father; smiling, aproned mother; two children; two rosy-cheeked grandparents, hovering in the background and prepared to deliver Thanksgiving dinner and family continuity, and a dog that closely resembles Checkers.

For a long time the proponents of day care were drawn principally from the ranks of early childhood educators and social workers, bolstered by the support of lady board members who were fond of children. One of the earliest day care centers in this country was established by Mrs. William DuBois in New York City in 1854. She had discovered that infants in the slum areas of the Lower East Side were left untended during the day by mothers who were forced to go out to work. In what has become a classical fund-raising method, she nagged her husband and her friends' husbands until she had enough money to open a center for infants. It was not at all like programs we know today. Nevertheless, it forecast a continuing concern for what was happening to children whose mothers, for one reason or another, were not at home during the day.

After the Civil War a substantial number of crèches were set up to care for the children of war widows. Some of the existing centers in New York City date back to the 19th century. At that time the emphasis was on care, on providing a safe place for children. Little, if any, consideration was given to the curiosity and hunger for learning that must be satisfied if a child's mental and physical development and his relationship with adults is to be good. Not until 1900 was a school established to train those who were working with children in day care centers and nursery schools.

During the depression of the 1930s a good many unemployed teachers worked in WPA nurseries and, as a result, attention was focused on early childhood education. When the country entered World War II, Lanham Act funds became available to provide day

care programs in labor-impacted areas, the purpose being to induce women to work in defense industries. Even though that was the motive, an attempt was made to establish good day care standards.

But day care was also looked upon as a wartime evil, similar to rationing and civil defense, and it was confidently expected that, when the war was over, women would return to the home and the nation would once again become "normal." That concept of what is "normal" still confuses us. The country has consistently refused to recognize that, in continually increasing numbers, women have entered and will continue to enter the labor force. We have feared that, by providing services that obviously are needed, we would deprive children of their mothers' loving attention during the most important formative years, even though studies indicate that economic necessity, not the presence or absence of good care, is the governing factor in a woman's decision to work. The disintegration of the American family, which is so greatly feared, may occur more rapidly from the fact that children receive so little physical and emotional nutrition of any sort in the earliest years that they are incapable of forming permanent attachments as adults.

The elimination of Lanham Act funds after the war forced centers to close in almost every area of the country, except California and a few large cities, notably New York. It was during the 1950s that the opposition to day care seemed to jell—whether from fear of family breakdown, or a reluctance to commit large sums of money, or because day care programs were being encouraged in Russia. It was certainly also due to the strange Congressional misapprehension that 20th-century America is an agrarian society.

The 1961 Social Welfare Amendment provided the first federal funding for day care since World War II. It was a very small sum—only \$7 million, of which only \$3 million was actually appropriated. Nevertheless, it did move the states to develop licensing laws, in order to be eligible for whatever money was available.

The big breakthrough in child care came in 1965 with the introduction of Head Start. The country suddenly accepted the idea that early childhood education, health and social services were valuable. A few years later Title IV of the Social Security Act was passed. It provided open-ended funds and made possible the wide expansion of day care. The day care formula provided 75 per cent federal money, to be matched with 25 per cent from city and state. Under a sliding scale of fees, day care services were made available to families with incomes ranging up to \$20,000 a year, but the overwhelming majority of children in publicly funded day care were—and always have been—from families on public assistance or in the category called the "working poor."

The Head Start program was never meant to serve the same purpose as day care. It was created in 1965, with the blessing of Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, to give underprivileged children a bit of a jump on their first years in school. Some Head Start programs were open from two to three hours a day, others from nine in the morning until three in the afternoon. As time went on, the enormous need for full day care was such that a number of programs adopted even longer hours. Some parents, too, found a way to convert Head Start into full day care by entering their children in both morning and afternoon programs.

Today the battle over day care seems particularly violent. The earlier group of its proponents has been joined by an active and sometimes militant group of women's liberationists who believe that the country should provide twenty-four-hour free services for all children, so that mothers who work on either

night or day shifts can find care for their children. And newly formed community groups are fighting, not only for increased day care services but to insure that they are subject to community and parent control. Aside from the battle to convince legislators and the present Administration that child-care services are important, a certain amount of internecine war is being waged between those who are part of the day care establishment and the community and parent board members of new groups that have recently opened centers or family day care programs.

In order to understand the battles and their possible outcome, it is important to know what services are now available in this country and the extent of the need. The term "day care" can be stretched to include all services given on a regular but less than full-time basis to children under the age of 18 by some one other than their parents or guardians. In fact, however, it has come to mean child-care services in group centers or in the home of a nonrelative, for children of preschool years. This is sometimes extended to the age of 12, with programs provided after school and during vacations. The program content of the two- or three-hour nursery school is usually quite similar to that offered in the day care centers, which may remain open for ten to twelve hours. Nursery schools have not been part of the controversy. However, despite a great deal of pressure by professional organizations to increase the number of such schools in the public school system, a large majority of the children in this country are still deprived of any formal schooling prior to 1st grade.

Day care, then, in the popular sense, implies longer hours than a nursery school offers and an element of need. The centers come in all sizes and styles. Some of them are in housing projects, some in schools, converted houses or storefronts. All kinds of space have been used and all kinds of programs provided in that space. The educational programs have ranged from modified Montessori to unstructured play. The funding, too, has varied. There are philanthropically supported nurseries, government-supported day care centers and Head Start programs whose support derived originally from the Office of Economic Opportunity but is now transferred to the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. A very large number of proprietary day care centers are run for profit.

Perhaps the most widely available type of day care is family day care. There are a great many women who take one or more—in some instances as many as thirty or forty—children into their homes during the day as a way to make money. Some of this care has been excellent, particularly in the few areas where those providing it receive intensive training and consultation. However, much is inadequate and even damaging.

In addition to preschool care, there are a few school-age programs, all-day neighborhood schools, play schools and extended school services that meet a small fraction of the need for care of children between the ages of 6 and 12. The enforcement of standards has been spotty in the case of the preschool child, but for the school-age child almost no standards have been established. Vacation day camping, which is one form of school-age care, has at times had as its chief indoor facility a bus, in which children are kept for a large part of the day. Of course, there are good programs, particularly those under philanthropic auspices, but for the great number of mothers who enter the labor force when their children reach the age of 6, the choice, more often than not, is the latch key.

Census data give some indication of the extent of need. More than 6 million children under the age of 6 have mothers who work full time, but there are known and licensed

* Elinor Guggenheimer is founder and honorary president of the New York City Day Care Council and also of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America.

day care accommodations for only 900,000. The majority of children are looked after in a variety of informal ways—by relatives, older siblings, in the home of a neighbor, or by a janitor. More than 40 per cent of the families in question would have incomes below \$7,000 a year without the mother's earnings; around 75 per cent would fall below the \$10,000 a year that is considered the minimum for a family of four in a large urban center. One of the most astonishing figures is the 18,000 children under 6 for whom no care is arranged. These are the children whom we find from time to time, tied to their cribs all day long or—even more devastating—left locked in their homes within reach of dangerous drugs and fire hazards.

There are so many indices of need that it is hard to select among them. Among migrant workers there are 700,000 children younger than 12, and their mothers work in the fields. The extent of child neglect among migrant families is reflected in the fact that they lag two to four years behind other children in elementary schools.

One other fact of interest is that 42 per cent of working women are single, widowed, divorced or with no husband; the median salary level of women over 14 is \$2,408. This compares with a median salary level of \$4,317 for black men, a group that is not conspicuously well paid. What this means is that the children of the single-parent family—which almost without exception means a family headed by a woman—are usually the victims of poverty and neglect.

We have cause to be alarmed about the effect of neglect in the earliest years. At present, 12.9 per cent of young people don't finish 8th grade and 41.8 per cent don't finish high school. In 1971, there were 603,875 arrests on various charges of children under 15. Crimes committed by children are becoming increasingly serious, not only in number but in violence. It is too late to start remedial work in high school; we ought to begin almost on the day a child is born. Day care by itself cannot insure a good education or a stable personality, but it is a first step toward achieving literacy and stability.

However, figures tell only part of the story. Almost anyone who lives in a city is aware of the many very young children who play unsupervised in the street. The newspapers record, almost daily, tragedies resulting from children being left to themselves. They sit on the floor and eat flakes of lead paint, which may lead to permanent mental retardation; they play with matches and the TV shows a fireman with tears rolling down his face carrying a charred body from a blackened building. In the major hospitals, doctors are reporting sickening examples of child abuse—children with broken arms; children with welts all over their bodies. All of these horrors are the handiwork of a society that has turned its back on its children.

Thus it has seemed to the proponents of day care that the need is well documented. Even President Nixon has not suggested legislation that would prohibit women from taking employment. He has, in fact, laid the groundwork for a system wherein mothers on public assistance will be forced to accept training and seek employment. But proposed federal and state regulations are setting income maximums for eligibility for free day care so low and fees for families above that level so high that it becomes apparent the service is to be extended chiefly to families on public assistance. To compound the tragedy of segregation, there is added the tragedy of the ceiling that will now be put on a woman's earnings. The proposal that the child of a woman who get a job with a salary one-third above public assistance levels should not be eligible for the day care after its mother has been off public assistance for six months, simply means that the

woman would either have to refuse promotions or would have to become part of an on-again off-again public assistance merry-go-round.

Thousands of day care centers that opened in the last two or three years, when federal funds were readily available, are finding that the ceiling on Title IVa of the Social Security Act cuts substantially into day care funding at both state and local levels. That is particularly true in areas where citizens were already concerned about child neglect and were able to move rapidly to use federal funds. Many of us hoped that the revenue-sharing moneys would compensate for the loss of day care funds under Title IVa, but the first general revenue-sharing bill has resulted in far less money than was anticipated, particularly in the large cities. Boards and staffs of agencies dealing in health and welfare services fear that government officials will succumb to political expediency and turn over the already diminished funds to such projects as increased police protection. Short-range solutions may once more defeat the attempt to find real and lasting solutions to an urban society's problems.

As this is being written four additional revenue-sharing bills are in the hopper; they would eliminate more of the categorical programs. But it now appears that, even if all of the revenue-sharing funds that become available are committed to health, education and welfare services, there will still be far less than has been available in the past—and this in a period of rising costs.

All across the country parents, community groups, board members and professionals connected with the day care program are taking to the barricades. They are going by bus to state capitals and to Washington. They are holding demonstrations and applying in masses for public assistance. They have set aside a day to take their children to their places of work. All of this effort is directed to alerting the public to the cutback in day care services and the elimination of thousands of children of the working poor from existing centers.

In 1971 Congress did recognize the problem. Both Houses passed a comprehensive Child Development Act that would have provided free day care for children in families of four having annual incomes of less than \$4,300. Above this level, the fee scale would have been moderate, with a family of four on an income of \$6,960 paying \$317 a year, and HEW was instructed to set fees for families above \$6,960. If it had passed, the bill would have been a first step in dealing with our massive child neglect.

President Nixon opposed it, but in all fairness he was not alone. Thousands of letters poured in to Congress expressing strong reservations. Many of them used arguments similar to that of James J. Kilpatrick who wrote in the Sunday edition of the *Washington Star* on October 24, 1971, that "the Comprehensive Child Care Act was the boldest and most far-reaching scheme ever advanced for the 'Sovietization' of American youth. . . ."

Of all the points of view voiced in opposition to the bill, none seems to me so astonishing as that day care is a Communist device. The fact is that Russia is much more likely to have copied day care from America. Most democratic countries provide day care services and most of the newly developing countries seem to honor day care as a first and most important social service.

And now, while the battle goes on, children are waiting. Mary Dublin Keyserling published a report in 1972 called "Windows on Day Care." Members of the National Council of Jewish Women in many parts of the country helped prepare the material for the report. Some of them recorded the almost total absence of quality care for infants and toddlers outside the home. In Sacramento, the report states, licensed homes and centers

serve less than 10 per cent of the community need. In Portland, Ore., where there were 3,100 approved or licensed family or group day care slots, at least 20,000 mothers of preschool children were at work. Burlington County, N.J. reported the need for Spanish-speaking day care centers. San Antonio said that twenty-four-hour service was needed. Washington, D.C., felt a critical need for day care after school hours. The list of shortages continued with special mention of retarded and handicapped children.

In particular, family day care was found to be inadequate. In one Midwestern city a fire disclosed that thirty children were being kept in a four-room firetrap apartment, with twenty more in another. In one home, again in a Midwestern city, eleven children, five of them infants and the six others between the ages of 1 and 4, were found almost naked in a home where stale food was lying about and bugs were crawling. In a mid-Atlantic state, one of the council members reported seven or eight children in a kitchen, most of them strapped to kitchen chairs and all apparently in stupors.

All those who have observed good day care can point to seeming miracles. Children who were considered retarded, malnourished or deeply disturbed have made astonishing strides. Trained teachers have an opportunity on a daily basis to observe children and to work with them as no doctor or psychiatrist possibly could. In a good day care program, the mothers participate and help shape the policies. The center does not take the child away from the mother; it becomes the grandmother, the neighbor, the nanny and the teacher.

Undoubtedly a new comprehensive child development act will be moving through Congress and up to the President's desk within the next year. There will be an attempt to avoid a Presidential veto by making the provisions conform to President Nixon's stated policies. It would be unfortunate if this resulted in pushing day care nearer to a complete welfare program. The effect of that might be to lower educational standards still further, and to eliminate millions of children who have a desperate need for care. The problem that we face now is to educate the public on the dangers of child neglect and on the importance of giving every child the best health, educational and social services of which the country is capable. That does not mean that every child needs day care; it does mean that such services must be available as an option. Forcing reluctant mothers to stay at home is just as bad for children as forcing equally reluctant mothers into the job market. The Day Care and Child Development Council of America, the only national agency concentrating exclusively on these types of early childhood programs, will set in motion a nationwide education program as rapidly as possible. In the meantime, we can only hope that our legislators will have the wisdom to recognize that the freedom and welfare of the country rests with its future citizens and their dedication to a democratic society.

REMARKS OF HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO ON OVERRIDING THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, the question of overriding the President's veto of S. 518 confronts the House with a classic issue of ends versus means.

During House consideration of the companion measure, H.R. 3932, requiring Senate confirmation of the Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, it was apparent from the recorded votes that an overwhelming majority of our colleagues supported the principle of Senate confirmation of these two very important officials, since many Members who voted against the bill on final passage voted in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEELMAN) which provided for Senate confirmation of future appointees.

The real issue, therefore, on May 1 as on the present occasion was not whether the Director and Deputy Director of OMB should be subject to Senate confirmation but how the Congress should provide for such confirmation. That issue depends, in turn, on which of two objectives we are seeking through this legislation, either establishment of the principle of Senate confirmation or the removal of the present holders of the two offices.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we are seeking to achieve the former objective then the appropriate vehicle would have been the original legislation as amended by the Steelman amendment.

If, on the other hand, our objective is the removal of the incumbent officeholders, then the method employed in the pending legislation is clearly inappropriate, if not unconstitutional.

If the Congress finds the qualifications or the performance of the present OMB Director and Deputy Director so lacking in merit as to warrant their removal from office, then Congress has more appropriate means of doing so at its disposal; specifically, either conviction or impeachment.

The failure to utilize these constitutionally appropriate means, therefore, suggests strongly that the present legislation should be condemned either as an unwise exercise of ex post facto rule-making—since the incumbent officeholders were appointed and are now serving in a completely legal manner—or as an unconstitutional bill of attainder, since removal from office by legislative means can surely be interpreted as the kind of punishment usually associated with conviction of a crime. It hardly needs to be added that, in this case, no crime has been alleged, no trial conducted, and no conviction obtained.

I should think, Mr. Speaker, that in the present political environment, our colleagues would be extremely sensitive to the question of ends and means, and exceedingly careful to assure that in seeking sound objectives we use equally valid means.

For these reasons, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto even though I am convinced that the offices of Director and Deputy Director of OMB should be subject to the scrutiny and the approval of the other body. If the President's veto is, in fact, sustained, I hope the appropriate committee of the House will shortly report out legislation which will permit us to accomplish the objective in a more fitting manner.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program is of critical importance in a district like mine. The unemployment rate in Cleveland is 11.8 percent. The percentage of unemployed whites is 6.9 percent while the rate for minority citizens is 18.2 percent. Minority unemployment in Cleveland is the highest in the Nation.

The Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program is vital to my city and to the Nation. Youngsters from low-income families are given an opportunity to learn by working and, at the same time, to contribute to the support of their families. The income they earn during the summer is important in making possible their return to school in the fall.

Cleveland has one of the finest Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in the Nation. Last summer the program had a budget of \$4.3 million and served 12,457 disadvantaged youngsters. Last year, the Department of Labor, without any justification, transferred the official sponsorship of the program to city hall. The board of education, which had sponsored it for 7 years, continued to manage the program but did not have the ultimate authority.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the prospects for a vigorous, effective program are bleak. Only \$1.8 million is now committed to the program. That amount is from discretionary funds provided to the city under the Emergency Employment Act. Use of this money for SNYC will not result in the removal of any adults from the Emergency Employment Program. However, with unemployment still at a critical level in Cleveland, the funds could have been used to provide more full-time transitional jobs to adults. The money could also have been used to hire some additional supervisors for the SNYC program. I am told that even when adequate funds are available for SNYC, the funds for supervisory personnel are inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, if no more than \$1.8 million is available this year, only 4,500 youngsters will have jobs. This is just over one third of the number served last summer. The city could, as President Nixon suggests, use more of its emergency employment funds, in order to bring the SNYC program up to last year's \$4.3 million level, however, it would be necessary to fire 702 adult workers from emergency employment jobs. It makes no sense to fire fathers to hire sons.

The administration has announced that the emergency employment program can be phased out because the unemployment crisis is over. That argument is absurd. The thousands of unemployed people in Cleveland and elsewhere cannot live on claims like that. They need jobs, and the emergency employment programs is the last major program to provide them.

We cannot permit the administration to force cities to choose between unemployed adults and disadvantaged young people. Both programs must continue at full capacity.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has already appropriated \$256.5 million, none of which has been released by the administration, for this Summer's Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Those funds must be released, I have discussed the situation with my colleagues in the Northeast Ohio Congressional Council, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. JAMES STANTON, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. VANIK. All of them agreed that a bipartisan effort to obtain the release of these funds was necessary. On May 18, we circulated a dear colleague letter urging Members to cosign a strong letter to the President, urging him to release the funds. Yesterday we sent out the letter with the signatures of 85 Members of the House.

This issue is a part of the larger conflict between the Congress and the executive branch. I am proud of the work of the Congress with respect to both the SNYC program and the Emergency Employment program. We have created two fine programs and have appropriated the funds to execute them. We must now join together to see to it that the programs are carried out.

CONGRESSMAN STEELE TELLS OF NEW ENGLAND'S VANISHING RESOURCE

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with a number of my colleagues in cosponsoring legislation intended to save from extinction the North American lobster, a species which is being ravaged by indiscriminate foreign fishing fleets.

Under this bill, introduced initially by Mr. KYROS of Maine, and Mr. STEELE of Connecticut, the North American lobster would be designated a "creature of the Continental Shelf," thereby providing it with the same protection now accorded under Federal law to the Alaskan king crab.

The multifaceted problem of reckless foreign fishing practices is not new to us in New England. It strikes at our history, our economy, and our efforts to conserve much of what we hold dear.

In the current issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin, my Connecticut colleague, (Mr. STEELE) authored an in depth and perceptive account of the enormity and scope of the problem we face. I believe that a review of this article, "Trouble in Fishing Waters," will give all of the Members a clear understanding of this vital issue.

Accordingly, I insert Congressman STEELE's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

TROUBLE IN FISHING WATERS

(By Robert H. Steele)

In Gloucester, Massachusetts, a plaque commemorates the founding of New England's great fishing industry in 1623 by "a company of fishermen and farmers." Today, America's first and oldest industry is rapidly dying because over-fishing by foreign fleets is threatening our once plentiful fisheries with extinction. If something is not done soon, Gloucester's plaque may well serve as the future tombstone for many species that were once plentiful in Northwest Atlantic coastal waters.

New England fishermen have been facing this problem for a number of years. This year, a Gloucester trawler returned after a week-long voyage with only two haddock to divide among the seven-man crew. The captain said that during past years his vessel would normally return with several thousand pounds of haddock in its hold. Increasingly, New England fishermen set out on their boats only to find that supplies of haddock, ocean perch, whiting, mackerel, herring, red and silver hake, yellowtail flounder, cod, salmon, scallops, and lobsters are not so abundant as they once were.

In 1971, for example, New England's fishermen landed only 380 million pounds of food-fish. Ten years earlier, they caught nearly double that amount—742 million pounds. A breakdown of this figure by species reveals just how critical the problem is becoming. Haddock landings in 1971 totaled only 21.6 million pounds against 134 million only a decade earlier. The 60-million-pound catch of ocean perch in 1971 was less than half the 1962 catch. Hauls of whiting totaled a mere 28 million pounds, compared with 98 million ten years earlier.

Although the total catch by U.S. fishermen over the past 25 years has remained almost steady—from 4.6 billion pounds in 1945 to 4.9 billion in 1970—these figures mask the problem in New England because fishing gains were being made in other coastal regions, such as the West Coast and the Gulf of New Mexico. Even so, the overall national catch has failed to keep up with the country's growing appetite for fish. To meet this demand, we have had to rely more and more on imports. At the end of World War II, we imported only 13.4 percent of the fish we consumed. By 1970, that figure had risen sharply to 57.4 percent.

To help determine the cause of the problem, last October I invited the ranking member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Representative Frank M. Clark (D-Pennsylvania), to hold investigative hearings at Stonington, Connecticut. Stonington is particularly representative of once-thriving fishing ports that have been forced to curtail operations because of diminishing supplies of fish. In 1930, fishermen from Stonington alone caught more than five times the haddock that was landed in all of New England; last year Stonington's present fleet of 11 fishing boats is a far cry from the 40 that once berthed there.

At the hearings, witness after witness—most of them active fishermen and lobstermen—testified that the depletion of our fish stocks has one basic cause, namely the reckless and exploitative fishing operations of foreign fleets in and just outside the U.S. fishery zone. These fleets operate with no regard to size restrictions or U.S. catch limitations, with the result that, in just two years of intensive overfishing, these foreign trawlers have reduced the stock of herring along the Atlantic coast by 95 percent. They are similarly endangering other species, such as haddock, yellow-tail flounder, cod, mackerel, and sea scallops.

This invasion dates from 1961, when a large Soviet fleet appeared on Georges Bank, the traditional fishing grounds of U.S. fishermen.

That year's operations by the Soviets were described as "exploratory fishing"—mostly for herring. In the following years, they increased the number and size of their vessels and expanded the range of species they took.

In 1965, Polish vessels began appearing on the banks, joined in the late 1960's by trawlers from West and East Germany, Spain, Romania, Bulgaria, Japan, and several other countries. In February of this year, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) of the Department of Commerce reported a total of 220 fishing vessels and support ships off the New England and Middle Atlantic coasts. They came from the Soviet Union (128), Poland (35), East Germany (16), Bulgaria (5), Spain (15), Japan (12), Italy (6), and West Germany (3). Eighty-one of the Soviet ships were working off New England. Among them were 57 stern-factory and freezer trawlers, 19 medium-size trawlers, four processing and transport vessels (the factory-base ships), and one tanker. Their operations spread from the eastern tip of Long Island to south and southeast of Nantucket Island, and on to Georges Bank. Their catches, according to the NMFS report, included mackerel, herring, and red and silver hake.

The 1963 haddock spawning season was very productive—and closely observed by the Soviet's "exploratory" herring fleet. In 1965, they moved in and in an 18-month period took 180,000 tons of haddock, including a high percentage of fish smaller than those allowed by federal regulations. Reproduction of haddock stocks from 1965 on has been poor. By 1969, continued heavy fishing by foreigners had reduced stocks to a quarter of the level that had once provided the 50,000-ton sustained yield.

To counter this appalling situation, the International Commission of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF) established a 12,000-ton quota for haddock for 1970 and 1971 in ICNAF's sub-area 5, the region comprising Georges Bank. Despite this action, our hearings at Stonington last fall and recent hearings in Washington have revealed little hope among fishery representatives that ICNAF quotas could do much more than express pious hope that foreign fleets would abide by the rules.

ICNAF was established more than 20 years ago to protect and conserve fishery stocks in the Northwest Atlantic in order to maintain a maximum sustained catch. For most of its history, the commission's main activity has been limited to studying fish populations and recommending to its member-nations such conservation measures as open and closed seasons, size limits, closed spawning areas, and prohibitions of certain types of gear. In 1970, ICNAF set catch limits on haddock and yellowtail flounder in the Georges Bank area, and provided for international inspection in mid-1971. Since then, additional quotas have been set and allocated to the member-nations, and new recommendations have been proposed to put teeth into the inspection program.

The trouble with ICNAF is that its rulings have often been ignored. In general, the commission's effort to limit takes of cod and haddock worked until 1965 when foreign fleets moved in with modern, government-subsidized fleet and equipment, and proceeded to ignore the guidelines. Since then, the commission's main accomplishments have been to provide a forum for well-meaning rhetoric and to produce an annual report outlining a raft of proposals—decisions on which, more often than not, have been put off until the following years. Quotas or no quotas, witnesses told our subcommittee last fall, the foreign vessels keep busy. "One by one they have picked off haddock, cod, yellowtail, herring, scallops, and who knows what's next?" Reading our delegation's stiff-sounding reports of ICNAF annual meetings leaves one with the impression that foreign

representatives generally take a dim view of measures proposed by the United States to conserve the fisheries.

When the U.S. proposed in 1970 that national quotas be allocated on an historical basis to give U.S. and Canadian fishermen fair access to stocks in their traditional fishing grounds, the Soviet Union replied that in computing such quotas it would only consider using as a base the previous three to five years, the period covering their heaviest fishing effort. Quotas thus calculated would, in effect, be no quotas at all. During the 1971 meeting, the USSR, Poland, and Romania "stated again that they could not accept inspection of fishing gear below deck or of their catches," despite acceptance by most member-nations of the reciprocal inspection scheme, and despite indications that the U.S. would pass legislation requiring its fishermen to allow ICNAF inspectors to board their vessels.

Although most ICNAF countries accepted a 1969 proposal to prohibit fishing for Atlantic salmon in waters outside national fishery limits, Denmark, Norway, and West Germany refused to reduce their effort below the 1969 level. It was only when the U.S. last year passed a law giving the President authority to ban imports of fish from countries violating international conservation agreements that the Danes agreed to phase out their high-seas Atlantic salmon operations. More often, though, items in a thorny agenda are put off until they can be "further studied." So it is that action on a U.S. proposal made at a special ICNAF meeting in January, 1973, to reduce the total fishing effort has been deferred until the commission's next annual meeting in June. Judging from past experience, it is unlikely that New England's diminishing supply of fish will realize any relief from foreign fishing pressure on this score, since almost no one believes that the foreign nations will agree on a way to limit catches.

Several years ago, the United States concluded agreements with both the Soviet Union and Poland to protect U.S. fish resources in the mid-Atlantic south of the ICNAF region and beyond the 12-mile fishery zone off the coasts of New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland. Within the region covered by the agreement, "no fishing" zones are set out for various periods during the year. In February of this year, the NMFS reported that "no Soviet or Polish vessels were observed" fishing in the prohibited zones. However, the February report noted that five Japanese, four Spanish, three Italian, and one West German vessel were fishing inside the zone. Since we have no similar bilateral agreements with those countries, the U.S. is unable to protect its offshore resources from their operations.

More and more, officials are expressing pessimism about remedies in multilateral arrangements or in formal and informal bilateral agreements. Our government so far has proven itself ineffective in dealing with countries that flaunt the "spirit" of the agreements. Ask someone like Jacob Dykstra of Rhode Island, a working fisherman and president of the Point Judith Fisherman's Cooperative, how he feels about "international cooperation" in the Northwest Atlantic fisheries, and he'll say—as he told us at Stonington—that "the root of the problem is to get the foreign fishermen off those stocks of fish that are being depleted."

The "species approach," which says that "authority to regulate the living resources of the high seas shall be determined by their biological characteristics," means that the United States will regulate coastal and anadromous species throughout the range of their movement. As it was stated last August, the U.S. draft article reads: "The coastal state shall regulate and have preferential rights to all coastal living resources off its coast beyond the territorial sea to the limits of their

migratory range. The coastal state in whose fresh or estuarine waters anadromous resources (e.g., salmon) spawn shall have authority to regulate and have preferential rights to such resources beyond the territorial sea throughout their migratory range on the high seas (without regard to whether or not they are off the coast of said state)."

If this principle is accepted by the Law of the Sea Conference, the United States could presumably enter into agreements with other high-seas fishing countries by which we would issue licenses, and enforce regulation of their operations in any of the fisheries over which we claimed jurisdiction. During our hearings, former Secretary of the Navy John Chafee testified on behalf of the species approach, saying in effect that it would not in itself endanger national defense requirements for free passage in international waters.

But history tells us that workable agreements between nations take a long time to accomplish. Until that happens, something must be done to solve the problem of the Northwest Atlantic fisheries for the near future. Clearly, the most desirable solution to the problem is some sort of international agreement which is workable and which issues fair shares of fishery resources to those countries with sustainable claims. While several organizations, including the Sierra Club, who seek to save our fisheries favor an international approach, I fear that the present condition of several Northwest Atlantic species of fish may compel us not to wait on diplomats, but to take unilateral action now—at least until effective international accords can be agreed upon.

Professor John L. Jacobson of the University of Oregon Law School wrote last year: "In view of the apparent trend toward over-exploitation of certain stocks of the world's commercial fisheries, and in light of the proven incapacity of the international community to come to effective agreement in anything like a timely fashion, coastal nations ought to be allowed—even, perhaps, encouraged in some instances—to take action on the high seas." He stipulated that such unilateral action, pending final resolution of the problem by the Law of the Sea Conference, would have to follow these guidelines:

It must be in response to a "demonstrable" conservation crisis;

It must be concerned solely with protection of the endangered resource;

It must not unreasonably discriminate on the high seas against nationals of other nations;

It must carry on automatic termination date; and

It must be accompanied by a clear call for international agreement.

With a sense of urgency in mind, I joined fellow members of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee in introducing H.R. 4760, the High Seas Fisheries Act of 1973. Since this is the only measure suggested by the Administration to protect and regulate our fisheries, I believe it should be given the earliest possible consideration and should be utilized to focus full Congressional attention on the issue. Although the bill is based on the species approach, it would only implement existing international treaties, which in light of recent developments, I fear are too weak to solve the crisis we face.

I am completely in favor of implementing existing treaties, but in order to preserve already endangered fish populations and to strengthen our position in future negotiations, I believe we must first pass legislation to unilaterally declare species jurisdiction and protection. Having thus protected our fishing resource, we can then bargain with other nations on a long-term agreement. I am currently drafting legislation to formulate this approach.

Unless conservationists grasp the significance of stock depletion by foreign fishing fleets and work to implement strong legislation, species of fish once abundant in New England waters will, for fisheries purposes, be lost forever. This fact must be recognized because no one now knows how the ecology of the entire North Atlantic may be upset by continued destruction of the stocks. For my part, I don't want to see us guess about the consequences any longer.

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE SPEAKS ON AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following concurrent resolution of the New Hampshire Legislature speaks for itself. Its message is clear: The United States has neither a legal nor a moral obligation to financially assist North Vietnam.

Grants to foreign nations, especially North Vietnam, make no sense at a time when this country is striving to meet the domestic needs of American citizens burdened with a national debt approaching \$500 billion. Since the end of the Second World War, President after President and Congress after Congress—but not with my vote—have recommended and approved bilateral gifts of U.S. taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations—to the tune of more than \$130 billion. Despite this massive generosity, the United States has usually failed to earn either the respect or the friendship of those nations so lavishly assisted. We are generally considered a "soft touch."

With inflation gnawing at us from all sides, it is time to stop this wasteful use of such revenues as we have. The Yankee commonsense expressed by the New Hampshire Legislature is convincing that North Vietnam must not be added to the foreign aid list.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 13
MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES NOT TO REBUILD NORTH VIETNAM

Whereas, The people of the State of New Hampshire have given strong support for the actions taken by the various administrations in prosecuting the conflict in Vietnam; and

Whereas, The numerous sons and daughters of the Granite State have actively participated in this conflict as members of our armed forces; and

Whereas, Many of these native sons and daughters made the supreme sacrifice along with their numerous comrades-in-arms from throughout the United States as well as those who shall bear the permanent scars of this conflict for the rest of their lives in their valiant and courageous efforts to secure and maintain freedom for their South Vietnamese allies; and

Whereas, The United States government is under neither a legal nor moral obligation to render financial or other assistance to a former military enemy; Now Therefore, Be It

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire with the Sen-

ate concurring, that this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to deny any financial or material assistance to the people or government of North Vietnam.

Be it Further Resolved that the secretary of state forward certified copies of this resolution to the members of the New Hampshire delegation, clerk of the United States Senate, clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to the President of the United States of America.

WEEKLY NEWSPAPER OBSERVES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, this year the Charlotte Gazette, published at Drakes Branch, Va., is observing its 100th anniversary.

I count it a privilege to represent the Fifth Congressional District in which this fine weekly newspaper has been carrying forth for the past century and take this means of extending to that organization my very best wishes.

The current issue of the Charlotte Gazette is vol. 100, No. 30, and I, like all of its readers, have found it to be one of the best examples of the traditional country newspaper. It is well written, displays its written material, pictures and advertisements in an attractive format and continues to maintain a high standard of excellence. For the past 27 years, the paper has been edited by Mr. Otis O. Tucker, Jr., and he and Mrs. Tucker collaborate in its management.

The Charlotte Gazette first came into being on May 8, 1873, and its story is not unlike that experienced by many weeklies throughout the Nation. It has maintained a policy of serving its readership and is now the only newspaper in Charlotte County. It has a good balance between straight news and the personalized items which typify the country press. Readers find within its pages a generous coverage of local civic affairs, social news, sports, school news, and a wide assortment of feature material which is distinctive to the rural press. The paper has a high standard of propriety and recognizes its responsibility to inform.

Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the Charlotte Gazette affords me an opportunity to pay respect to the institution of the weekly newspaper. At the present time, there are more than 5,700 newspapers in the United States which are weekly, biweekly, semiweekly, or something other than daily. The papers range from the very small circulation to some which run into substantial numbers.

These papers perform an extremely important and worthwhile function in America. Without them, many communities would not be the same. For the most part, they tend to rely not on spot news but on local, community-interest items. Through their pages, they frequently are able to give credit and honor to local people whose achievements might not otherwise be published, be-

cause the daily press either does not know about them or does not have space to devote to this purpose. Like the country store, the country newspaper has an important role to play. Not all weekly newspapers are rural in their area of coverage, but most of them have adopted the format of appealing to the homespun approach to news and public events.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to them.

Mr. Speaker, because the story of this newspaper is indicative of the trend which many such publications have followed, I would like to include herein with my remarks an article which appeared in the May 10, 1973 edition.

The article follows:

THE CHARLOTTE GAZETTE IS 100 YEARS OLD!

On May 8, 1873, the first issue of "The Charlotte Gazette" was printed by the Rev. Leonard Cox, who came to Charlotte County from Massachusetts to become pastor of Mt. Tirzah Baptist Church, in Charlotte Court House.

The location of the first printing plant for "The Gazette" was just off Route 645, about three miles south of Charlotte Court House. The land for the building was sold by Mr. Thomas L. Moore, grandfather of Mr. Robert L. Moore, of Charlotte Court House, who has given us much interesting information about the early history of "The Gazette" and the Cox family.

We are grateful to Mrs. Ellen N. Catron, who has made an extensive study of the history of Charlotte County, for the following article about "The Charlotte Gazette" and other newspapers that have been published in Charlotte County.

NEWSPAPER HISTORY OF CHARLOTTE COUNTY (By Ellen N. Catron)

The Charlotte Gazette was the earliest newspaper printed in Charlotte County. The first edition was printed May 8, 1873 with a sub-title, "A local family newspaper, devoted to home interests and general literature".

The Gazette's first editor was Reverend Leonard Cox from the North. He came to the county as a minister at Mt. Tirzah Baptist Church at Charlotte Court House.

Reverend Cox was a well-educated man. He graduated from Harvard College with a B.A. degree in 1843 and a M.A. degree in 1848. He served Mt. Tirzah for about two years.

With Andrew Parish and John M. Bouldin, Leonard Cox founded The Charlotte Gazette in 1873. Cox bought some land, Fruit Hill Farm, from Thomas L. Moore three miles south of Charlotte Court House and established the newspaper there.

In Cox's eighty-second year, 1903, he set the type and printed a book of his poems. Poems Serious and Humorous. Two of his poems were inspired by the death of Wood Bouldin, October 10, 1879, and by the death of Hugh Blair Grigsby, April 18, 1881.

Leonard Cox died in 1913. His son, Arthur L. Cox printed the paper until 1916, when he sold it to R. S. Chamberlayne. Arthur obtained a paper in Marion, Virginia, and operated the Marion Publishing Company for several years. He sold his business in 1927 to the novelist and short-story writer, Sherwood Anderson. Marion's Smyth County News became, perhaps, the most talked about weekly in the nation after its purchase by Anderson.

Mr. Chamberlayne had The Charlotte Gazette printed at Phenix by Nelson Robins from Richmond for about three years. It was discontinued briefly during 1919. In July 1919, J. A. Scoggin of North Carolina and his son, James, began printing the paper at

Drakes Branch. James began editing the Kenbridge-Victoria Dispatch about 1927 and had it printed at Drakes Branch.

Mr. Lewis H. Greene of Lexington, Virginia, and formerly of the Eureka neighborhood, began his apprenticeship under J. A. Scoggin in 1931. Mr. Greene completed one year at Hampden-Sydney College, but because of the lack of funds and the death of his father he was forced to get a job. He found the printing office and newspaper fascinating and spent a great deal of time hanging around it. Mr. Scoggin hired him at a salary of \$2.50 a week and under his tutelage, Mr. Greene became a linotype operator. Mr. Greene left the Gazette in 1935 to join the staff of The Rockbridge News in Lexington, Virginia.

In May 1946, The Charlotte Gazette was purchased by O. O. Tucker, Jr., E. E. Franklin, and Robert W. Bowen. Mr. Franklin was a native of Danville and Mr. Tucker's brother-in-law. Robert W. Bowen was a native of Meridian, Connecticut, and served two years overseas in the Aleutian Islands with Mr. Tucker. Mr. Bowen sold his interest in the paper after two years and returned to Connecticut. The paper was copublished by Franklin and Tucker until Franklin's death April 8, 1966.

Mr. Franklin's interest was purchased by Mr. and Mrs. Tucker. They are the present owners and publishers of The Charlotte Gazette and The Kenbridge-Victoria Dispatch.

Just before noon, Friday, December 27, 1968, fire was discovered in the building which housed the plant that produced the two newspapers. The staff was on Christmas vacation and the tenants in the two apartments upstairs were away. By the time the firemen arrived, the flames had spread through the aged wooden roof of the nearly century-old building, leaving only the four brick walls standing. The printing machinery was heavily damaged. The loss was estimated at over \$75,000. All records were saved.

A new modern brick and block building was constructed on the approximate site of the old building. It was built with two sections; one containing conventional "hot type" equipment and the other containing new offset or "cold type" equipment. The plant was completed early in the summer of 1969.

Other newspapers known to have been printed in Charlotte County have all been located in Keysville. The Herald was a conservative newspaper begun in 1879, just three years after The Charlotte Gazette. It was edited by M. Holt and J. Newton Huston. It suspended operations July 1880 and there are no known copies.

The Banner and Alliance was established in 1891 by J. P. Wood and Company. It supported the Farmers' Alliance party. The paper is believed to have been discontinued about 1892. There are no copies available.

The independent Keysville Progress was first printed January 1893 by George V. Tuohy and later by T. Frank Greenwood. This paper was discontinued about 1894 or 1895. There is a copy of this paper.

F. H. Gregory edited the Times, established in 1896. There are no known copies of this paper, but it was printed longer than any other Keysville newspaper. It ceased publication about 1899.

The last paper printed in Keysville was the Courier. It was established in 1908 and edited by Robert H. Bryan. There are no known copies of this paper and it was discontinued in 1909.

The Charlotte Gazette was begun as an independent paper and became Democrat in 1891. It has been the only paper established in Charlotte County to survive. The Gazette has been printed almost continuously. Only

for a short time in 1919 was it discontinued and then revived at Drakes Branch by Leonard Cox. The "masthead," The Charlotte Gazette, is still printed in the same type as in 1873.

A MOTHER'S PLEA AGAINST THE LEGALIZATION OF MARIHUANA

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for some time now a great deal of attention has been focused on our drug-oriented culture as there is little doubt but that drug abuse is rapidly becoming one of the most serious problems in America. However, far too often we hear only from those who espouse the legalization of marihuana rather from those whose personal experiences clearly show the need to strengthen our laws relating to the use and/or possession of this mind-altering drug.

Although marihuana is regarded as a weaker or milder drug in comparison to the "hard stuff" such as heroin, I can see no logical reason for the Government sanctioning its use. In my mind, this would serve as a signal to thousands of impressionable youths throughout the country that the Government had put its stamp of approval on this drug and that it was alright to use without any harmful effects.

The May 3 issue of the Evening Independent contained a "Letter to the Editor" from a concerned mother who is personally experiencing a not-so-rare situation involving her son's efforts to rehabilitate himself. I believe the anguish suffered by "H. K." and her family, as described in this letter, merits the attention of my colleagues.

A MOTHER'S PLEA: DON'T MAKE MARIJUANA
LEGAL

Editor:

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

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

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

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

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

Shortly after his 16th birthday, he told us that he was smoking marijuana, that he

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H. K. St. Petersburg.

THE FLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN FILM INDUSTRY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, film is the art form of the modern world. Born in this century, and fostered by the American culture, film has grown to become one of the most significant artistic contributions of all time. Film, and its various counterparts, such as videotape, have become one of the dominant arts of the world. Indeed, they have revolutionized the world. And now the art form that was inspired by America is being lost in America.

Film is incomparable to all previous forms of art. It moves. It is colorful and magic. It brings the world into our neighborhood theater or living room television set. Film has brought the foremost dramatic contributions of all time to people throughout the world, who might never have heard of Shakespeare without it. Film crosses national boundaries and breaks language barriers. It brings the commonality of all human beings across the globe right before our eyes. Moreover, it is one of the only true art forms that appeals to such a wide segment of people from different educational and cultural backgrounds. It brings art to the king and to the pauper alike.

Unfortunately, the art form that was developed in America is now dying in America. No, the quality of American film production has not decreased. Nor has the reservoir of talent and expertise in this field become less capable. These are not the problems. However, the entire motion picture and television industry is in dire economic trouble.

Unemployment is now 47 percent, and is soaring higher daily. The entire industry is floundering in depression, from the single craftsman inside the sound studio, to the largest film-producing corporation. For example, according to industry figures, in a recent year 76 percent of the Screen Actors Guild members made an annual income of less than \$2,500. Understandably, this figure may be hard to accept because of the exaggerated impressions most of us have of Hollywood life, but nevertheless, it is still true. Everyone seems to think that every actor and director owns a mansion in Beverly Hills, and spends most of his or her time lying out by the pool in the California sun to maintain a good tan. We seem to think that it does not take much effort to create quality production, and that all of Hollywood spends most of their time at parties or in other leisurely pursuits. But, this is certainly not the case. In fact, the actors and technicians who are fortunate enough to find work in the job-tight market work long and arduous hours to produce quality material. The remainder of the industry may not be working, but they certainly are

not wasting time at parties, because in fact, they are likely to be unemployed.

There are many reasons for this crisis unemployment situation. One major cause is the attitude of our own Government in film production related areas. It is not commonly known, but the American Government is the largest single producer of film-related matters. However, as I have pointed out earlier in this Congress, the Government has attempted to produce its own materials rather than contract out to the professional industry. Moreover, even when the Government does use the private sector, it rarely pays the prevailing wages of the industry. There is presently a bill, H.R. 1090, before this Congress that would alter that situation by requiring Government departments and agencies engaged in the production of motion picture films to pay prevailing wages. I urge all my colleagues to consider this legislation thoughtfully, as it is only proper that professionals be paid consistent wages, whether they are employed by Universal Studios, or the U.S. Government.

Furthermore, I feel that it is the Government's obligation to make a concerted effort to utilize the vast skills and resources of the film industry when they are involved in this type of audiovisual production. President Nixon himself, in October 1972, instructed Government agencies to "better utilize the American motion picture industry in film production." However, this administration mandate has not been adhered to, and moreover, the White House has not followed through with its call for action. I urge both the President, and the agencies involved to take further steps to assure that if the U.S. Government is involved in mass media production, use of the professional industry is a high priority.

The increasing level of foreign production in this area is also one of the foremost causes of the present unhealthy state of affairs. Due to Government subsidies by foreign nations, it is now cheaper for American companies to produce their films outside the boundaries of the United States. For example, in 1972, there were 181 feature motion pictures shot throughout the entire United States of America. During this very same period, there were 149 feature productions shot by American-interest investments in foreign countries that were released in the United States. American companies produced almost as many feature films in foreign nations as they did in their own country. In addition, these figures do not even take into account the thousands of imported feature films produced by foreign interests in foreign lands. Put in another light, these statistics appear even more appalling. According to reliable industry sources of data, foreign-subsidized American interest productions, together with foreign imports, have dramatically increased over the last two decades as shown by the following figures:

1946—19% of films shown in the U.S. were foreign-made.

1956—43% foreign-made.

1966—65% foreign-made.

1970—70% foreign-made.

1972—73% foreign-made.

As these figures dramatically point out, less than 30 percent of the productions seen by Americans in the past year were filmed within our own national boundaries. What is the effect of this wide discrepancy? It should be obvious. Unemployment in the American film industry grows daily, unabated, while the subsidized film industries of foreign nations grow fatter on American investment.

I am not here today to ask that all American companies begin producing all their films here in America. I only mention these figures to point out the importance of this astounding fact—the United States is the only important film producing country in the world which extends no governmental assistance, either in the form of subsidies, low-interest loans, investment guarantees or tax incentives, to help provide adequate financial support or appropriate forms of economic encouragement for domestic film production.

I urge all my colleagues to keep these facts in mind when they are faced with decisions on legislation that will affect the motion picture and television industry. The American film industry should be a significant concern to this Government. American film represents America to the rest of the world. It carries the messages of American culture, democracy and freedom to all peoples around the globe. It is our responsibility, I feel, to assure that American film production does not slowly become extinct.

It is our duty in Congress to consider every possible means to maintain film production as a significant and necessary part of American life. We need to explore new ways and means for creating incentives for domestic production. Federal agencies must be urged to use the professional industry in their work whenever appropriate. We must also make sure that professional workers are paid the proper fair wage when they are working for our Government. Presently, such issues as these are being discussed in the great Standing Committees of this House. Indeed, various bills have been introduced in this Congress that can have a beneficial effect on the severe depression in the film industry. When examining these issues, we must remain aware of the severity of the depression in this industry. I believe it is possible to reach decisions that can have a favorable impact on the film industry, which in turn, will have a great impact on American life across the country. However, legislation that attempts to maintain and encourage the economic development of the film industry, must not be confused with subtle efforts at censorship. I suggest to my colleagues that when evaluating such proposals, they remain aware that we need an economically stable industry, but we also need a media free from governmental control.

In conclusion, I, for one, intend to do all I can to assure that quality American film production is increased, both for the benefit of the skilled members of the pro-

fessional industry, as well as the viewing public across the Nation. They deserve better, and we can help them attain it.

URGING SUPPORT FOR SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2246

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be in conference with the Senate on a matter of vital importance, the Public Works and Economic Development Act extension. When this bill, H.R. 2246, came before the House on March 15, this Chamber realized its responsibility to preserve and protect our economy. We passed H.R. 2246 by a substantial majority. At that time, our economy was in serious trouble, and the need for this legislation was readily apparent. Since that time the situation has worsened. The recent Department of Defense announcement to close military installations has added thousands of workers, particularly in New England, to the already critically skyrocketing unemployment roles. Forceful legislation is needed immediately to control this situation. This bill, which we passed on March 15, was adequate for its time, but times have changed. Fortunately, the Senate was prompt in taking constructive action in this area. Realistic amendments have been added to H.R. 2246, amendments which must be supported in conference.

The amendment which is of particular importance in protecting our economy is the amendment which was offered by Senator KENNEDY. This amendment, which is section 7 of the bill, states that—

The President's Inter-Agency Economic Adjustment Committee established under Presidential Memorandum of March 4, 1970, shall submit to the Congress within thirty days following enactment of this Act a report. Such report, with respect to each community affected by the defense facility and activity realignments announced on April 17, 1973, shall—

(1) contain details as to the facilities or portions thereof affected by the realignments which are excess to the Government's security needs and which can be turned over to the local jurisdiction for civilian use;

(2) describe procedures providing for the most expeditious transfer of such facilities to civilian use;

(3) contain comprehensive analyses of the community economic impact of a realignment which reduces or terminates activities resulting in a decrease in military or civilian personnel employed at a facility;

(4) describe technical assistance and program resources made available by Federal agencies to communities in planning and carrying out economic development plans to utilize facilities transferred to civilian control; and

(4) contain an estimate of the Federal program resources and the anticipated cost to fully implement community development plans, and, where necessary, contain recommendations for increased appropriations to meet those anticipated costs.

This amendment is of crucial impor-

tance to every community which is near or which has a defense installation within its borders. These communities have a right to know what the impact will be of these closings, and what they might be able to expect from the Government to assist in the transition. Many communities are heavily dependent upon the installation in their area, and in some cases, the loss of the installation would mean the loss of the community. We, as Representatives of these communities deserve to know how areas in our districts will be affected.

There have been 274 actions to consolidate, reduce, realine, or close military installations which will eliminate over the next 10 years 42,800 military and civilian positions in 32 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. I would remind my colleagues that virtually all of you represent districts which contain defense installations or defense-related industries. Future Department of Defense cutbacks could have a sudden and severe effect on almost any portion of the country.

I will be contacting the conferees on this bill today to urge their support for the Senate amendments to H.R. 2246, and I would urge my colleagues to join with me in this.

OBJECTIONS TO SONNENFELDT CONFIRMATION MUST BE ANSWERED—PART II

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, May 23, there appears, beginning on page E3428, the prepared statement of John D. Hemenway who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee last week in opposition to Helmut Sonnenfeldt as the administration's choice for Under Secretary of the Treasury. As indicated in my remarks of yesterday, Mr. Hemenway's statement was accompanied by an affidavit of Mr. Otto Otepka, the retired State Department security officer who was directly involved in Mr. Sonnenfeldt's case in the 1950's and early 1960's.

Mr. Otepka was present at the Sonnenfeldt nomination hearing on May 15, and his letter to Senator CARL CURTIS commenting on Mr. Sonnenfeldt's testimony is worthy of careful consideration. Mr. Otepka states at one point:

In response to your questions, and to questions of other Senators, Mr. Sonnenfeldt made several statements which, in the light of my knowledge, if not deliberately and outrageously false, are, to say the least, inaccurate and misleading.

I insert at this point the sworn affidavit of Mr. Otto F. Otepka and his letter to Senator CURTIS of May 17 concerning the nomination of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt as Under Secretary of the Treasury.

AFFIDAVIT OF OTTO F. OTEPKA

I, Otto F. Otepka, 1832 Arcola Ave., Wheaton, Maryland, having been duly sworn according to law, hereby depose and say:

1. I was employed by the Department of State from June 15, 1953 until June 29, 1969. During a substantial portion of that time I occupied the positions of Chief, Division of Evaluations, Office of Security and Deputy Director, Office of Security. Between June 30, 1969 and June 30, 1972 I served as a Member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, a Presidential appointment for which I was confirmed by the United States Senate. I am now retired from the Federal Government.

2. While in the Department of State, I became aware of an official investigation of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt undertaken by the Office of Security in or about 1955 on the basis of information that Mr. Sonnenfeldt was providing classified data obtained by him through his position in the Department's Bureau of Intelligence Research to certain individuals in the public media in violation of the security standards and practices of the Department of State.

3. The investigation established the fact that Mr. Sonnenfeldt had furnished information without authority to several members of the press despite specific prohibitions applicable to employees of the Bureau of Intelligence Research that were necessary owing to the sensitivity of that Bureau's operations.

4. No disciplinary action was taken against Mr. Sonnenfeldt by management, despite the serious nature of his offense, in order to avoid a public issue about the use of electronic surveillance methods by the State Department in corroborating the offenses in question.

5. Subsequently, Mr. Sonnenfeldt was reassigned to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of the Department of State when he could not be approved under security standards established and enforced by the United States Joint Intelligence Board for access to certain highly sensitive data that was required for his position in the Bureau of Intelligence Research. Mr. Sonnenfeldt was deemed ineligible because of his propensity for leaking classified information and because he was not a native born citizen.

6. During 1960 another investigation was undertaken of Mr. Sonnenfeldt when it was revealed that he was providing classified or otherwise nonpublic information obtained by virtue of his official position to persons outside the Department of State who were opposed to the election of Richard Nixon as President of the United States. In the course of a physical surveillance of Mr. Sonnenfeldt, he was observed, for example, on an official working day, leaving the residence of Marguerite Higgins, a newspaperwoman, in the company of Robert Kennedy, brother of John F. Kennedy, who was Mr. Nixon's opponent in the 1960 national election.

7. On my information and belief, Mr. Sonnenfeldt's tenure in the State Department was solidified by the election of John F. Kennedy. However, subsequent reprisals were taken against security officers in the State Department who testified before Congressional committees about deficient security practices. State Department management, meanwhile, promoted Mr. Sonnenfeldt to more critical positions relating to the national security.

8. There are other important details to be provided in this matter at the appropriate time before a suitable board of inquiry. The information provided in this affidavit can be expanded and elaborated upon in greater detail by myself and other witnesses to these and other related events on such an occasion.

Sworn to before me this 26th day of January A.D. 1973

JAMES B. CONNOLLY,
Notary Public D.C.
My Commission Expires Mar. 31, 1973.

WHEATON, MD.,
May 17, 1973.

HON. CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senate,
Dirksen Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: I was in the audience at the May 15 public hearing of the Senate Finance Committee held in connection with the executive nomination of Mr. Helmut Sonnenfeldt to the post of Under Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Sonnenfeldt is now a Foreign Service Officer, Class 1, Department of State, assigned as a staff assistant in the White House on the National Security Council.

In response to your questions, and to questions of other Senators, Mr. Sonnenfeldt made several statements which, in the light of my knowledge, if not deliberately and outrageously false, are, to say the least inaccurate and misleading.

My concern relates to the references made to me as well as to my intention to support Mr. John D. Hemenway, a former Foreign Service Officer, who testified in opposition to Mr. Sonnenfeldt's confirmation by the Senate. The hearing, as I understand, is incomplete and will be resumed at a later date.

I have asked that the stenographic transcript be made available to me. Since I am told there may be some delay in this, I thought it necessary, in the meantime, to submit my observations on Mr. Sonnenfeldt's statements. I shall, of course, submit specific references to the passages in the transcript when it is provided to me, together with additional details, if required.

My reactions are predicated on my familiarity with Mr. Sonnenfeldt's personnel security files and other evidence of his conduct which were within the purview of my jurisdiction during my employment as the Chief Security Evaluator and Deputy Director, Office of Security, Department of State.

In his testimony before the Committee, Mr. Sonnenfeldt repeatedly denied that he had furnished classified information to a foreign national, without authority, in violation of government regulations. According to him, the allegation was made in the "late 1950's" and "during the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration."

His statements make it appear that the above offense has been the only one alleged against him, that none has been proven or established, and that he had been absolved of any wrongdoing following an interview with him in the Department of State which he said took place in 1960. He named me as the interviewing officer.

He stated that he accepted employment with the U.S. Disarmament Administration, now the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, for the reason that his experience was deemed to be useful there.

I respectfully ask that the Committee consider the following facts.

In order to be certain of my own recollection concerning Mr. Sonnenfeldt's security reliability, I have made a careful and recent inquiry of other former State Department security officers. What I say here can be corroborated by them and by the actual personnel security file on Mr. Sonnenfeldt at the State Department, if it has not been tampered with, and if the executive privilege doctrine is not invoked against the Congress to deny it access to the truth. I am informed that portions of the investigative data on Mr. Sonnenfeldt have already been destroyed.

It was established by State Department investigations conducted in 1954 and 1955, that Mr. Sonnenfeldt was the source of leaks of classified intelligence information from the Department's Bureau of Intelligence Research, which he furnished without authority

to at least four members of the press whom I can identify. In view of the delicate nature of the matter, management took no punitive measures against Mr. Sonnenfeldt but he was kept under observation by his superiors.

In the next incident, unrelated to the first, occurring in 1958, a State Department official observed Mr. Sonnenfeldt transmitting highly sensitive intelligence information to a representative of the Government of Israel, again without authority. Unable to obtain assistance in the chain of command, the official reported the offense directly to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Investigation established that this allegation was also true. However, upon FBI referral of the matter to the State Department for cooperation with prosecution, the Department refused to declassify the documents from which the information was derived, on the ground that a public trial would impair relations with the country involved. This judgment nullified further administrative action. Thereafter a substantial portion of the information obtained by investigation was withheld from me.

In 1960, the cumulative evidence with respect to Mr. Sonnenfeldt's transgressions was taken into account by the Bureau of Intelligence Research. It became necessary to consider whether in his continued assignments in that Bureau he could qualify for access to a category of sensitive information designated as "communications intelligence." Under the rules of the U.S. intelligence community, a person who had the "need to know" had to be of absolute security reliability and a native born citizen of the United States.

Neither I, as the official in the Department's Office of Security authorized to make findings whether any substantive information in the Sonnenfeldt record could preclude a clearance under the special standard, nor Ambassador Hugh Cumming, Director of the Bureau of Intelligence Research, would recommend a waiver of that standard for Mr. Sonnenfeldt. Aside from the question of the leaks that militated against his clearance, the fact that he was not a native born citizen of the United States served as an automatic bar under the prescribed standard.

It was for this reason that Mr. Sonnenfeldt was transferred to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency where he occupied a position not involving the "need to know" for communications intelligence data. While he was employed in this adjunct of the State Department, I was requested, and for the first time permitted, to question Mr. Sonnenfeldt about leaks of classified information.

Another member of the Office of Security assisted in the interrogation. As instructed, our questions were confined to the leaks that had occurred in 1954 and 1955. Mr. Sonnenfeldt denied the leaks. Because the interrogators were not allowed to confront Mr. Sonnenfeldt with the actual source material to prove the leaks, his employment was continued without change in status.

Following the interview, Mr. Sonnenfeldt continued his furtive meetings with persons outside the Department known to be interested in stories about foreign policy planning for use in the press, despite prohibition against such contacts unless they were duly reported by the employee. His demeanor created consternation and dissension among his coworkers who had scrupulously adhered to the regulations. They noted and reported on his undue curiosity in seeking information from them for which he had no "need to know." Additionally, State Department investigators authorized to maintain an open investigation on Mr. Sonnenfeldt's activities, observed his contacts and prepared official reports indicating that there were unauthorized meetings with individuals gather-

ing information to use against Mr. Richard Nixon in the 1960 Presidential campaign.

A special interview was then given Mr. Sonnenfeldt with the aid of a polygraph, in which I did not participate and did not see its results. I am told the findings were inconclusive because only perfunctory questions were put to Mr. Sonnenfeldt.

I was eased out of my jurisdiction over the Sonnenfeldt matter early in 1961 and thus could not review the case again, this time with access to all pertinent investigations. Soon the authority to enforce the rules of the intelligence community regarding access by Department employees to critically sensitive data was taken away from me by my new superiors. Mr. Sonnenfeldt was returned to the Bureau of Intelligence Research in September 1961 and he was granted clearance for information that had previously been denied him by me. Mr. Roger Hillsman succeeded Ambassador Cumming as the Director of the Bureau.

In anticipation of an invitation from another Congressional committee to personally appear and submit my views about deficiencies in the Federal Employees Security Program that need to be corrected by legislation, I will not go into further details at this time in the case of Mr. Sonnenfeldt. In closing, I wish to say that his case is a good example of double standards that exist in the Executive Branch and in the media in matters involving the disclosure of classified information.

If an employee is compelled to appear before a Congressional committee, and on its request and response to legitimate questions, helps establish by documentation that his superiors had lied to the same committee, vengeful superiors will do almost anything possible to ruin the man's career.

The treatment, however, is far different toward those who are wholesale purveyors of classified documents to the press. The same media who previously deplored the action of the employee in assisting Congress, approve of the actions of government personnel who provide documents to them. At the same time these providers, if they are not given a cloak of immunity from punishment by the Executive Branch, are turned into national heroes by a bungling Justice Department and White House assistants whose political motivations exceed their capacity for good judgment.

I sincerely hope that in the case of Mr. Sonnenfeldt, your committee has, or will be given the assurance that a responsible, knowledgeable, and impartial security officer in the Treasury Department gave his endorsement regarding Mr. Sonnenfeldt's security reliability.

While I was in the State Department it was the practice with respect to prospective Presidential appointees to high positions, to obtain the recommendation of the responsible security officer there who made his judgment only after he had examined the results of a current FBI investigation and obtained such other relevant reports of investigation he knew to be in existence.

As indicated in Congressman John Ashbrook's letter dated May 15 to Senator Harry F. Byrd, I am available to testify before the Senate Finance Committee if it is desired.

Sincerely,

OTTO F. OTEPKA.

GAO REPORT ON POSTAL SERVICE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, I have been concerned over the

deterioration in quality of our postal service, as indicated by correspondence from my constituents. To determine the nature and causes of the problem, I requested the General Accounting Office to investigate the quality of postal service in the State of Florida.

That study has now been concluded, and the GAO reports that service indeed suffered in the State of Florida, and that Florida's problems were not unique, but rather reflected a nationwide pattern.

The GAO further concludes that certain improvements have been initiated by the Postal Service, which should result in an improvement of service. I plan to stay in close contact with the situation, and hope these changes will not prove to be temporary.

I know that many Members have experienced similar problems in their own districts, and am therefore inserting in the RECORD for their consideration the full text of the General Accounting Office report:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1973.

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: Pursuant to your request of January 3, 1973, and later discussions with you, we reviewed postal operations in Florida. On March 2, 1973, we briefed you on the results of our review and provided you with copies of the charts used in the briefing. This letter summarizes the highlights of that briefing.

The central theme of our presentation was that the problems affecting mail service in Florida are not unique, but are part of a nationwide pattern. As conceded by the Postal Service, the quality of mail service has generally deteriorated in recent months.

The President's Commission on Postal Organization—The Kappel Commission—which was established in April 1967 concluded that the former Post Office Department had been operated as an ordinary Government agency; when it was, in fact, a business—a big business. The Commission further concluded that "... the challenges faced by this major business activity cannot be met through the present inappropriate and outmoded form of postal organization." The Commission recommended establishing a Postal Corporation to operate the postal service on a self-supporting basis.

The Postal Service's mail processing problems are the direct result of its efforts to become self-supporting. Becoming self-supporting is a formidable task, because from 1926 through 1971, the former Post Office Department and the Postal Service had accumulated a deficit of \$20.4 billion and because in a March 28, 1972, speech, the Postmaster General projected that by the end of 1984, unless significant improvements are made, there would be a further accumulated deficit of \$38 billion.

The Postal Service's problems are principally due to an increase in labor costs with little related increase in productivity. Of the Service's total estimated costs of \$10.4 billion for fiscal year 1973, about \$8.6 billion is for labor. From 1956 through 1967 the average postal salary increased almost 60 percent, although productivity remained virtually constant. (See exhibit A.) Although postage rates have been significantly increased, the Postal Service still requires an annual Federal subsidy of over \$1 billion to cover costs.

Because future salary increases are inevitable (assuming an increase of 5.5 percent a year, the current average annual postal salary of about \$9,200 will almost double by 1984), the Postal Service is striving to increase employee productivity through mech-

anization and thus minimize the postage rate increases that would otherwise be required for the Service to become self-supporting.

The Postal Service has taken economy measures that affect the overall quality of mail service. These include—

- Reducing collection services;
- Reducing delivery services; and
- Curtailing window service on Saturdays.

The Postal Service reduced its work force which had an adverse impact on the quality of service. This reduction was accomplished through two early-retirement campaigns which resulted in the retirement of about 13,000 employees—many in supervisory positions—and a hiring freeze instituted in March 1972. Between June 1 and December 31, 1972, an additional 17,000 employees either retired voluntarily or retired because of disability. Overall, the Postal Service reduced its work force from about 741,000 at July 1, 1970, to about 687,000 in December 1972. The reduction in work force affected certain facilities more than others, especially new facilities, such as the sectional center facility at Merrifield, Virginia, which could not be adequately staffed. Also the Postal Service made changes in the mail distribution system which increased the workload at certain facilities. Many of these facilities did not have enough employees to cope with the increased workload.

The Postal Service attempted to overcome this problem by instituting mandatory overtime, often requiring employees to work long hours 6 or 7 days a week. Besides diminishing efficiency, mandatory overtime aggravated an existing morale problem.

Regarding Florida, although mail volume in January 1973 was 18.5 percent above that in January 1972, the number of employees was down 24.8 percent. To meet these conditions, overtime was increased 89 percent. Florida postal union officials told us that this overtime was a cause of much discontent among employees. They informed us that morale also suffered because of (1) the shifts of many employees from day to night work at the Miami and Orlando Post Offices, (2) concern about the effect of the Postal Service's Job Evaluation Program,¹ and (3) the poor image of postal workers resulting from the Service's problems.

Another factor affecting mail service in Florida was a November 1972 change in the routing of mail from out of State. Before the change, out-of-State postal facilities sent all Florida mail, including residue mail (mail without zip codes or otherwise not machine processable), to one of three locations in Florida. After the change, each out-of-State facility had to sort its machine-processable mail for delivery to the three Florida locations and to send all of its residue mail to the Tampa Post Office. This change, coming at a time of high-volume activity, was said by postal officials to have resulted in much mail being sent to the wrong facilities in Florida. The Tampa Post Office was especially affected by the change because of the large volume of residue mail—about 15 percent of mail destined for Florida. The Tampa Post Office was not prepared to handle such a large volume requiring hand sorting.

The Postal Service has also experienced problems with letter sorting machines. First, the Miami and Orlando sectional center facilities did not receive machines that were scheduled to be installed before Christmas 1972. Although these machines were essential for expeditious mail processing, they were not received until after the Christmas holidays. Secondly, use of the machines has resulted in much misdirected mail because of operator errors. In Florida, about 5 percent of the mail processed on these machines was

¹ The Postal Service's Job Evaluation Program is a study of all Postal Service jobs with the intention of making postal pay equal to the compensation for comparable skills in private industry.

misdirected. We estimate that, during the 6 months ended December 8, 1972, about 8.4 million pieces of mail processed on the Miami, Tampa, and Orlando machines were misdirected. In our opinion, misdirection of mail is the principal cause of extremely tardy deliveries.

The Service has developed a device for checking the performances of letter-sorting-machine operators to identify those with a high error rate that would indicate a need for additional training. Because of a built-in error rate of at least 1 percent in the machines, it is questionable whether the Service will succeed in reducing the error rate to that experienced in manual sorting—estimated by postal officials at 1 percent or less.

Another problem results from the Area Mail Processing Program which is designed to gather mail from small post offices for mechanized processing at a larger facility. According to the Postal Service, this program significantly reduces processing costs. However, it can also result in mail traveling longer distances. For example, before this program started mail was sent directly from Okeechobee, Florida, to Sebring, Florida—a distance of 35 miles. To take advantage of centralized machine processing, mail is now routed from Okeechobee to West Palm Beach to Lakeland to Sebring—a distance of 255 miles. Although this routing still allows overnight service, it increases the processing step where something can go wrong to delay delivery.

Also the Miami District did not have the resources to expeditiously handle the increased mail volume in fiscal year 1973. This problem resulted from basing the District's operating budget for the year on an underestimate of the anticipated increase in mail volume. The budget was based on an increase of 5.9 percent. As of February 1973 the actual increase was 16.3 percent.

The net effect of the various problems discussed above was a delay in mail delivery. As shown in exhibits B and C, the average time to deliver first-class mail and airmail nationwide increased significantly during the second quarter of fiscal year 1973, and as shown in exhibits E and F, the West Palm Beach and Miami sectional center facilities did not meet the Postal Service's overnight delivery standard in recent months. These exhibits were prepared on the basis of statistics developed under the Postal Service's Origin-Destination Information System which determines the time between the date a piece of mail is postmarked and the date it is received at a delivery point.² The system does not, however, measure the time required for mail to be (1) collected, (2) prepared for postmarking, (3) sorted for delivery by carriers or clerks, and (4) delivered. Also the Postal Service discontinued considering Sundays and holidays in computing the average number of days to deliver (1) local first-class mail beginning with the first postal quarter of fiscal year 1972 and (2) all first-class mail and airmail beginning with the second quarter of fiscal year 1972. Eliminating Sundays and holidays in the computations understates the delivery time. The broken lines on exhibits B and C indicate the average time to deliver the mail if Sundays and holidays are included.

Postal Service records at Miami, Tampa, and Orlando showed that during the 4 months ended January 1973, delivery of 2.3 million pieces of mail was delayed (not delivered within the times specified in the service standards shown in exhibit D). No records were available to enable us to verify this quantity.

Certain postal employees provided us with documented information concerning some third-class advertising literature that was

delivered after the expiration of the sales dates and some that was destroyed rather than delivered late. We brought these matters to the attention of the Postal Inspection Service.

Despite the many problems discussed above, cause for optimism exists. At a meeting during the week of February 5, 1973, Postal Service top management and its District Managers from around the country finally acknowledged that the Service does have problems. This meeting apparently enlightened top management on the true situation in the field because most of the problems we found were also cited by the District Managers.

Regarding Florida (1) local postal facilities have been given the authority and funds to hire additional personnel, (2) the letter sorting machines scheduled for installation before Christmas 1972 were installed after January 1973, (3) mandatory overtime was required only 5 days a week in January 1973, (4) a new mechanized postal facility in Fort Lauderdale was scheduled to open in March and should improve the quality of mail service by lightening the workload at other facilities, and (5) Postal Service Headquarters is closely monitoring the Florida operations.

You also requested that we investigate the operations of the Postal Service and compare them with those of the former Post Office Department on a nationwide basis. We are making such a review in major postal facilities throughout the Nation and will provide you with a copy of our report when it is completed.

We discussed these matters with Postal Service officials who expressed general agreement with our observations. We do not plan to distribute this letter further unless you agree or publicly announce its contents.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education recently adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a single Federal Board for Vocational Education and Manpower Training to coordinate the administration of all vocational education and job training programs.

When I received a copy of the resolution from the chairman of the council, I asked my former assistant, Dr. Arthur M. Lee, to give me his opinion on it. Dr. Lee is presently a member of the faculty and administrative staff of Northern Arizona University, as well as a member of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

Dr. Lee's comments, I believe, merit serious consideration by each Member of Congress. I am pleased to insert them in the RECORD for the information of those who are as concerned about our Nation's vocational education and manpower training programs as I am. His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF DR. ARTHUR M. LEE

Like the man said, I'm glad you asked me. This resolution by the National Advisory Council to recommend a Federal Board for Vocational Education and Manpower Training stirred up a lot of controversy. It was a

new idea to me, although it represents a variation of creating a new Department of Education and Manpower Training. What is new about it, and disturbing to some people, is pulling vocational education out of the Office of Education. The biggest concern here is that it will destroy career education by re-establishing the old dichotomy between vocational education and academic subjects.

This was my first thought, too, but I don't see it that way after further consideration. Vocational education and academic programs have continued to remain sharply divided in the Office of Education. Dr. Marland's advocacy of career education has had no visible effect among the academic staff personnel in O.E. All of the acceptance of this concept—with which I am in complete agreement—and the leadership provided by O.E. to bring it about, including funds, has come from the vocational education staff.

Now, here is the interesting part. Career education, while being encouraged and supported by vocational education and virtually ignored by academic education at the Federal level, is being developed in an increasing number of local schools each year all over the country. Vocational education here, too, provides most of the leadership and the money, but academic educators are being involved. I have talked with many of them, and they are moving in this direction for the same reason vocational educators are—they see the need for it.

The conclusion is that career education, a merging of academic and vocational objectives and programs, is now taking place in the schools without a united academic and vocational administration at the Federal level. On the other hand, the one remaining area of serious dichotomy at the local level is that of vocational education and manpower training. With the increasing emphasis in all education on preparing persons for careers and upgrading their employment skills to improve their careers, manpower programs cannot remain logically outside of the educational system. They do so largely because they are supported almost entirely by Federal funds administered through the Department of Labor and through non-educational agencies at the State and local levels. As such, they do duplicate and overlap identical programs which have the same purpose and serve similar trainees.

A Federal Board for Vocational Education would serve to consolidate the appropriations made by Congress for all of these job oriented programs, and a single administration of these funds should be able to gradually pull the various programs themselves together at State and local levels.

It should be possible at the same time to continue the development and support of career education. To bring vocational education and academic education into a common relationship does not depend on a common administration of the Federal support funds for each. If it did, there would be no career education being developed now. What is required, it seems to me, is that the support funds of all kinds—Federal, State, and local—be merged at the local level. And this is already being done in a great many cases.

There is one other reason for supporting a Federal Board for Vocational Education and Manpower Training. Large, unwieldy bureaucracies have been established in both the Department of Labor and HEW, to administer two different budgets for two sets of programs many of which are duplicating and overlapping the others. It should be possible by creating a completely new agency to eliminate both of the old ones. Hopefully the new agency's administrative staff could be drawn from the best of the existing ones.

And if the new agency is established with the purpose of a monitoring function for the most part rather than a decision-making and controlling function, the objectives of President Nixon's revenue sharing proposal can be accomplished. It would even be possible, if

² A delivery point is usually the last mail-processing point, such as a post office box section or a carrier station, before delivery to the customer.

Congress should want to do so, to establish a Federal Board and revenue sharing at the same time by authorizing the Board to pass vocational education and manpower training appropriations on to the States and local educational institutions without discretionary regulation or delay.

This is a bit lengthy as an analysis of the National Council's recommendation, but I feel the subject deserves some serious thought. I am also returning the copy of the Council letter to you with my notations in the margin for a quick appraisal.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST REFORMED CHURCH OF LITTLE FALLS, N.J., AND CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHURCH PASTORATE OF REV. E. WILLIAM GEITNER

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the Congress to join with me in heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the pastor, Rev. E. William Geitner, and the congregation of the First Reformed Church of Little Falls, N.J., in celebration of their 150th anniversary and in national recognition of a century and a half of total dedication and devotion to the service of God and the cause of brotherhood, goodwill and understanding among all men. I commend to your recognition the concurrent 25th anniversary of the pastorate of one of our most distinguished clergymen, Reverend Geitner, who, after having served as pastor of the First Reformed Church of Little Falls for the past quarter of a century with the greatest of devotion epitomizing all the treasured qualities of a man of God, will be retiring during this anniversary year.

During the week of June 3 to June 10, 1973, his many friends and citizens of the State of New Jersey will join his congregation in celebration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the church and in revered tribute to Pastor Geitner's 25 years of outstanding service to the church and its parishioners.

To be forever lastingly etched in this historic journal of Congress, church history records that in 1823 a mission group of the Fairfield Church formed a devout and dedicated nucleus of citizenry whose leadership and responsibility for the spiritual well-being of its members formed the early beginnings of the church as it is today. The church was incorporated as the Reformed Dutch Church of Little Falls in 1838 and welcomed the Reverend Joseph Wilson as the first ordained pastor. He was followed by Mr. Edwin Vedder who was succeeded by the Reverend J. C. Cruikshank who served the church for 18 years.

The Reverend George J. Van Neste was the first occupant of the parsonage, completed shortly after he moved to Little Falls, 1870. According to his manual, prayer meetings were held in abundance and an unblemished loyalty to church and God was required. The congregation was concerned with the "blighting in-

fluence of intemperance, especially among the young," and in 1872, two-thirds of the young people had signed pledges of total abstinence.

A depression in 1873 took its toll on the church and the community financially but the staunch character and faith of its parishioners prevailed. The records indicate that Reverend Smith was the church pastor in 1876, succeeded by Rev. W. L. Moore. Mr. Phillip Furbeck was called in 1881 to be pastor and brought with him a family of growing boys and girls. He resigned in 1888 and the next 10 years, 1888-97, Mr. Jacob Van Fleet served as pastor. When Mr. Van Fleet resigned, the consistory decided to hear candidates under 45 years of age and Mr. Steffens was elected. The church manual concludes in 1902 with a 5-month record of Mr. Bayles' pastorate. The records from this date until 1927 are believed to have been destroyed.

Mr. Martine served as pastor during the period of 1908 to 1911, succeeded by Mr. MacNeill, then Mr. Mould came to Little Falls in 1915 and subsequently became a professor of biblical history at Elmira College. His book, written just before his death, "Essentials of Biblical History," was well received. The church grew in size and activity during Mr. Finigar's pastorate and Mr. Wiedenger served as pastor for 21 years, 1927-48. The tragic years of the war followed those of the depression. The young people's organization of the church was a strong and active group for many years, cooperating with the Pompton Lakes Young People and, at one time, with a similar group from the Fairfield Church.

The present pastorate of Rev. E. William Geitner is well known to many of us in New Jersey. He has served the church devoutly and faithfully for 25 years. Pastor Geitner was born June 3, 1906, succeeding a long family line of ministers. He received his B.A. degree from Upsala College, 1927; his B.D. degree from Bloomfield Seminary, 1930; and his masters in theology from Princeton Seminary, 1932. He began his ministry at the age of 19 as spiritual leader of the Wallington Chapel. In December 1928, while still a student, he was called to the pastorate of the Union Congregational Church in Cedar Grove, N.J. He was ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church at the First Presbyterian Church of Passaic, N.J., on June 13, 1929. He spent 9½ years of his early ministry at the First Presbyterian Church of Carlstadt, N.J. He was a member of the Reserve Army Chaplain Corps from 1934, and was appointed in 1940 to serve in the Regular Army. He was stationed at Pearl Harbor during the Japanese armed attack and served during World War II with distinction in service to God and his fellowman.

Under Reverend Geitner's leadership, the church has flourished and in testimony to his genuine enthusiasm and strong support of group participation activities and programs for the young and adults alike throughout his congregation, the expansion of the church facilities known as Fellowship Hall was completed under his auspices in 1965.

Today, the church with a member-

ship of 175 families is a historic landmark, an impressive sight to the residents and visitors alike. Most of the citizens of the region during their daily busy chores feel a lot closer to God when they hear the peal of the chimes from the brownstone steeple and the solemnity of the hymns played intermittently throughout the day.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the cornerstone of our people's faith in God which is truly the spirit, conscience and very being of our society. It is indeed with great honor and privilege that I ask you to join with me today in tribute to the congregation of First Reformed Church of Little Falls and its pastor, Rev. E. William Geitner whose dedication, devotion, and untiring efforts toward the spiritual and cultural enrichment of others deserves the national recognition of the Congress of the United States in commemoration of their 150th anniversary and 25th anniversary respectively in pursuit of the noble cause of service to God and brotherhood, good will, and understanding among all men.

NORTHFIELD, MASS., CELEBRATES 300TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish all my colleagues could be with me next week when I join in the celebration honoring the 300th anniversary of the founding of the town of Northfield, Mass. The townspeople have been preparing for months and have gone all out for this birthday gala.

Northfield is a lovely town of 2,600 citizens, rich in history and promise for the future.

In the year 1673, the intrepid explorers Marquette and Joliet reached the Mississippi River after a torturous journey down the Wisconsin. But as notable as that event was, of premier importance to those of us who celebrate with the town of Northfield, half a continent away, the year 1673 marked the beginning of a long struggle to settle the area that would be known as Squakheag, after its first inhabitants, the Squakheag Indians, and later, Northfield.

Two times attempts were made to establish a community along the Connecticut River northeast of the town of Northampton. Both times, the settlements were abandoned following bloody Indian battles. But those who would reside in that northernmost outpost were a tenacious lot. They tried a third time, in 1714, and this time the Northfield settlement "took."

The first town meeting was held in Northfield on March 18, 1686. And to this day, citizens continue to govern themselves in that most democratic of means.

Not only did they advocate a democratic system of town government, they fought for that same freedom for all others. Northfield sent a representative to the Provincial Congress in October of 1774, and its contingent of Minute Men

responded to the call to join the fight for independence from the British monarchy following the Battle of Lexington.

But, undoubtedly, the most widely noted period in the history of Northfield came during the life and ministry of its most famous son, Dwight Lyman Moody. Internationally known and respected evangelist and educator, Mr. Moody founded two of the finest preparatory schools in the Nation in the Northfield area. The Northfield Seminary for young women opened in 1879 and the Mount Hermon School for young men opened in 1881. After almost 100 years of separate existence, these two schools merged in 1971 and now, under the name Northfield Mount Hermon, has a combined enrollment of over 1,100 students.

The founding of these two institutions to provide an education for youngsters regardless of financial means, was just one of the accomplishments of the remarkable Mr. Moody.

In 1881, he instituted religious conventions in the tranquil setting of Northfield. One of these conventions, the Northfield Student Conference, led to the organization of the renowned World Student Christian Federation and the Student Volunteer Movement.

The name Mount Hermon was given Mr. Moody's boys school from Psalm 133: 3 which described that peak as the location where "the Lord commanded the blessing, even life forevermore."

Among the many blessings bestowed on this fine school, and in fact on the entire town of Northfield, is a great physical beauty. The town straddles the Connecticut River at the northern edge of Massachusetts and is the only community in the Commonwealth to stand on both sides of this waterway. The boundaries of three States, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire converge at a point on the Connecticut River on the Northfield boundary.

The town holds uncommon charm for those seeking escape from the noise and bustle of more populous areas and is a favorite vacation site. Aiding the tourist program is the famous Northfield Inn.

But the hills of Northfield are deceptively silent. One of these, Northfield Mountain, conceals Northeast Utilities' \$120 million hydroelectric pumped storage project slated for completion this summer.

A natural depression in the top of Northfield Mountain makes an ideal natural reservoir. Water from the Connecticut River is pumped up to that reservoir during the night and released during the peak of energy demand during the day to turn mighty turbines. The output of this facility will be 1 million kilowatts, a capacity that could supply one-thirteenth of the power demands of the entire New England region. Thus, the town of Northfield will play a crucial role in the future of the area in this age of "energy crisis."

The citizens of Northfield are also understandably proud of their fine junior-senior high school, the Pioneer Valley Regional School; the fact that the bell that once graced the First Parish Church was forged by Paul Revere; and that the

town is the place where the American Youth Hostel was founded in 1934 and headquartered for many years.

Beginning Saturday, the town will embark on a week long demonstration of civic pride, culminating in a parade on June 3.

I remarked at the outset that I wished you could all be with me next week in Northfield when the celebration hits its peak. But Northfield is a community that always puts its best foot forward. Its friendly residents will have the welcome mat out during the whole tercentenary year and beyond. I call on my fellow Congressmen to join with me in extending a hearty "Happy 300th" to this wonderful town.

ZAMBIAN TROOPS MURDER FOREIGN TOURISTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the murder of two young Canadians and the wounding of one American at the Rhodesian-Zambian border near historic Victoria Falls should have shocked world opinion into demanding to know what is taking place in Zambia.

Especially is this so when Zambia continues to be the recipient of U.S. foreign-aid dollars, and her one party dictator, Kenneth Kaunda, remains the darling of the liberal news establishment and the "great new leader" of the African continent to the international U.N. crowd. This occurs while the peaceful, nonaggressive people of Rhodesia are treated as an outcast under some pseudo-intellectual theory of their being a threat to international peace.

The entire Victoria Falls incident is especially repulsive to me. As a tourist in Rhodesia in 1968, my wife and I were taking pictures of the falls from the Victoria bridge when a Zambian border guard attempted to apprehend me for "violating Zambian territorial integrity" by crossing a white painted stripe in the center of the bridge. I refused to be taken into custody and the guard did not draw his gun, although other militia on the Zambian side of the bridge set up a machine gun and forced all of the tourists by direct intimidation to leave the scenic overlook.

The American financiers, church people, and bleeding hearts who send encouragement in the way of dollars and political support to the present Zambian regime should understand that they are just as responsible for the murder of tourists in Rhodesia as is the Zambian racists at the present helm of that country.

It is ironic that while the State Department giveaway specialists are gearing up to invest large amounts of American capital in Red China in the interest of assisting that "emerging nation," the Chinese Communists have already emerged enough to spend great amounts of their money in their own "foreign-aid programs" to subvert Africa.

I include an evaluation of Chinese Communist subversion in Africa from Asian Outlook, the publication of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League of Taipei, Taiwan, and related news clippings at this point:

[From Newsweek, May 28, 1973]

AFRICA: DEATH IN THE AFTERNOON

They were young tourists in southern Africa—John and Carol Crothers from Ohio and Christine Sinclair and Marjan Drijber, both from Ontario—and they were clambering along the rocky banks of the Zambezi River last week, taking in the scenic majesty of Victoria Falls. From their perch on the Rhodesian bank of the river, they waved a cheerful greeting toward a group of men on the Zambian side. The reply was a burst of automatic-rifle fire that killed one of the Canadian girls instantly and sent the other plunging to her death in the rushing, crocodile-infested Zambezi. John Crothers fell wounded in the face, stomach and thigh—but he and his wife, who was not hit, managed to struggle to shelter behind a boulder. While sporadic gunfire continued to seek them out, the Crotherses huddled on the ground for more than nine hours—until Rhodesian rescuers finally reached them after nightfall.

ACCUSED

The murderous attack was the latest in a series of incidents that have bloodied the tense border separating white-ruled Rhodesia and black-ruled Zambia. The Rhodesian Government has accused Zambia of harboring African "freedom fighters," who flit across the border to attack isolated Rhodesian farmsteads. Earlier this year, Rhodesia's Prime Minister Ian Smith closed the border in an effort to shut off the copper shipments that are vital to landlocked Zambia. Though Smith later reopened the border, Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda has declared that he would find alternative shipping routes for his country's copper exports.

Even though Victoria Falls is a mainstay of both nations' tourist industries, Zambian troops have brazenly seized foreign nationals on the Victoria Falls Bridge twice in recent months. But last week's shooting was far and away the most serious incident in the area to date. Lusaka officials finally admitted that Zambian sentries had opened fire on the four tourists—mistaking them for saboteurs on their way to attack a nearby power station. The explanation was not convincing. "I don't know how they could have mistaken us for anything but tourists; one of the girls even had a swimming costume on," said Carol Crothers. "At first, I thought it was all a ghastly mistake, but now I realize they were deliberately trying to kill us."

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1973]

ZAMBEZI GUNFIRE KILLS TWO CANADIANS— RHODESIA BLAMES ZAMBIA—OHIOAN IS WOUNDED

SALISBURY, RHODESIA, May 16.—Two Canadian women tourists were killed and an American man seriously wounded yesterday when Zambian troops opened fire across the Zambezi River border between Rhodesia and Zambia, the Rhodesian Government said here today.

A Rhodesian helicopter today lifted the wounded American, John Caruthers, 28 year old, of Troy, Ohio, from the bottom of a steep gorge and flew him and his wife, Carol, 25, who was uninjured to a hospital at nearby Wankie.

Mr. Caruthers was hit in the stomach in the shooting, which occurred at the Victoria Falls on the Zambesi.

One of the two Canadian women was killed instantly when the four came under automatic weapons fire from Zambian Army troops on the other side of the river. The other was hit and toppled into the swift-flow-

ing river. Her body has not been recovered but she has been declared dead.

The Rhodesian Government has sent an official protest note to Zambia saying that it held the Zambian Government responsible for the shootings.

The note said: "The Government of Rhodesia informs the Government of Zambia of its deepest concern at this deliberate and flagrant violation of human rights."

ATTACK CALLED MURDEROUS

The note went on:

"The Government of Rhodesia holds the Government of Zambia responsible for this crime and calls upon the Government of Zambia to take immediate steps to bring the perpetrators of this murderous attack to justice.

"The Government of Rhodesia further requires the Government of Zambia to take all steps necessary to insure that there is no recurrence in the future."

A Rhodesian statement said that there was no possibility that African nationalist guerrillas—who have been active in Rhodesia the last few months—were responsible for the shooting and asserted that Rhodesia had "irrefutable proof" that Zambian troops were responsible.

INCIDENT SECOND SUCH THIS YEAR

The incident is the second this year in which Zambian troops have been accused of opening fire across the border and killing civilians.

A White Rhodesian fisherman was killed Feb. 9 while in a boat on the Zambesi. An inquest found that the craft had probably been in Zambian waters and that Zambian troops were probably responsible.

In another recent incident two elderly West German tourists who strayed across the halfway mark on a bridge spanning the Zambesi River near the Victoria Falls were arrested at gunpoint by Zambian soldiers. They were later freed.

Victoria Falls is Rhodesia's top tourist attraction and draws thousands of visitors every year.

ZAMBIA SAYS INQUIRY IS ON

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA, May 16 (Agence France-Presse)—A Zambian spokesman said here today that the Government was investigating "an alleged incident" in which Zambian troops were reported to have fired on tourists at the Zambian-Rhodesian border yesterday.

A brief statement said that the investigations were being carried out following reports from Salisbury and inquiries from the Canadian High Commission and the American Embassy in Lusaka.

Both missions said that they had been in touch with the Zambian Government to seek further information, their information so far being based mainly on news agency reports.

CANADA IDENTIFIES VICTIMS

OTTAWA, May 16 (Reuters)—Canada's external Affairs Department today identified the two Canadian victims as Christine Lois Sinclair, 20, of Guelph, Ontario, and Marion Iduma Drijber, 19, of Rockwood, Ontario.

[From the Rhodesia Herald, Jan. 9, 1968]
U.S. CONGRESSMAN SAYS ZAMBIA THREATENED TO CAPTURE HIM AT FALLS

A United States Congressman, Mr. John R. Rarick, yesterday described an incident on the Victoria Falls bridge over the Zambesi River in which, he said, he was threatened with capture by a Zambian border guard who was accompanied by armed men. Mr. Rarick said at his Salisbury hotel yesterday after returning from a tourist trip to the Falls on Sunday that he would report the incident to the U.S. Consulate in Salisbury and would seek a formal protest to Zambia.

He and his wife were among a party of tourists, mostly Americans, which went to the Falls bridge in the early afternoon. They left their buses on the Rhodesian side and walked on to the bridge to take photographs. The Congressman said that they were approached by a Zambian official in uniform who, addressing Mr. Rarick personally, began to shout and gesticulate and behave aggressively.

WHITE LINE

The Congressman said the official adopted this threatening manner immediately—without explaining anything or asking anybody for documents.

Mr. Rarick said the official pointed to a white line across the bridge which, until then, had meant nothing to any of the party, and said: "This is it. If you come across here, I will capture you."

Mr. Rarick said today: "I tried to reason with the man. But he didn't seem to want to listen to reason, and continued to shout and make threatening gestures."

While this was going on, two armed men appeared—one with a revolver and the other with a rifle—and the party, which included several women, made its way back to the buses.

Congressman Rarick said that at one stage, standing on the Rhodesian side of the line, he started to take a picture of the Zambian official, but this only made matters worse.

He added: "He said something that sounded to me like a threat to pull me across the line and then capture me."

He said that although it was later possible to describe the incident lightheartedly, the moment was a nasty one. "Knowing the mood the official was in—and with two armed men there as well—it is not pleasant to think of what could have happened."

The Zambian Ministry of Home Affairs in Lusaka refused to comment on Congressman Rarick's report of the incident.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM AFRICA: CHINESE COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN AFRICA

(By Chi Tel)

Inside Tanzania, guns, textbooks for bush land classrooms, facilities for infantry training, the Chinese Communist instructors, and the Chinese Communist workers on the Tanzam Railways, have all entered that country through Dar-es-Salaam, capital of Tanzania and center of the "liberation struggle" movement for the whole of southern Africa.

Tanzania occupies an important position in the political and geographical spheres of the African continent. With an area of nearly 1,000,000 square kilometers, it gained independence only more than 10 years ago but has played an important role in the Organization of African Unity and has become a rallying center for its eight neighboring nations.

President Nyerere of Tanzania is still giving political asylum to former Ugandan president Obote and Ugandan refugees. They hope to return and seize political power they lost to president Amin. In the western part of Lake Tanganyika called Kigoma, there are still many refugees who came from Zaïre and are still considered by President Mobutu as arch enemies. Many Malawi political refugees who are living in Tanzania have shown some friendly attitude toward President Banda but are preparing for an uprising.

However, Tanzania's most striking political stand is its role as leader in the liberation struggle against the South African whites. This position has given the Chinese Communists a firm base in Africa.

Zambia and Tanzania are different in their support of the guerrilla movement. Zambia supplies the guerrillas combat bases for guerrilla warfare against Rhodesia, Tete province of Mozambique, and the northern part of southwest Africa while Tanzania provides

mostly training, logistics and supply and moral support.

Zambia also has close ties with the south African economic group (including South Africa) but Tanzania does not. Tanzania therefore has no obligations to southern Africa. It belongs entirely to black Africa. Under military aid from the Chinese Communists, it can openly provide military support to the organization of African Unity.

The Executive Secretariat of the Committee for Liberation of the Organization of African Unity at Dar-es-Salaam serves also as the military command headquarters for the guerrillas while training camps and bases scatter all over Tanzania. Each unit has a representative at Dar-es-Salaam to maintain close contact with the Liberation committee. New recruits from various countries are first gathered at a training station 8 miles southwest of Dar-es-Salaam for basic military training. After selection, the well qualified ones are sent to other places or into police academies for further training in military affairs, leadership and the use of arms.

The Chinese Communists provide some military instructors but most of the training is conducted under Tanzania's army instructors. In order to effectively familiarize the new recruits with the environment, most new recruits are trained within Tanzania. Only the very best get a chance to study further abroad. They are sent to the Chinese mainland, the Soviet Union, North Korea, Cuba, and nations in the Balkans, Algeria, Egypt, Sudan and Nigeria. Intensification of training in Africa started after the high level conference of the Organization of African Unity held last year at Rabat. Nigeria was also able to supply the guerrillas with training facilities and extra military equipment for terrorist activities after the civil war ended there.

Guerrilla organizations inside Tanzania may have from hundred to several hundred people. One of the largest has a membership of over ten thousand. They receive daily training and participate in attacks on the northeastern provinces of Mozambique. They can freely camp and launch combat activities in Tanzania and in the Tanzania-Mozambique border areas. They engage in surprise attacks on the guerrilla forces in Rhodesia. The border areas serve as their retreat bases.

Most of the supplies and military equipment reach them through Dar-es-Salaam. Supplies to the largest guerrilla organization go further south to a port near the Mozambique border. The supplies are then distributed to the inland border area bases. Some supplies go directly to Zambia or to the border area of Malawi to Tete province in Mozambique via the Tanzam Railway. The largest guerrilla organization owns its own truck convoy and has increased this fleet by 30 Soviet and foreign made trucks. The Tanzanian army also helps transportation of guerrilla supplies.

The guerrillas often launch attacks on Tete province because of that area's strategic and political importance. It also has rich mineral resources and a lot of white farmers. Most important is that it constitutes a political threat to Malawi.

The guerrillas must depend upon Dar-es-Salaam for their supplies. The Chinese Communist supply ships often visit the port. According to statistics, for ten days last December, there were at least four Chinese Communist ships anchored in the port. These ships were all reported in the port logs and the local newspapers. These ships brought supplies for the construction of the Tanzam Railway, and military equipment including tanks and field artillery. Ships were of the 10,000-ton class. They enjoyed free entry without customs inspection and priority in docking privilege. They were often unloaded

at night under heavy security guard and most of these ships were armed. About every ten days a passenger ship arrived with some 600 Chinese Communist workers. They also took black passengers to the Chinese mainland.

The Chinese Communist cadres were very influential in the training of guerrilla fighters. They even thought of organizing the guerrillas under one central authority but failed. They also tried to force Nyerere to follow the Maoist political line. The Chinese Communist tactics is first to offer some military aid and then apply political pressure. Because of their efforts in building the Tanzam Railway, repairing part of the highways that lead to Zambia, and helping protect the oil pipelines that lead to Zambia, the Chinese Communists have established a strong foothold in Tanzania. Their military aid and training of the new recruits and the Tanzanian army have turned many of the Tanzanian army members into pro-Peiping elements.

The Chinese Communists will assist the Tanzanian government to improve and expand the port of Dar-es-Salaam after completion of the Tanzam Railway probably next year. They will also help that government build a naval base and thus increase their influence with Zambia. The Chinese Communists have already helped in improving the 500-kilometer-long highway from Lusaka to Mongu. Active support of the guerrilla's terrorist activities and increasing influence in other African nations on the part of the Chinese Communists have enabled them to exercise control in the Organization of African Unity. Under the influence of the Chinese Communists, terrorist activities will become more and more intense, and the longer these activities continue the more heated will the conflict in south Africa become.

THE "ANSEL GIBBS"

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have learned of a most interesting and, I think, significant project underway in Massachusetts, which my colleagues should take note of.

A group from New Bedford, Mass. have mounted an expedition to Northern Canada to attempt the salvage of a long-lost American whaling ship, the *Ansel Gibbs*.

The expedition was conceived and brought to life by Alexander and Suzanne Byron of Marion, Mass., together with the enthusiastic assistance of a number of Massachusetts residents. They all share in a dedication to recovering the whaler, restoring the ship and placing it on display as a memorial to the proud Americans who have gone down to the ships year in and year out in a constant renewal of the classic struggle of man against sea.

The Canadian Government has been exceptionally cooperative in assisting the Byron expedition, and I know my colleagues from Massachusetts join me in wishing the party success in this most difficult and inspiring effort.

I look forward to the day when the *Ansel Gibbs* lives again proudly, for Americans to visit and remember.

AMNESTY—NO!

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in recent days about the question of granting amnesty to those young men who either evaded the draft or deserted from the Army in protest against the war in Vietnam. Much more will be said about this subject in the future.

Many who advocate amnesty do so out of what they genuinely consider to be a spirit of forgiveness. The war is now over, they argue, and in order to bind up the divisive wounds which we have suffered from it, amnesty should be granted to those who opposed it and expressed their opposition in the form of evasion or desertion.

This viewpoint, however, seems to ignore many important considerations and tends to simplify what is, in fact, a far more complex question, with consequences far more serious than many believe.

Discussing this question, Wayne H. Valis, assistant to the director of legislative analysis of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, points out that—

A grant of amnesty to draft evaders and deserters, especially at this time, would achieve neither harmony nor reconciliation, but would instead reaggregate tensions and divisions in our land that have only recently begun to ebb. Amnesty would violate historic precedent, weaken respect for law and cause morale problems for our armed forces. If granted on a "blanket" basis to all deserters and draft resisters it would violate fundamental concepts of justice and morality, causing great resentment. . .

At a time when there is growing disrespect for law, a policy of amnesty would weaken even further the concept of a society in which the law is applied equally to all citizens.

Mr. Valis notes that—

Amnesty would . . . weaken the rule of law, for no civilized society can operate if its members may pick and choose the laws they will obey. "Equal protection of the law" provides that no one be discriminated against, or in favor of, before the law. Amnesty would favor a whole group, releasing it from some of the most important duties of citizenship.

As the national discussion of this subject proceeds, it is important that all points of view be carefully considered. Mr. Valis, who formerly served as eastern director for the Intercollegiate Studies Institute and as editor of the *Intercollegiate Review*, has made an important contribution to this discussion.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article by Wayne Valis which appeared in the March 23, 1973, issue of the *Catholic Virginian*, and insert it into the *RECORD* at this time:

AMNESTY—No!

(By Wayne H. Valis)

A grant of amnesty to draft evaders and deserters, especially at this time, would achieve neither harmony nor reconciliation,

but would instead reaggregate tensions and divisions in our land that have only recently begun to ebb. Amnesty would violate historical precedent, weaken respect for law and cause morale problems for our armed forces. If granted on a "blanket" basis to all deserters and draft resisters it would violate fundamental concepts of justice and morality, causing great resentment among the American people.

The size of the problem should first be put in proper perspective. Despite much rhetoric about a younger generation's opposing America's commitment in Vietnam, over 2.5 million men served in Vietnam and another million in other areas, while only 7,000 to 10,000 (or three-tenths of 1 per cent) fled to Canada or Sweden (February, 1973, "New York Times"). The number of draft dodgers and deserters in the U.S. is also small, with only 4,448 draft violators and about 1,500 anti-war deserters at large, according to recent FBI and Pentagon statistics. Thus there is no lost generation living in exile or hiding "underground;" the problem is small, limited to a minute percentage of our young.

The most important reason for opposing amnesty is that it would sorely divide the American people. Seven out of 10 Americans (Gallup Poll, 3/5/73) oppose amnesty, and the issue reflects the most basic and deeply felt attitudes Americans have about their country and the meaning of citizenship. Many anti-war and pro-amnesty spokesmen have explained their position on the Vietnam War in moral terms, alleging that America's role in the war was immoral and unjust, that her presidents were "mad" or "murderers," that the real heroes were the draft-dodgers, deserters and protesters.

Most Americans emphatically reject these claims. They believe that America's Vietnam effort was honorable and that their sons performed nobly and unselfishly—as shown by the outpourings of joy and love upon the return of our POWs. The majority opposes amnesty because it would be interpreted as vindication of those who denigrate America. They see little love or charity—little desire for healing reconciliation—in these critics who continue to proclaim their moral superiority, or, like Father Philip Berrigan, to call returning POWs "criminals" and "destroyers."

These harsh and unjustifiable views of America were decisively repudiated in November, to seemingly "legitimize" them now by an amnesty would be abhorrent to three-quarters of our citizens and would strain the fabric of our society.

Societies are delicate creations, beset by numerous tensions and strains which statesmen must minimize in order to prevent disruption. This can now best be done by letting passions cool, by promoting a spirit of reflection which will allow all Americans to rediscover their common concerns.

To many Americans an amnesty now would undermine long-established concepts of fairness and equity and would dishonor the memory of those who fought and died for their country. For every deserter and draft evader who avoided service, another young man had to go. Moreover, those who fled now ask their government to declare that they were right and that those who gave their lives were morally insensitive and wrong, indeed, that they died needlessly and in vain. Any such declaration would be politically and morally wrong and would have a grave effect on our nation.

Blanket amnesty would undermine fundamental concepts of justice. Under our system every accused person is tried on the merits of his own individual case, with great consideration of circumstance and motivation. A general amnesty makes no distinctions between those who deserted or evaded because they were criminals and those who

did so for political reasons. Defense Department studies have shown that two-thirds of all deserters are common criminals and most others mental cases. The 1947 Amnesty Board found that only 6 per cent of all desertions were for reasons of "conscientious conviction," and recent investigation indicates this figure may have dropped to less than 5 per cent.

Violators who wish to take their places in society may now go before our courts to show why each chose his particular course of action and to demonstrate extenuating circumstances or motivation. For those convicted there are elaborate procedural safeguards if they wish to appeal. It is important to note that our courts are dealing very leniently with those who turn themselves in. Last year, 4,900 alleged draft violators were prosecuted; only 1,640 were convicted. Of these, 1,200 were put on probation, generally on condition they perform alternative public service for from one to three years. Fewer than 500 received prison sentences. It is clear that our judicial system can deal with this problem without any blanket amnesty.

Amnesty would also weaken the rule of law, for no civilized society can operate if its members may pick and choose the laws they will obey. "Equal protection of the law" provides that no one be discriminated against, or in favor of, before the law. Amnesty would favor a whole group, releasing it from some of the most important duties of citizenship.

Those who claim they were demonstrating principled civil disobedience should remember that Ghandi, Thoreau, and Martin Luther King made it clear that true civil disobedients must be willing to accept punishment to demonstrate their moral beliefs. It is intellectually and morally indefensible to violate the law and then demand to go unpunished on grounds of moral superiority.

Amnesty could also adversely affect national security. It would set a bad precedent and might undermine the morale and sense of obligation of men serving in the armed services. It would practically nullify the penal sanctions of the Selective Service Act. If a failure crisis should make it necessary to reinstitute the draft, a recent amnesty might convince some inductees that they had little to lose by avoiding service. Certainly, no country can survive that encourages every citizen to decide for himself when he will or won't participate in a particular war. Under such conditions no country could conduct a credible foreign policy.

Amnesty also violates precedent and tradition. Most of the 37 amnesties in U.S. history were given to persons who were in no way comparable to today's violators (i.e., Confederate soldiers, polygamous Mormons, ex-convicts who served in World War II, etc.). Deserters have received "amnesties" from President Jefferson's time on, but always on condition that they first pay a penalty. In most cases, U.S. presidents, including Lincoln, have required deserters to surrender, rejoin their units, and serve out their terms. Many had to first serve prison terms, and some lost their U.S. citizenship for about five years. There were no amnesties of any kind after the Korean War or World War I, and it was not until 1933 that President Roosevelt pardoned World War I violators of draft and espionage laws—and then only after they had completed their sentences. Two years after World War II President Truman set up an amnesty board to review punishments of men who had been tried and convicted of evasion and other violations. The board recommended pardons in only 1,523 of 15,803 cases reviewed. Strictly speaking then, there has never been general amnesty for deserters and evaders.

Finally, charity and understanding are vital elements of civilized life, but they must be extended to the law-abiding majority as well as the minority of violators. For its part,

the U.S. has been extremely generous in recognizing claims of conscientious objectors and in dealing with draft violators. Unfortunately the anti-war movement has not reciprocated. The government should continue its humane, but firm, policy, for only in this way will true harmony and reconciliation be restored.

ART HOPPE STRIKES AGAIN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 I entered in the RECORD an item by San Francisco Chronicle columnist Art Hoppe. The column, which related to the Watergate situation, contained some persuasive logic mixed in with a heavy dose of humor to make it easily digestible, even for supporters of the current administration, many of whom seem to have nervous stomachs these days.

Yesterday I received in the mail another Art Hoppe column, sent to me by a constituent who wrote that anyone who appreciated the column I entered in the RECORD on the 15th would also appreciate this one. After reading it, I quite agree, and so I would like to share with our colleagues today this second column, which was clipped from the Riverside Press & Enterprise on or about May 7.

The column follows:

BIRD? PLANE? NO, IT'S SUPERTEX!

Is it a bird? Is it a plane? No, it's . . . Supertex!

Faster than a depletion allowance, stronger than an oil import quota, able to leap over party lines in a single bound, it's . . . Supertex!

Disguised as a humble Democratic Texas millionaire named John Connally, no one knows our hero is really Supertex—not even his attractive secretary, Lotus Lane.

There she is now, dabbling her tears as she enters his modest block-long office.

Lotus: Oh, Mr. Connally, I can't help feeling sorry for poor Dick and Pat. Their expensive spread back East is under water. Their top hands are deserting them. And they're surrounded by mean old elitist gossips who keep sniping at them.

John: Well, now honey, that Dick's a mighty rich and powerful feller. I reckon he can take care of himself.

Lotus (angrily stamping her foot and storming out): Oh, you Democrats are all alike. You don't give a fig for poor, rich, powerful people in trouble. I sure wish Supertex were here.

John (to himself): Lotus is right. This sounds like a job for . . . Supertex!

(Stepping into the telephone building he owns next to his office, John whips off his Democratic vicuna jacket to reveal underneath a Republican cloth coat with a flag pin in the lapel—the uniform of . . . Supertex! With the speed of a Lear jet, he is soon at the side of Dick and Pat—both of whom are treading water.)

Dick: Look, Pat, it's . . . Supertex!

Pat: Oh, Dick, just knowing he's come to help us in our seventh crisis gives me the strength to go on.

Supertex: After surveying the scene with my 20-20 vision, my 100 I.Q. brain tells me that some sneaky varmints have tried to flood

you out of your expensive spread hereby opening up your watergate.

Dick: You mean people I trusted? I can't believe it!

Supertex: You better believe it, son. But don't worry. The first thing is to shut off the watergate. There! That takes care of that.

Dick: You mean our troubles with that watergate are over?

Supertex: Just don't ever mention it again.

Pat: But, Supertex, the elitist gossips are still sniping at us.

Supertex: No need to worry, ma'am. Using the amazing powers of my silver tongue, I'll lay 'em low. Take that for America, you dirty rats!

A Portly Figure (crumpling) Aaagggghh!

Dick: Excuse me, Supertex, but I think you just got our beloved foreman, Spiro.

Supertex: Never mind, son. Now that you got me, you won't be needing him.

Pat: Oh, Supertex, how can we ever repay you?

Supertex: No need, ma'am. My only duty is to help the rich and powerful in their time of trouble. And by the way, when's your lease up on this here expensive spread?

Dick (gratefully shaking his hand): In three years, Supertex. After that, the place is yours. But tell me one thing: what strange, mystic wisdom made you pick this precise moment to come to our rescue after all these years?

Supertex (hand over his heart): Why, The Secret Code that's the source of all my amazing powers.

Dick: What's that?

Supertex: Buy low, sell high.

U.N. PHILATELISTS COME TO WASHINGTON

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the U.S. Postal Service will play host to the United Nations Postal Administration and stage a United Nations stamp exhibit in Washington, D.C. may raise many profound questions as to where the U.S. Postal Service is headed.

Little consolation is found in the exhibit which includes copies of the Postal Agreement between the United States and the United Nations. American taxpayers who read the Postal Agreement may find it of interest that we are footing the bill for U.N. Post Office, including "all staff, equipment, and other services and facilities necessary to enable the United States Post Office Department to operate the United Nations Post Office."

Like the ancient adage that no house is big enough for two families, so it can be said that no country is big enough to house two sovereigns. In the logical conclusion, the international sovereign must eventually usurp the national sovereign.

All that is necessary to replace U.S. postage stamps with U.N. postage stamps is to change one letter. The U.N. dollar does not officially exist as such, the U.N. postage stamp and the U.N. Postal Administration are already in existence and internationally established.

I include a U.S. Postal Service news release as follows:

POSTAL SERVICE NEWS RELEASE

The U.S. Postal Service announced today that the United Nations Postal Administration will stage an exhibit in the Philatelic Exhibition Room at the Postal Service Headquarters from June 1 through June 30.

Titled "Stamps for Peace," the exhibit will be open to the public from 9:00 a.m. through 5:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday.

A ceremony dedicating the opening of the exhibit will be held in the Postmaster Gen-

eral's Reception Room on the third floor of Postal Service headquarters at 11:00 a.m. on June 1. Attendance will be by invitation only.

The exhibit consists mainly of a series of large and small panels. One panel will contain copies of the Postal Agreement between the United States and the United Nations. Displayed in another panel will be all UN stamps which have been issued, including those issued in 1973. All UN first day cachets which have been issued will be shown in another set of panels.

Also depicted will be the process of design,

selection and issuance of UN stamps and other typical UN activities which are described by stamps.

Progressive proofs will be shown of several UN issues, including two which highlight the social problems of racial discrimination and drug abuse.

A projector will operate continuously during the exhibit, showing reproductions of UN stamps on a screen. Thirty by forty inch blowups of UN stamps will also be displayed, and pamphlets and other information will be available to the public.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 29, 1973

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

Unless the Lord builds the house, those who build it labor in vain.—Psalms 127: 1.

Eternal God, our Father, who hast created us with minds to think, hearts to love, and wills to choose the right, we bow our heads before this altar of prayer set up by our fathers at our Nation's birth that we may feel Thy presence near and be assured of Thy love as we endeavor to meet the challenge of this present hour. Breathe into our hearts and into the hearts of our people the generosity of good living and the greatness of genuine faith.

Guide and direct the Members of this House of Representatives that their actions may be just, fair, and kind, and that our Nation and the nations of the world may benefit by their wise decisions. In all humility and faith may they lead our citizens and the peoples of the world in the paths of justice, peace, and good will.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 16, 1973, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 to extend the authorization of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education and the period within which it must make its final report.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the

chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 23, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on May 22, 1973, considered and unanimously approved the following work plans for watershed projects which were transmitted to you by Executive Communication 759, 93d Congress, and referred to this Committee:

Bacon Creek, Iowa
Carbon Hill, Montana
Cow Creek, Oklahoma
Colenoy River, South Carolina
Tallulah Creek, North Carolina
Attached are Committee resolutions with respect to these projects.

With every good wish, I am,
Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE, Chairman.

THE PROHIBITED KNIFE ACT

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the incident this weekend in which two youths from my district were stabbed—one fatally—with a long-bladed folding knife. This is the kind of tragedy which I believe could have been avoided if we had tough knife control legislation on the books.

Today I am reintroducing the Prohibited Knife Act which would strengthen Federal knife control legislation. For the last 4 years I have urged Congress to enact legislation to ban the sale and manufacture and possession of the most easily accessible weapons in our society—switchblade, gravity, and long-bladed folding knives. These deadly knives are sold indiscriminately and displayed openly and grotesquely in gleaming showcases to attract prospective buyers.

Switchblade knives, gravity knives, and long-bladed folding knives have no legitimate purpose or use for which other knives are not better suited. Sportsmen, fishermen, and the industry itself have borne me out on this. I am talking about those weapons whose only purpose is violence.

Knives are the second most often used weapon in murder cases. This is the proof that the Switchblade Knife Act of 1958 is grossly ineffective in curbing the availability of these knives.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7670, MARITIME PROGRAMS OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 7670, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1974 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF EULOGIES AND ENCOMIUMS OF THE LATE PRESIDENT HARRY S TRUMAN

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 93-229) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) providing for the printing, as a House document, of eulogies and encomiums of the late President of the United States, Harry S Truman, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 110

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document the eulogies and encomiums of the late President of the United States, Harry S Truman, as expressed in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Such publication to include the text of the funeral service held in Independence, Missouri, as well as the prayers and scriptural selections delivered at the memorial service on January 5, 1973, at the Washington Cathedral; and that thirty-two thousand five hundred additional copies shall be printed, of which twenty-two thousand one hundred and fifty shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and ten thousand three hundred and fifty shall be for the use of the Senate.

SEC. 2. The copy shall be prepared and bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing may direct.