

FURTHER QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON PRESIDENTIAL POWERS IN THE TRADE REFORM ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on May 16 and 17, I entered letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the General Accounting Office and from the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations concerning various aspects of H.R. 6767, the Trade Reform Act of 1973.

I would now like to enter in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I sent to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations on May 7 as well as Ambassador Eberle's reply of May 29.

The thrust of my inquiries in these letters, and in much of my questioning in the Ways and Means Committee, has been an attempt to define exactly what the President's authority in the trade area is and how much additional authority we are giving him. As one can see from the reply to my first question, the President does indeed have wide powers—and the letter still fails to spell out the details of the types of discretionary powers which he has and could employ under H.R. 6767. It is obvious that the Ways and Means Committee—and the entire Congress—are going to have to ask some hard questions to determine exactly what is contemplated under this bill.

The letters follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 7, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM D. EBERLE,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EBERLE: During your testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 6767, the Trade Reform Act of 1973, I would appreciate it if you could provide me with some data and answers for the record to the following questions, so that these issues may be explored more fully during the hearings.

(1) In Section 103, the President is provided with authority to remove non-tariff barriers to trade. The Congress is given a veto authority over any such negotiations in 103(e). But in the explanatory notes to this provision of the bill, the following paragraph appears:

"This authority could apply, for example, to new agreements relating to quantitative limitations on imports of agricultural products. However, it is an optional procedure [to obtain Congressional approval] since the President can, if he believes it appropriate, use his existing authorities or other constitutional procedures with respect to import limitations or other non-tariff barriers imposed pursuant to domestic laws." [Emphasis added.]

Would you please provide a complete legal description of the "optional" authorities and "other constitutional procedures" which might be used with respect to non-tariff barriers? In which cases does the Administration expect to avoid the Congressional review and potential veto route?

(2) In Section 201, relating to investigations by the Tariff Commission, the explanatory notes again raise some questions. In particular, the notes state—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Comparable" is intended to be a more narrow category of products than "like or directly competitive articles".

From this note, it appears that it will be more difficult in some cases for American industries to prove "market disruption." Any clarification you can give to this note would be appreciated.

(3) Finally, certain foreign aid assistance may not be provided in violation of 22 U.S.C. 2370(d) which states that—

"No assistance shall be furnished under section 2161 of this title for construction or operation of any productive enterprise in any country where such enterprise will compete with United States enterprise unless such country has agreed that it will establish appropriate procedures to prevent the exportation for use or consumption in the United States of more than twenty per centum of the annual production of such facility during the life of the loan. In case of failure to implement such agreement by the other contracting party, the President is authorized to establish necessary import controls to effectuate the agreement . . ."

How does this section "coordinate" with Title VI. It would seem to me that possible conflicts might arise between the direct foreign aid loan program and Title VI. Has any consideration been given to adjusting this language so that it is consistent—and provides necessary safeguards for the American producer?

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE
FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., May 29, 1973.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VANIK: I am supplying the following information in response to the questions raised in your letter to me of May 7, 1973, on the Trade Reform Act (H.R. 6767) for insertion in the record of the Committee on Ways and Means hearings on this legislation as you requested during my testimony on May 10, 1973. I am also including a response to your request during that testimony for a review of the emergency powers of the President under current statutes in relation to provisions proposed in the Trade Reform Act.

Response to Question 1:

The United States currently enters into international obligations in the form of a treaty or an Executive agreement. These documents are given domestic force within the United States by one of several means: action by the Senate in the case of a treaty, enactment of legislation by both Houses of Congress, and the exercise by the President of authorities previously given to him by the Congress or by the Constitution.

The concept of "nontariff barriers and other distortions of trade" covers a very broad area of our domestic statutes and administrative practices. Some, such as those covered by international commodity agreements, are traditionally the subject of treaties and could continue to be handled in this fashion. Other matters, because of their complexity and the far-reaching nature of changes required in domestic law by an international agreement, might best be the subject of new legislation. The third category of authority for domestic implementation—the authority that the President already has—concerns matters such as making arrangements for the establishment of commercial offices within the United States, reducing administrative barriers to trade, and harmonizing United

States Government administrative practice with that of foreign governments.

Section 103(d) and (e) of the proposed Trade Reform Act adds a new legislative method, a veto procedure, which can be used in place of legislation or in place of a treaty or action which could have been based solely on Presidential authority.

As under existing practices, the President must choose whether to implement an international agreement by submitting a treaty to the Senate, submitting legislation to the Congress, or utilizing the authority he already has. The choice depends mainly on the subject matter of the agreement. Were the President to act where he did not have authority, our legal system provides for redress in the courts. The new procedure adds another choice of the method for implementing an international agreement at home. It does not change the necessity for Congressional authorization, in any of the forms listed above including the veto procedure, where the President does not have Constitutional or previously delegated powers.

Response to Question 2:

The use of the word "comparable" as a narrower category of products than "like or directly competitive articles" is necessary because price comparisons are more valid when made between similar articles. The term is used to make clear that price comparisons of imports and domestic articles should not be based on an overall average applicable to a broad category of products which may be "like or directly competitive" in their end-use, for example, but on articles within the broader category which are similar in material, style, quality, or other relevant characteristic. This requirement does not imply a greater burden on American firms seeking to show market disruption.

Response to Question 3:

Nothing in the proposed Trade Reform Act of 1973 would change or nullify the provisions of section 620(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act, 22 U.S.C. 2370(d). There have been very few occasions which required the application of this section. In any event, if action were required by the President to establish necessary import controls to effectuate an agreement under this section, the President would have no difficulty in suspending the application of preferential treatment under Title VI of the Trade Reform Act for imports covered under such an agreement. Section 605(a) of the Trade Reform Act would specifically authorize the President to modify, withdraw, suspend or limit the application of the preferential treatment with respect to any article or with respect to any country.

Emergency Powers of the President:

The reference to "emergency powers" was directed to section 318 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1318) which authorizes the President, during any period of emergency declared by him, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit duty-free imports of food, clothing, medical, surgical, and other supplies for use in emergency relief work.

No similar authority is contained in the proposed Trade Reform Act nor is it needed in view of the continuing existence of the authority contained in section 318 of the Tariff Act of 1930. There would not appear to be any compelling reason to repeal this section in view of the purposes which it serves which are distinct from the purposes served by Title IV of the Trade Reform Act. Moreover, this provision is relied upon currently for extensions of times within which certain matters of customs administration must be accomplished.

The repeal of section 318 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1318) would have the effect of revoking Presidential Proclamation No. 2948 of October 12, 1951, issued thereunder, which authorizes extensions of the

statutory period in which imported merchandise may be held in a general order or bonded warehouse. The statutory period for merchandise in a general order warehouse is 1 year (19 U.S.C. 1491); for a bonded warehouse, there is a 3-year period (19 U.S.C. 1557 and 1559). By eliminating Customs authority to grant extensions of these periods, Customs recordkeeping responsibilities would be simplified. However, owners of warehoused merchandise could be adversely affected in that merchandise would have to be withdrawn from warehouse and either entered for consumption or exported at the end of the statutory period when it might be economically disadvantageous to do so. To retain the flexibility available under existing law, sections 491, 557, and 559 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1491, 1557, and 1559) would require amendment to grant the Secretary of the Treasury authority to extend the time periods stated therein.

The "Truman Emergency Proclamation" to which reference was made is the proclamation of December 16, 1950 (no. 2914). That proclamation of national emergency was based on the menace of communist aggression, especially in Korea, and created the legal basis for the imposition of an embargo on trade with Communist China and North Korea (and, subsequently, North Vietnam). President Johnson relied on the Truman proclamation in promulgating the Foreign Direct Investment Regulations on January 1, 1968. President Nixon declared a new balance of payments national emergency on August 15, 1971, in the proclamation establishing the import surcharge.

The request for trade authorities in the Trade Reform Act are entirely separate from the existence of a state of national emergency. Sections 401 and 405 are specifically related, for example, to fighting inflation or protecting the United States balance of payments position. The question of the existence of a national emergency is not relevant to the proposed provisions of the Trade Reform Act.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. EBERLE,
Special Representative.

ROBERT E. BAMMER OF LEAVENWORTH, KANS. WINS AWARD

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that my constituent, 2d Lt. Robert E. Bammer, USAR, of Leavenworth, Kans., was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

His essay, entitled "Freedom Has A Price," is quite original and thought-provoking. I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following award-winning essay:

FREEDOM HAS A PRICE

Accepting freedom is like accepting a coin of great value. This coin has two sides, both being inseparable parts of the whole. On one side is inscribed "freedoms and rights." Seeing this side of the coin, we eagerly grasp it, claiming it for our own.

Upon closer examination of our precious coin, however, we find that the other side reads "duties and responsibilities." This side of the coin must also be wholeheartedly accepted. We receive the freedoms, rights, duties, and responsibilities simultaneously.

Americans have been guaranteed certain

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

freedoms and rights by our Constitution and Bill of Rights. For example, we have the privilege of electing our legislative representatives. Our duty is to vote intelligently and responsibly. In criminal prosecutions we have the right to trial by an impartial jury. Our responsibility is to serve on juries in a fair and non-prejudicial manner.

We also have the freedoms of religion, of speech, and of the press. These carry with them the responsibility to respect our neighbor's rights of worship and lawful expression, and not infringe upon them. A militia and navy have been constitutionally established to protect our freedoms from outside usurpation. It follows that we have a duty to serve in the national defense as necessary. These are but a few examples of the "two-sided coin."

As Americans we can all enjoy the rights and freedoms of our great nation. When we discharge our American responsibilities, we help insure that future generations will receive, untarnished and inviolate, the same precious Constitutional Freedoms and Rights that we hold so dear.

NIXONOMICS: THE HIGH COST OF EATING

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the evidence that phase III of Mr. Nixon's economic stabilization program is a flop and a fraud continues to mount. Today's papers carry the report that Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show an increase of nearly 12 percent in the cost of food in the New York metropolitan area over the last year.

This administration may be adept at bombing, bugging and burglary, but it rates an "F" in economics. The text of the New York Times story on the BLS report follows:

FOOD PRICES ROSE A RECORD 11.9 PERCENT IN A YEAR

Retail food prices rose 1.2 per cent in the New York-northeastern New Jersey area from March to April, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported yesterday, bringing the year's rise from April, 1972, to a record 11.9 per cent.

The previous over-the-year record was set in March of this year, when prices showed an increase of 10.4 per cent over March, 1972.

More than nine-tenths of the April rise was the result of price increases for meat, poultry and fish and fruits and vegetables. The Federal agency noted that the over-all April increase, although sharp, was less than the previous monthly increases recorded this year—2.4 per cent from December to January, 2.2 per cent from January to February and 3.1 per cent from February to March.

Prior to this year, the highest one-year increase for food used in the home—as opposed to food bought in restaurants—was 9.3 per cent, between March, 1957, and March, 1958.

SOME DECLINES

Meat, poultry and fish prices rose 18.5 per cent over last April, while fruits and vegetables rose 16.6 per cent. Among higher meat items were frankfurters, up 3 cents a pound since March to \$1.14; pork sausage, up 7 cents to \$1.23 a pound, and sirloin and porterhouse steak, each up 8 cents to \$1.81 and \$2.11, respectively.

In all there were 29 increases, but there were some declines, too. Pork chops were down 9 cents, to \$1.54 a pound, and lamb chops dropped 6 cents a pound, to \$2.25.

Fruit and vegetable prices were up 2.8 per cent in April, compared with March, reflecting in part increases for bananas, up 2 cents a pound; potatoes, up 7 cents for a 10-pound bag; lettuce, up 8 cents a head, and onions, up 6 cents a pound. In this category, too, there were some lower prices, including asparagus, down 21 cents a pound, and tomatoes, down 3 cents a pound.

AIRPORT NOISE CURFEW COMMISSION ACT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has recently ruled that local governments cannot enact anti-noise curfews on jet aircraft operations at their airports because such regulation of aviation is the exclusive province of the Federal Government.

In light of this decision, I am reintroducing the Airport Noise Curfew Commission Act, which has been referred to your subcommittee. This bill, which has 33 cosponsors, is entirely consistent with the Court's ruling.

Cosponsors are: BELLA ABZUG, JOSEPH ADDABBO, FRANK ANNUNZIO, HERMAN BADILLO, FRANK BRASCO, GEORGE E. BROWN, PHILLIP BURTON, ROBERT DRINAN, DON EDWARDS, JOSHUA EILBERG, DON FRASER, BEN GILMAN, ELLA GRASSO, GILBERT GUDE, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, KEN HECHLER, MARGARET HECKLER, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ED KOCH, WILLIAM LEHMAN, ROBERT McCLORY, STEWART MCKINNEY, WILLIAM MOORHEAD, CLAUDE PEPPER, BERTRAM PODELL, CHARLES RANGEL, MATTHEW RINALDO, PETER RODINO, FRED ROONEY, EDWARD ROYBAL, ANTONIO WON PAT, LESTER WOLFF, and JOHN WYDLER.

This bill would not establish curfews itself but would create a nine-member Commission to investigate the question of curfews on aircraft during normal sleeping hours. The Commission would be composed of the Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Aviation Administration—in whose jurisdiction the Supreme Court ruled this question falls—two representatives of the aviation industry and five public members. The Commission would report its findings and recommendations to the Congress within 6 months of creation and then go out of business.

Not every community may need or want a curfew on its airport, and conditions vary from airport to airport and community to community. The Airport Noise Curfew Commission would be able to take these factors into consideration as well as the need for Federal control in this matter.

A curfew on aircraft operations is not the ultimate solution to the noise pollution problem, but it is a viable short-term answer that will provide immediate relief to millions of persons plagued by the whine, roar, and soot of low-flying planes. The cost of a curfew is minimal, there is no question of compromising safety and no new technology is needed. Curfews may mean some inconvenience for

the airlines and an extremely small number of passengers—because most flights during normal sleeping hours contain freight—but that must be weighed against the public's right to domestic tranquility and a decent night's sleep.

The noise impact of a jetliner taking off or landing is 10 times more disturbing during sleeping hours, when it is much more difficult to assimilate sounds, than during the day, according to acoustics experts.

OEO CUTBACKS HARM FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD at this time, an article which originally appeared in the May 17, 1973, issue of the Community Nutrition Institute Weekly Report, dealing with the effects of OEO cutbacks in food assistance programs.

The Weekly Report is published here in Washington, and the CNI was, up until very recently, an OEO grantee. Our colleagues may have read about the CNI Weekly Report at the time the OEO Public Affairs Office made an attempt to censor the newsletter. Rather than accept this censorship and harassment from Acting Director Howard Phillips' office, the Community Nutrition Institute Board chose to terminate their grant relationship with OEO.

This has consequences beyond the actual termination; it is, regrettably, part and parcel of the administration's policy of intimidation, bordering on hostility, toward certain social programs of proven quality. By this action, we all suffer.

The article follows:

OEO CUTBACKS WILL HARM FOOD ASSISTANCE

With funding from the Office of Economic Opportunity about to expire, community action agencies (CAAs) throughout the country are preparing to institute massive cutbacks in local food assistance programs for the poor.

A CNI survey of 42 CAAs in 20 states, completed this month, shows that scores of supplemental feeding programs, day care and summer feeding programs, and food stamp and commodity outreach, certification, and transportation programs will be eliminated or drastically cut if Congress does not appropriate funds to save CAA operations. Only one CAA in the survey stated no cutbacks would occur in any of its food assistance programs if OEO funding ends.

OEO supporters are now planning a campaign to rally support in Congress for a new appropriation for the agency or for a continuing resolution to maintain OEO funding until an appropriations bill is readied. However, the struggle to keep OEO alive is considered a very uphill battle at this point (see CNI Vol. III:19).

DAY CARE AFFECTED

CNI found that over half of the CAAs in the survey that operate day care feeding programs plan to eliminate the program upon termination of OEO funding. Every CAA in the survey running supplemental feeding programs would eliminate or cut back these operations.

In addition, 88 percent of the CAAs running food stamp outreach, certification, or

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

transportation programs and 67 percent of the CAAs providing similar services to surplus commodities recipients reported plans to terminate or substantially reduce their programs. The remaining agencies with programs to assist food stamp and commodity recipients replied that they did not know what would become of their programs.

Last year, a study of the Maryland food stamp program conducted by the Maryland Food Committee, a state-wide anti-hunger organization, found that counties with CAA outreach programs had vastly more successful food stamp programs than counties without OEO-funded outreach activity.

SUMMER PROGRAMS HIT

Community action directors also voiced concern about the future of summer feeding programs. While 17 of 26 CAAs reported they would be able to maintain their program this summer, many of these 17 CAAs reported that their funding would run out next fall and that they would be unable to run the program again in 1974.

Of the 42 CAAs, only three day care feeding operations and three summer feeding programs were reported to be secure from cutbacks or termination during the coming fiscal year. Most CAAs stated that no other local agency will pick up the food programs if they end operations.

An earlier Children's Foundation survey focusing on the supplemental food program found that over 40,000 mothers and young children would be eliminated from the program by OEO cutbacks. This figure represents 25 percent of nationwide participation in this program (see CNI Vol. III:12).

In addition, a February survey of OEO Emergency Food and Medical Services (EFMS) grantees in eight states reveals that a variety of other food and nutritional services offered by CAAs have already ended or will end by September. Such services include starting elderly feeding projects, establishing breakfast programs in schools, using food stamp vouchers in emergencies, organizing farming cooperatives and community gardens, and operating nutrition classes.

CAA SURVEY RESULTS

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS YOU NOW OPERATE IF YOUR OEO FUNDING ENDS?

	Eliminate	Cut	Maintain	Don't know	Recipients eliminated
Day care	6	1	3	2	2,100
Supplemental	6	2	—	—	9,400
Food stamp	16	6	—	3	60,000
Commodity	5	3	—	4	3,000
Summer, 1973	3	5	17	1	5,300
Summer, 1974	5-16	—	3	7	—

¹ Based on responses from 42 CAA's, about 4.5 percent of CAA's in the Nation.

FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX INCREASE WILL NOT COOL INFLATIONARY SPIRAL OR CURB AUTO FUEL CONSUMPTION; PROPOSAL IS REGRESSIVE TAX

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to any increase in the Federal gasoline tax as a means of raising revenue in an effort to cool spiraling inflation.

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz has said the administration is consider-

ing proposals to increase the Federal gasoline tax. Reports of the boost range from as low as 1 cent to as high as 10 cents per gallon.

Deputy Treasury Secretary William E. Simon, chairman of the President's Oil Policy Committee, has said one reason for the tax increase would be to raise prices in order to keep down demand and consumption during the current gasoline shortage.

I do not think the proposal is justified on either count.

A 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax is estimated to produce an additional \$1 billion in Federal revenues.

Raising \$5 to \$10 billion in additional Federal gasoline taxes is no way to cool off a rapidly expanding and inflationary economy.

Mr. Speaker, this would be a regressive tax. The impact would fall hardest on lower to moderate income persons.

The Federal gasoline tax is now 4 cents per gallon. State and local taxes boost the gallon price of gasoline considerably higher.

Hiking the Federal tax is not going to cut down on gasoline demand and consumption. Most families need the automobile for work and shopping because of inadequate public transportation. Admittedly, there is luxury driving, but increasing the Federal gasoline tax is not going to make the current gasoline shortage less severe.

Drivers have been watching the price of gasoline at the pump creep up for the last several months.

They have heard scare reports of 60 to 70 cents per gallon prices in the future.

Now they hear they may be faced with a 5 to 10 cents Federal tax boost per gallon on gasoline.

If the administration's voluntary petroleum allocation policy is not satisfactory to meet all of the Nation's gasoline demands, boosting the Federal gasoline tax is not going to bring about corrective forces in the production distribution of auto fuel.

INTRODUCTION OF AN ALL-CHANNEL RADIO BILL

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with Mr. VAN DEERLIN, a bill to amend section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that all radio receivers shipped in interstate commerce be technically equipped to receive and amplify both AM and FM broadcast signals.

This bill aids in increasing the diversity, availability, quality, and fidelity of radio programming for listeners throughout the United States.

As the FCC has pointed out, the AM frequency band is, in essence, exhausted, and the public must rely upon FM for additional broadcast service. With a greater number of frequencies available for the average receiver, the listeners

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

will have a greater selection from which to choose. And, with expanded choice available to the listener, we have greater opportunity to achieve the objective of the Communications Act of diversity of voices through our communications system. Listening possibilities can be especially broadened, for example, in auto radio. Of the 110 million vehicles presently on the road, only 4 million have FM capability. Moreover, half of the 4,400 AM stations are daytime-only outlets. Hence, many rural areas lack local service at night. FM has the potential to provide such service.

It should also be noted in furtherance of this diversity that the FCC has already held that jointly owned AM-FM stations in markets of over 100,000 population must program separately in order to provide the public with greater choice and diversity.

In addition to boosting the availability and diversity of radio programming, this bill promises to foster greater competition between stations. Improved radio program content can result.

Furthermore, passage of this legislation can help insure significant expansion of public radio programming. Congress has mandated the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to build a system of general educational, cultural, and informational radio throughout the United States. Considering that 549 of the 571 noncommercial educational radio licensees in the United States are FM, one can see that increased capability to receive such stations will strengthen their impact and expand the scope of their operations, especially in the field of education.

Broadened receiver capability also provides the chance for FM broadcasters, especially the smaller independents, to prosper more equitably.

For example, at the beginning of this decade, radio revenues and profits increased 10.7 percent while the proportion of the independent FM stations sustaining losses was 65.5 percent. This bill would then significantly increase FM broadcasting market potential by making investment in FM stations more worthwhile.

Technical considerations should also be emphasized. FM offers signals not as susceptible to static and other such interference and a medium particularly conducive to high fidelity broadcasting.

In short, passage of this bill offers to the listener greater potential diversity and quality of programming. To the FM broadcasters, it provides the chance for increased economic stability. For public broadcasting, the all channel bill holds tremendous promise for increased effectiveness. I strongly urge consideration and passage of this bill by the Congress.

GEN. HARLEY B. WEST SPEAKS ON
AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, in Texas, we are more proud of America today

than any time in history. We still have the patriotic conviction that our country is the greatest land in the world.

Every year on Memorial Day we pause in memory and respect of our greatest heroes. These are the men who died for our country. The men who gave their lives so that today we can enjoy the liberty and opportunity of America.

I want to especially voice appreciation to George Young, who directs the program of Restland Memorial and Laurel Land Memorial Cemeteries. George Young keeps the flags flying and arranges an inspiring Memorial Day program at these great parks.

This year the Memorial Day address was given by Maj. Gen. Harley B. West. General West is the national commander of the Military Order of World Wars. General West is a decorated veteran and staunch patriot. I include in the RECORD the high points of his great Memorial Day message:

ADDRESS BY GEN. HARLEY B. WEST

This the day we honor those who have given their lives in the Nation's defense. We pay special tribute—on this 105th Memorial Day—to those members of the Armed Forces who made the supreme sacrifice in the cause of freedom.

Let us pause to reflect on their courage and to consider their challenge to us, the living.

These brave men have served their country in a manner beyond our experience. For their selfless dedication, we owe them our lasting gratitude for a heritage of freedom. We can never honor them enough for the price they have paid for this great heritage.

They have crossed many milestones on the long road to freedom: Concord . . . Gettysburg . . . Belleau Wood . . . Normandy . . . Chosin Reservoir . . . and Khe Sanh. They stand tall in history for their efforts in behalf of free men.

Let us never ignore their contributions to our national heritage, for these soldiers have served their fellow man in the fullest sense of that word. It is not their participation in war which we glorify. What we glorify is the dedication to an ideal, to the faith in a living concept of freedom, to the spirit of personal sacrifice for the common good which these brave men so gallantly served. When the Nation needed them, they left their families and homes to meet their responsibilities. They did what needed to be done . . . and more . . . above and beyond the call of duty.

What sustained these courageous men? What is the lesson to be drawn from their noble service?

General George C. Marshall spoke of what sustains the soldier when he said: (Quote)

"The soldier's heart, the soldier's spirit, the soldier's soul are everything. Unless the soldier's soul sustains him, he cannot be relied on and will fail himself and his commander and his country in the end."

"It is not enough to fight. It is the spirit which we bring to the fight that decides the issue. It is morale that wins the victory."

"Morale is a state of mind. It is steadfastness and courage and hope. It is confidence and zeal and loyalty. It is *Elan, esprit de corps* and determination."

"It is staying power, the spirit which endures to the end—and will to win."

"With it all things are possible, without it everything else, planning, preparation, production, count for naught."

During recent weeks the spotlight has been on our recently returned prisoners of war from S.E. Asia—properly so—Dallas, on this coming Friday, Saturday & Sunday (6/1-2-3, 1973) is mounting a Dallas salutes ceremony honoring not only the P.O.W. but, all who served in S.E. Asia—it promises to be the

largest and most extravagant occasion in the whole United States. 450 P.O.W.'s have already accepted invitations to attend. The Cotton Bowl will be filled to capacity Saturday night. The M.I.A. and those who served and returned safely will not be forgotten—this is the way Dallas feels!—this is the way Dallas does things!

These P.O.W.s maintained the spirit General Marshall spoke about—they kept their spirit, their discipline, their self respect, and their hope despite the worst possible conditions of captivity, including long periods of solitary confinement.

Our hearts swelled with pride and the most hard bitten of us let a tear come to our eyes as each stepped from a plane at Clark Field—saluted their flag—our flag too—and stepped to a microphone to express their gratitude to this country, to its leadership, and to their God.

The men and women we honor today, are not alive to speak for themselves—their deeds speak for them!—just as eloquently—more eloquently than any of us would possibly speak—they spoke with their lives!

These men did not voice tender expressions of idealism, for on the field of battle, actions spoke louder than words.

Then why, we may ask, did these men, as individuals, give so much of themselves.

Those cynics who deride patriotism and faith tell us no. They seek to convince us that these men went blindly and fought blindly while they cursed the impersonal fate which led them inexorably through the darkness of combat.

Today it is sometimes unfashionable to speak of patriotism and idealism, to fly the flag, to proclaim in depth what America stands for and what our freedoms cost us. Nevertheless, we believe in the meaning of all these, and it was this deep belief that motivated those we honor today.

This ceremony here at Laurel Land will soon be over—as will similar observances in thousands of cities across the land—you and I will return to our homes and our regular routines—of course we promise ourselves to return again next year to memorialize our military dead; to place a flower; to say a prayer; and to sound taps.

Let me repeat the lessons our honored dead would tell us if they could speak—

Weakness does not bring peace—it assures war! From the blue ribbon panel's report—

"Among the great Nations, only the strong survive!"

So, on this Memorial Day . . . we pay homage . . . to all . . . fallen comrades—to the strong, the weak, the leaders, the led; the brave, the fearful; to all who perished where only God could witness their charity to their fellow man.

"Proudly—but reverently, sadly—we honor them. We pray they will ever rest in peace."

TAX INCREASE: THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL TO ENERGY SHORTAGE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, after U.S. involvement in Korea, followed by years of military involvement in South Vietnam and Indochina, the American people are now told that they must change their pattern of living because we face a fuel shortage. Reports of the administration's reaction are unbelievable. Any fuel shortage, if it does exist, would certainly not be solved by increasing taxes on the price of gasoline, presumably as

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a means of deterring gasoline consumption.

It is strange indeed that the same administration, which has been in power for 4 years, waits until the people are threatened with a denial of energy to take any action. And then that action is to further aggravate the situation rather than offer alternatives or solutions.

I do not believe the American people are being fooled by the overnight brainwashing. Nor do I believe that the American people are ready to curtail the high standard of living and affluent living conditions that they have grown accustomed to using, merely to be herded into a public opinion molding crusade for the further manipulation of international schemers.

I include a related newsclipping:

VARIED TAX PLANS WEIGHED IN GASOLINE CRISIS

The Nixon administration is considering a variety of tax measures designed to reduce fuel consumption by making gasoline more expensive in the face of current and anticipated shortages.

Officials involved in oil policy decisions also are considering meeting with Detroit's big four auto manufacturers to encourage the construction of smaller cars which consume less fuel.

Among the taxes being considered at the Treasury Department are an increase in gasoline levies, an auto weight tax and a horsepower tax.

Each of the taxes have been presented as options in various memoranda presented to the Oil Policy Committee chaired by Deputy Treasury Secretary William E. Simon.

The gasoline tax increase has been the most widely publicized mode so far.

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz indicated yesterday during an all-day seminar on the economy for the press that this idea "has been around a long while."

He told the seminar the gas tax raise "has some pluses and minuses connected with it."

A five-cent-a-gallon gas tax increase had been included in the first three drafts of President Nixon's energy message to Congress. It was knocked out, however, of the final message by Shultz.

Simon, who appears to be merging as the administration's principal fuel policymaker, yesterday addressed himself to the "pros and cons" of this particular tax. He said the advantages are that it would help as a general anti-inflationary measure and encourage conservation of fuel.

Its disadvantage is, he added, that it is a "regressive" tax—meaning that the poor will pay proportionately more.

Another administration spokesman pointed out that the tax increase would also be a revenue-raising measure. He estimated that a one-cent a gallon price hike would bring an additional \$1 billion into the federal treasury.

The administration in the first draft of the President's energy message had specifically earmarked the additional money for research and development of alternative energy sources. This specification, however, went out early—long before the gasoline tax was scuttled.

The other two kinds of taxes under consideration would bear most directly on fuel shortages.

Under the auto weight tax the government would impose an excise tax on big cars, presumably at the time of purchase.

The horsepower tax would work the same way, with larger cars paying heavier taxes.

Officials are also not ruling out a possibility of combining taxes. For example, Europeans generally pay gasoline as well as horsepower taxes.

An administration energy spokesman said the idea to appeal to Detroit came out of a

recent Oil Policy Committee "kitchen cabinet" meeting held by Simon. This smaller working group includes Asst. Treasury Secretary Stephen Wakefield; Duke Ligon, director of the Interior Department's Office of Oil and Gas; Charles DiBona, White House energy policy adviser; and representatives of the Cost of Living Council and the Environmental Protection Agency.

The administration has no power to order the Big Four—Ford, General Motors, American Motors, and Chrysler—to build smaller cars. But it hopes it can "educate" the manufacturers to the merits of smaller autos.

It hopes to learn at such a meeting whether there is any possibility for the auto manufacturers to change their manufacturing processes to smaller models before the three-year lead time normally needed.

At the least, the government officials hope to encourage the manufacturers to advertise their smaller cars now on the assembly line to help get through the fuel shortage.

Other recent developments geared to cutting down the country's fuel consumption include:

Administration energy officials have proposed relaxation of air pollution standards so that more polluting, higher sulfur content oil and coal can be burned at refineries and utility companies. The Oil Policy Committee is currently working with EPA to see if less stringent clean air standards can be worked out.

A survey now being conducted by the Cost of Living Council to determine what will encourage oil companies to import more oil and gasoline now that import quotas have been lifted. Oil companies have been arguing that they need to pass on to the consumers the higher cost of foreign crude oil and gasoline.

The Civil Aeronautics Board yesterday authorized all U.S. scheduled airlines to engage in talks aimed at fuel conservation measures. The authority is for 180 days and subject to filing with the government of any agreement reached.

CAB permission was needed to avoid antitrust action against the airlines.

Airlines report that there are no important shortages at present, but they fear some may develop this fall when the heating season begins. Fuels used by airplanes are closer to heating oil than gasoline.

Standard Oil of New Jersey, the world's largest oil company, selling its gas under the brand name Exxon, has announced that it will begin allocating—or rationing—gasoline to service station retailers and commercial account customers beginning June 1. The move, Exxon said, is to assure "proportionate distribution" of available gasoline supplies among all its customers.

THE BURKE-HARTKE BILL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Burke-Hartke bill is based on the premise that industries in New England are gravely affected by unfair import competition. What we rarely hear is the fact that New England is twice as dependent on export production as the Nation as a whole.

Burke-Hartke would impose quotas on imports so that goods could be imported in no greater quantity than they were in 1967. Such a policy would lead other nations to retaliate with similar measures, decreasing our exports.

Granted, import competition is im-

portant in certain portions of the shoe, paper, textile, machinery, and jewelry industries. This is a problem we must address, but not in a way that damages the sectors leading our development, such as nonelectrical machinery, transportation equipment, and instruments and related products.

I claim no particular expertise and have no final solutions to what we would agree is a serious problem, but I do think we can see the directions in which we must work.

I will support legislation that will provide the protection workers legitimately need, but with the flexibility Burke-Hartke lacks. Our industries must be protected from nations that have unjustifiable or unreasonable barriers against American goods, or that subsidize their own exports. We also need much simpler procedures to enable domestic industries that claim serious injury from imports to establish their case and obtain relief in the form of import restraints through higher tariffs, countervailing duties, or any of several other devices as well as adjustment assistance.

In addition, the broad industry assistance approach, as outlined by Ambassador Eberle, the President's Special Trade Representative, which would assist companies in their efforts to modernize and upgrade their efficiency, appeals to me at least in its direction of addressing the fundamental competitive problems facing many American firms. It seems to me that the administration's proposal comes closer to meeting these goals than Burke-Hartke, at least as the proposals now stand.

CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

HON. HAROLD V. FROEHLICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, May 26, I had the privilege of addressing the graduating seniors of Little Wolf High School in Manawa, Wis. The occasion was an appreciation dinner for the graduates and their parents, sponsored by the Lions Club of Manawa.

The theme of my remarks was civic responsibility. The remarks follow:

CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

Graduation from high school is an important event for young people—here in Manawa and throughout America.

For some, it marks the completion of formal education. For others, it means the end of but a segment of the educational process. For all, it signals the beginning of new undertakings and new challenges in a complex and uncertain world.

Graduation from high school is one of the great milestones of life. And it is certainly fitting and proper to celebrate this milestone with banquets like this one and other forms of recognition.

No one has to tell you graduates that you have come a long way down a rough road—and that you have achieved something significant in the process. You know the hard work that high school has been.

I suspect that many of you are glad it's

May 31, 1973

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

over, glad to get on to something new. But I am equally confident that a great many of you, in time, will look back on high school as a splendid haven of friendship, happiness, security, and reflection.

Some of you may never know a better time.

Graduation is a milestone, an event you will remember all your lives. And that is why a speaker who is privileged to address new graduates strives so hard to impart some thought, some message from his insight and experience, that is worthy of the occasion.

Tonight I would like to share with you a few thoughts on civic responsibility.

Thomas Paine is remembered, among other things, for his remark that, "These are the times that try men's souls."

That quotation is appropriate in our present situation.

Fortunately, you are not leaving high school, as some of your parents and I did, to enter a world at war. Nor are you leaving at a time of severe depression or economic catastrophe.

You are, however, leaving high school at a time when there is a crisis of confidence in the integrity of the national government—and perhaps in the integrity of all government.

For those who read the daily newspapers and watch the hearings on television, following each new disclosure of sordid, unseemly, and illegal conduct by officials in Washington, these are the times that try men's souls and shake one's confidence in our public institutions.

It is hard to conceive of a less auspicious, more ironic moment to appeal to idealistic young people for an intensive interest and an active participation in politics and government.

But, while it may be ironic, such an appeal tonight is not inappropriate, because regardless of what happens in this deplorable Watergate mess, it will pass, and the nation will go on.

I received a letter the other day that contained a rather startling observation.

The writer said, "I think that everybody in Washington, D.C., from the President on down, is a crook and I think there needs to be a good housecleaning."

I interpreted this to mean that the writer was somewhat disenchanted with the government!

But it is also evident—and this is significant—that the writer wanted a house *cleaning*, not a house *burning*.

Government must go on, and government will go on.

And the question tonight is whether you will improve that government and strengthen that government through your interest and participation, or whether you will go through life as a civic dropout.

One of the easiest but most important facets of civic responsibility is regular voting. If we look for a model community in terms of voting participation, we need look no further than the City of De Pere in Brown County.

For a period of more than 20 years, the voters of De Pere have been turning out at record percentages. Last November more than 98 percent of the registered voters in the city exercised their franchise.

This phenomenal turnout is consistent with that city's voting history in Presidential elections since 1952. In two of these six elections, the turnout was better than 99 percent. In all of them, the turnout was better than 95 percent.

These statistics represent an unparalleled civic achievement, fully deserving of national recognition.

But they are statistics that could be equalled or surpassed by voters in Manawa if you put your minds to it.

Why is it, when so many voters throughout the country are apparently alienated from the electoral process, believing it to be mean-

ingless, that 98 percent of the voters in De Pere should turn out to vote?

The answer lies in part in the extraordinary sense of "community" that exists in De Pere and in a brilliant organizational effort to get out the vote.

For 20 years, the citizens of De Pere have set as one of their major goals a 100-percent vote in presidential elections.

In 1972, this crusade was organized by the 100 Percent Vote Committee, which was made up of leading members of the Lions, Kiwanis, Rotary, and Optimist Clubs of De Pere. They all worked closely with the city government, the local media, the schools, the churches, and the business community to bring out the vote.

They acquired poll lists of all registered voters. Each service club took one of the city's four wards and made sure that every registered voter received a personal telephone call. Voters who were away from home, at school or in the service, were contacted and sent absentee ballots.

Disabled and elderly voters who could not come to the polls were given the opportunity for a free ride.

The 100 Percent Vote Committee of De Pere proudly notes that every registered voter in the city under the age of 21 went to the polls on November 7. That is a marvelous reflection on De Pere's young people.

De Pere's good citizenship is not something that should be applauded and then forgotten. It is something that should be applauded and then emulated. It should be followed . . . and bettered . . . right here in Manawa.

When it comes to voting, participation is one of the prerequisites of good citizenship. Indifference is a vote against America.

Another aspect of good citizenship that deserves mention tonight is participation in political parties.

I have participated in organized political activity virtually all my adult life. This participation in political party organization is one of the most important ways I know to have a real impact on government.

—You can affect government by voting.

—You can influence government by writing to or conferring with public officials.

—You can help to elect government by contributing financial support to a party or a candidate.

But you can have a *real impact* on government when you invest your time in political organization, working shoulder to shoulder with candidates for office in a cause that is bigger than yourselves. By participating in the nuts and bolts of party organization, you will come to know intimately the people in government, and you will come to understand the policies and principles under which we are governed.

Your assistance, your guidance, and your counsel are greatly desired in political campaigns. Both political parties have an open door to young people, who can be invaluable workers, organizers, and originators of new ideas.

The people who walk through that open door and who commit themselves in the exciting world of politics will be in a far better position to affect the course of government than those who remain aloof and uncommitted on the outside.

Now, third, let me suggest that you carefully consider the possibility of government service in the future—as an employee, a voluntary participant, or a candidate for public office.

I certainly do not mean to lessen the importance of any vocation—be it farmer or businessman or laborer or teacher or engineer—when I say that it is hard to conceive of a calling in life that offers greater potential for solving problems and helping people than public service. It is hard to imagine any line of work that provides a greater challenge and produces a greater sense of satisfaction

. . . when things go right . . . than government service.

If you want to help people, if you want to help your community, if you want to secure reforms, if you want to improve the world, government may be your "bag".

Let me assure you, not everyone in Washington is a crook. There are hundreds of thousands of honest, dedicated, hard-working people doing a great job as government employees and public officials.

Government has not corrupted them. It has inspired them, and it has given them a chance to serve the people of our country.

There is ample opportunity for each of you to serve in some governmental capacity at some point in your lives. Local government always needs good people. Close to home there are boards and commissions and councils that could be strengthened by your support and participation.

I hope you will seek out these opportunities. Don't complain about the quality of government, nationally or locally, if you have never stepped forward and offered to serve.

Now let me close with a few additional thoughts on Watergate.

Grover Cleveland was never our most quotable President, but he did say something that people in government, people in public life, should always remember:

"A public office is a public trust."

Without naming names or going into details, it seems apparent that some of the men who were given very important responsibilities in the Federal Government forgot that a public office is a public trust, forgot that they too were bound by the law, forgot that they were subject to scrutiny and accountable to the people.

They became so arrogant about the power they possessed that they decided their unreviewable decisions should be implemented by any means at any cost.

In short, they abused their public trust, and they should be punished accordingly.

The Watergate mess involves appointed officials in the Executive Branch of the government.

But the legislative branch has also had its scandals over the years.

And a federal judge in Chicago was recently convicted of multiple felonies and sentenced to jail, so that the judiciary is not immune to misconduct.

Winston Churchill told us that democracy is the worst form of government—except for the others.

And the basic problem is that government is made up of people—people who can soar to great heights in their dedication to the public interest, or sink to great depths if they forget their public trust.

People are the strength and the weakness of all the institutions in American life.

What we should remember today is that the great institutions of our society will expose the full story of the Watergate situation, that people run these institutions, and that people will put the government and the Nation back on course.

I hope that as idealistic young people you will recognize the role that is open to you in our country—to keep your government on course and moving forward.

And when you graduate from this life into eternity, I hope you can look back and say, "I did my best."

THE BERGEN BULLETIN AND THE PALISADIAN RECEIVE 1973 ALFRED P. SLOAN AWARDS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was announced recently that two newspapers

in my district, the Bergen Bulletin and the Palisadian of Palisades Park, N.J., have been selected to receive 1973 Alfred P. Sloan Awards for distinguished public service to highway safety.

The Sloan Awards, now in their 25th year, recognize excellence by the broadcast and print media in the continuing campaign to improve safety on the Nation's highways. They are offered by the Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility to encourage vigor and innovation in the development of public services programs and activities aimed at the reduction of traffic accidents, injuries and fatalities.

The awards are made in the memory of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., a former president and chairman of the General Motors Corp. and a pioneer in the organized highway safety movement. Winners of the 1973 Sloan Awards will receive walnut plaques. Other commendable entries will receive certificates of merit.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the Bergen Bulletin and the Palisadian have been so distinguished and honored with Sloan Awards.

The publishers, editors, and staff personnel of these newspapers are to be congratulated for their contribution to highway safety, and for their hard work and excellence in making these awards possible. I am sure my colleagues join with me in extending best wishes to both newspapers.

WE CANNOT FORGET THE FORT WORTH FIVE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have risen many times before to discuss the predicament of five New Yorkers who are incarcerated in Texas and denied bail in violation of their civil rights.

I again direct my colleagues' attention to the Fort Worth Five because the House Judiciary Committee will shortly consider the resolution of inquiry into this case. I am hopeful the committee will provide the entire House the opportunity to consider this matter and its implications. We must act to release these men and return them to their families.

I ask that two items be inserted in the RECORD today. The first is a letter I wrote to Attorney General Richardson the day he was nominated to replace former Attorney General Kleindienst. I am anxiously awaiting his reply.

The second is a brief editorial broadcast by Jimmy Breslin on WNBC-TV in New York. As usual, Mr. Breslin gets right to the heart of the matter:

When you have corruption of the law—always the ones who get hurt are some poor guys out working for a living.

We cannot forget these men.

The items follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1973.

Hon. ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Attorney General Designate, Department of
Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Please accept

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

my best wishes as you take on your new, and extremely grave responsibilities.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention a situation in which the Justice Department has been involved for the last year in the Northern District of Texas, and which has become an increasing concern to me as the Congressman who represents the district in which one of the parties resides.

The case to which I refer, known generally as the "Fort Worth Five" investigation includes my constituent, Thomas Laffey. He and four other Irish-Americans from the New York area, were called last year to testify before a grand jury sitting in the northern district of Texas, which at the time was investigating possible criminal violations surrounding suspected gun-running to Northern Ireland. According to their sworn statement, none of them had ever been in Texas, nor did they know anyone in Texas. The five men cited their Fifth Amendment privileges and were forthwith incarcerated in the Tarrant County Jail. Although they were recently transferred to the Federal Correctional Institution at Seagoville, Texas, they have still not been charged with any crime.

Furthermore, Assistant Attorney General, A. William Olson testified at a hearing of a Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary that no further witnesses have been subpoenaed to testify in the investigation being conducted by the grand jury before which these men were called. Therefore, I am urging a prompt and complete review of this case in the hope that you as the new Attorney General and as a fair minded individual will further the basic interest of justice in this case. It is clear that the grand jury retains no further intention of continuing whatever investigation it had begun last year.

I have never taken a position as to the guilt or innocence of any of the prisoners, but I do believe that under our system of justice if charges are not brought against an individual within a reasonable period of time, it is imperative that he not be held in the custody of the state. These men have spent the better part of the last year in prison, and the majority of that time was spent in a county jail under conditions that would horrify most civilized people. Their families have undergone severe hardship separation, and have absorbed enormous financial losses.

There can be no purpose other than punishment and vindictiveness in keeping these men in jail any longer. If charges are to be brought, then so be it; but if they are not to be officially accused of any wrongdoing then they should be released immediately.

I cannot emphasize enough the urgency and importance of this situation. It is our system of justice and our traditions of fairness that are at stake. Every day that these men sit in jail adds to the seriousness of this travesty. I hope that you will see fit to take firm and prompt action that will once and for all end this perversion of justice.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this most critical matter. I anxiously await your reply.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

COMMENTARY: JIMMY BRESLIN, SIXTH HOUR NEWS, WNBC-TV, APRIL 26, 1973

Let me show you how this Watergate scandal comes right down to us:

There are at this time five family men from New York who have been in jail in Fort Worth, Texas for most of a year. They could remain in until November.

For no crime. The five refuse to answer questions in a Federal grand jury about arms purchases for Northern Ireland.

The case actually belongs in a traffic court, maybe.

But it is a big deal because it has been in the hands of first Robert Mardian and

then A. William Olsen of the Justice Department's Internal Security Division.

Mardian and then Olsen kept saying the case was vital to American security. What they really were doing, they were doing the English a favor. Harassing or arresting people connected with Irish causes here.

When you have corruption of the law, as I'm going to tell you about here, always . . . always . . . the ones who get hurt are some poor guys out working for a living.

When these five men asked for bail, Mardian and his assistant Olsen insisted that the five men might be killed by terrorists in New York.

Now.

We find today that Mardian is mentioned in all the stories about the Watergate mess.

Now we come to Olsen. For months, Olsen never took phone calls at the Justice Department.

The other day, with all this Watergate stuff going on, I decided to give Olsen another call.

Olsen came on the phone himself. When these people are scared, they show it right away.

I asked Olsen where the case in Fort Worth stands. He said, gee, I don't know; it's out of my hands now. I'm leaving Justice in 30 days.

I said to him, what are you in trouble over the Watergate? Are you going to get put in a penitentiary?

And Mr. Olsen said, no, I'm leaving because they abolished my job.

Of course, they're abolishing his job. He's not leaving because of the Watergate scandal. Olsen isn't going on the lam or anything like that.

I then said to Olsen, what about these five guys in prison in Fort Worth?

He said, oh, something will be done about it, I guess.

That was it.

You have five working men in jail. For no crime. Their families around here are without income.

The men are in jail because suspects with badges put them there.

SUCCESSFUL TOUR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of the Members the report on the successful European concert tour by the Viking Choir of Homewood-Flossmoor High School of Illinois.

This is the second such tour for this outstanding group of young men and women. I am especially pleased that this high school in my district has seen fit to support the development of this outstanding choir.

They appear to be excellent ambassadors as described in the article on the tour carried in the Homewood-Flossmoor Star of May 20, which follows:

SUCCESSFUL TOUR

To the Editor:

Settling back down into the familiar routine of school, the members of the Viking choir of Homewood-Flossmoor high school have had time to evaluate exactly what knowledge and experience they have gained from the April European concert tour.

The choir traveled through Holland, Germany and France, visiting many sites of interest and experiencing a growing rapport and understanding of the people and customs of Europe.

Part of this understanding was gained

from the fact that students were given the choice of either staying with the guides or going out on their own to see and experience the city from the inside. We not only saw the large cities but had our sampling of small villages and towns, which gave us a well-rounded view of Europe.

As a choir, musically we feel that we represented our school and our country to our fullest ability as we received standing ovations after every performance. We couldn't have asked a better reward for our rehearsal and concert schedule than the appreciation and respect we received from our audiences. As choir members, we achieved a unity in sound and spirit which was truly the most unusual experience that we all shared.

One of the high points of the tour was our journey down the Rhine on our cruiser, "The Holland Pearl," passing picturesque castles, towns and vineyards. The three-day cruise, the Keukenhof Tulip Gardens, the Castle Party, shopping in the cities, a visit to Rothenburg (300 AD), the Rijksmuseum with its famous Rembrandts and the experience of singing in the Great European cathedrals is something that will never be forgotten.

But the most touching and possibly the most memorable part of the trip was our visit to the American war cemetery "Magraten" in Holland. The choir sang the national anthem of the United States and the Aaronic Benediction during the ceremony commemorating the loss of 8,000 American soldiers in World War II. The president of the choir then placed a bouquet of flowers on one of the graves, that of an unknown soldier, as a memorial.

Castles, tulips, boats and parties were all a part of the tour. But the true purpose was to achieve a common bond between people of all cultures through the sharing of music. We feel that without a doubt we have attained our goal.

PATTY LUDVIGSON,
President, Viking Choir.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

any doctor who belonged to the foundation. In 1973, 96 percent of all of the physicians in the county were members of the foundation program.

Mr. Speaker, we cherish our traditional private doctor-patient relationship in our Nation and we are in a time when the fundamental decisions must be made regarding the delivery of medical care in the United States. Therefore, I believe the Post article will be of interest. It follows:

NEW MEXICO: SELF-REFORM BY DOCTORS (By Stuart Auerbach)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.—Two years ago New Mexico's medicaid program was bankrupt. The legislature threatened to jail the state health and welfare director for exceeding his budget. The doctors were mad because they weren't getting paid, and the patients were mad because they weren't getting treated.

Today New Mexico's program to provide health care to the poor is on firm financial footing. It offers one of the widest ranges of services of any plan in the nation, and most of the state's doctors participate willingly.

But more important, the method used to turn New Mexico's medicaid program around is now considered organized medicine's last chance to preserve the traditional way health care is delivered before the government is forced to step in.

Indeed, New Mexico's method of peer review—using an organization of doctors to monitor the quality and cost of all medicaid services—has been embodied into federal law.

By 1976, doctors throughout the nation will have to set up their own organizations to review all claims for medicaid and medicare—programs which cover one-third of all Americans. If the doctors fail to act, the law says the government must step in.

"The hope of the future is for the American doctor to take the responsibility," says Dr. Charles C. Edwards, HEW assistant secretary for health.

"If he doesn't, someone else will, and that's where the government comes in."

Sen. Wallace F. Bennett (R-Utah), who wrote the amendment mandating that doctors set up professional service review organizations (PSROs) and pushed it through Congress over the opposition of the American Medical Association, acknowledges that he used the New Mexico organization as a model.

CHANCE TO REFORM

"It's one of medicine's last chances to reform itself," says Bennett. "That's why we fought to make sure that each doctor has a chance to participate."

Nevertheless, American doctors—especially those who have had no experience with this type of review—are wary. For it is the first time that there has been a systematic effort to look over the shoulders of a doctor practicing in his office to make sure that he is treating his patients properly and not overcharging them.

"We are not telling them how to practice medicine. We just say that we will not pay for bad medical practices," says Dr. Henry E. Simmons, Edwards' top aide in HEW.

In New Mexico and California, where this type of review of medicaid started, doctors were found to be giving unnecessary injections, using the wrong drugs and keeping patients in hospitals longer than necessary.

New Mexico saved \$1 1/2 million in one year alone by cutting down on the unneeded injections and overlong hospitalizations.

By all accounts, it was New Mexico's doctors who took the lead in straightening out that state's medicaid mess.

"We thought it was so bad it couldn't get

any worse," recalls Dr. George Boyden, who rallied the state's doctors to form the New Mexico Foundation for Medical Care and now serves as its president.

One-fifth of the state's doctors belong, and no doctor, dentist, drug store, hospital or other health care facility can get paid for treatments under medicaid unless their bills are reviewed.

The foundation was given the authority to review medicaid claims by Richard W. Helm, who took over as director of New Mexico's Health and Social Services Department two years ago to find that medicaid was the legislators' chief dislike.

Helm gave the foundation just four months to begin reviewing medicaid claims. At that point claims had not been paid by the state for two months and medicaid was running \$5 million over its \$19 million budget.

REVIEWING SYSTEMATIZED

New Mexico's doctors hired the Dikewood Corp., a defense-oriented computer think tank here, to develop computer programs for the reviewing and paying of medicaid claims.

The doctors drew up guidelines for claims for specific illnesses that people with no medical training could compare with the treatments listed on medicaid bills.

In reality, the doctors found that 200 diagnoses and treatments account for 80 per cent of all medical problems.

The guidelines defined what drugs should be given for specific ailments (the foundation will not pay for any medication that the Food and Drug Administration says is ineffective); do's and don'ts for common diseases such as arthritis, and the tests needed to support diagnoses.

"There ought to be at least a urine test for urinary tract infection or a chest X ray to support pneumonia," says Boyden.

Dr. Donald Harrington of the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care in Stockton, Calif., which pioneered reviews of medical care 18 years ago, is now developing the first set of national norms for medical care.

These norms are being programmed into a computer. Currently Harrington and Celia Richards, executive claims officer in Stockton, are feeding dummy claims into the computer to see if the system works.

"We want to set up types of practice commonly used in this country," says Harrington. "The computer will remand any claims that do not meet this pattern."

Working under a federal grant, Harrington spent 2 1/2 years conferring with leaders of clinical medicine in the country to develop these norms.

"Everyone wants it right now," he says. "But we're refusing until we get it tested."

Whether the checks are done by computer or by hand, claims examiners can not refuse to pay a doctor's bill. They can only approve payment if the treatment follows the guidelines or refer it for further checks by reviewing doctors.

In New Mexico, more than 70 doctors, paid \$25 an hour, serve as reviewing physicians. About 15 per cent of all claims get reviewed, and half of these reviewed claims are either partially or totally denied. If a doctor doesn't agree with the decision of the reviewing physician, he can appeal to a panel.

Medicaid saved \$85,000 in New Mexico, reviewing doctor bills alone.

BETTER SERVICE

"We are not saving a whole lot of money," says Dr. Edward Herring, chairman of the review panel subcommittee in New Mexico. "But we think we are getting a better brand of medicine to the people."

Nevertheless, in California average medicaid costs per patient are \$52 a day in the area served by the San Joaquin Foundation compared to \$63 a day in Ventura County, which is similar in its socio-economic make-up.

Harrington, the San Joaquin medical director, says that cutting doctor bills doesn't save money. What does is cutting out unneeded services.

That was Herring's aim one day recently as he reviewed claims for New Mexico's foundation. A pathologist, he was looking especially hard at questioned claims for lab tests.

He found that one doctor gave every patient—no matter what the symptoms were—the same battery of tests done in his own lab. Because of that practice, all of the doctor's claims were being reviewed. "It looks like a routine to make money in the lab," says Herring. "If that's the way he treats everybody—and we can find out via the computer—we will send a reviewing doctor out to talk to him."

Meanwhile, Herring cut four tests (worth \$30) from one claim and two tests from another claim. He said the tests Medicaid paid for "are all we do at Presbyterian"—one of the best hospitals in the city.

TOO MANY INJECTIONS

Boyden said the first thing that became obvious from the medical reviews was that doctors were giving far too many injections. At first, 43 per cent of all Medicaid office visits included injections, which are more expensive (and provide more money to the doctor) than prescribing pills.

More important, said Boyden, many doctors were not even injecting the right kinds of medicine.

For example, he said, doctors still used tetracycline, an antibiotic, for strep throat even though most experts feel it does no good. Long-acting penicillin injections or pills are better.

"Tetracycline was thought in the 1950s to be good for everything," says Boyden. "Now we know differently. If a doctor stopped reading about changes in medical practice, he's out of date. But the foundation is raising the issues for him."

California reviewers also found that doctors were giving too many injections, although there the most abused drug was vitamin B-12, which many patients think will cure anything.

The San Joaquin Foundation found that one group of four doctors are giving 65 per cent of all the vitamin B-12 injections in Stockton at a cost of \$6.50 a shot.

Dr. Jack Kortzeborn, a claims reviewer in Stockton, notes that some doctors believe "that everything you do for a patient should be shot through their hides. We don't agree. It's more dangerous and more costly."

He questions the use of gamma globulin injections. "Like holy water and chicken soup," he says, "it sure can't hurt. But it doesn't help much either."

The New Mexico doctors also looked at the overuse of expensive hospital beds. They found a wide variation in the length of time different doctors leave patients in the hospital for the same ailment—from 7 to 16 days for a gall bladder operation and from 1 to 10 days for an appendectomy, for examples.

MIDDLE ROAD BEST

But they also found that the doctors at either extreme were in the minority; most doctors' practice fell in a narrow middle range. This range was adopted as the guidelines for hospital stays.

As a result of the guidelines, says Boyden of the New Mexico Foundation, "we are seeing a marked decrease in the length of hospital stays without any harm to the patients."

State officials estimate the average length of hospital stay has been decreased by a day—saving \$500,000 a year on Medicaid.

The New Mexico Foundation is now looking to eliminate unnecessary hospitalizations and operations completely by requiring pre-

admission certifications for all non-emergency cases.

Pennsylvania Insurance Commissioner Herbert S. Denenberg estimates that there are two million unnecessary operations each year in the country—20 per cent of all surgery—that account for about 24,000 deaths a year.

At one meeting of a preadmission panel—where either the doctor's, hospital's or patient's names are known—a panel member was surprised to find that a request for a tonsillectomy for one of his patients was denied.

Boyden quoted the doctor as saying, "My God you're right" after he had reviewed the case.

(One out of every 14 operations in the country is a tonsillectomy, and some doctors feel that many of them are unnecessary.)

Through its preadmission checks on hospitalization, the San Joaquin Foundation also has cut down on hospital use.

It does even more than make pre-admission reviews of hospitalizations; it has nurses checking on patients already in the hospital and arranging for their care after release. By finding less expensive means of treatment than a hospital—nursing homes or home care, for example—officials in Stockton estimate that this program can cut almost \$1 million a year on bills run up at an average 300-bed hospital.

Aiming at high drug bills, the San Joaquin Foundation runs computer checks on doctors' drug prescription habits.

According to Dr. Robert B. Talley, the foundation checks indicate that 12 per cent of all prescription claims are either duplications or unneeded drugs. Projecting on the nation's \$8.5 billion yearly drug bill, he estimates that patients across the country could save more than \$1 billion a year if similar checks were instituted nationally.

"If the San Joaquin experience is typical, and I think San Joaquin is a typical community, the national implications are very substantial," says Talley, associate medical director of the San Joaquin Foundation.

These checks are more important than simply saving money—even though medical costs are one of the fastest rising components of the cost of living index.

They are the first steps that government and medicine have taken toward inuring a high quality of health care in the country—an area where doctors feel threatened but where there is an even increasing amount of public pressure based on patients' complaints.

Indeed, a special HEW commission concluded that the increasing number of medical malpractice suits are due in a large part to poor care by doctors.

AMA WANTS A VOICE

The AMA, which opposed the PSRO legislation in Congress, is now trying to insure that it has a large voice in the review organization that will be springing up across the country.

An AMA survey shows that 36 state medical societies—three-fourths of them—want to be designated the PSRO for their area.

(In Washington, the District Medical Society has formed a foundation so it can be the PSRO for the city. Prince Georges and Montgomery County doctors have also formed foundations.)

OPPOSITION RISES

Other medical groups to the right of the AMA, however, are attacking the PSRO concept.

The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons says that PSRO stands for "Physicians Should Roll Over." It calls the concept "political medicine (which) is bad medicine," and is collecting money to finance lawsuits against PSROs.

"For myself," says AAPS President Dr.

Robert S. Jaggard of Olwein, Iowa, "I cannot conceive of how an ethical doctor would be able to cooperate with a PSRO."

"Sooner or later he would be caught in the cross fire of PSRO insistence that medical care not exceed computerized norms and ethical doctors' insistence that they are going to give their patients the best care possible, come hell or high water."

Nevertheless, medical foundations to do peer review are spreading throughout the country. The San Joaquin Foundation is the guiding light of the foundation movement, and so many doctors visit its headquarters in Stockton that it now charges for briefings.

As a result of the new interest in foundations, Harrington now spends as much time traveling around the country as he does tending to his patients and foundation in Stockton.

He is president of the Stockton-based American Association of Foundations for Medical Care which acts as an education group.

Boyd Thompson, executive director of the association, says there are now 115 foundations in operation or about to start with a membership of 90,000 doctors.

The San Joaquin Foundation launched the movement in 1954 when the longshoremen's union in Stockton, dissatisfied with the medical care its members were receiving, negotiated with the Kaiser-Permanente pre-paid group practice plan to move in.

As a counterproposal, the Stockton doctors formed a foundation and offered to provide medical care for the union, whose members would pay a fixed fee and be able to see any doctor who belonged to the foundation.

In effect, the foundation became a pre-paid group practice plan of its own. But instead of having to go to a special clinic for treatment, the longshoremen could go to any doctor who belonged to the foundation. By now, 96 per cent of the doctors in the area belong.

From the years of reviewing doctors' performances, Harrington feels that fees are not the problem in medicine; overutilization of facilities is. Moreover, he says that most doctors want to practice good medicine. A few, though, "are absolute crooks. We stop them on shots and they go into labs."

With only spotty checks on a doctor's practices, a crooked physician can always move on if a foundation makes it hot for him in one city. Harrington tells about one doctor who wanted to sue the foundation for refusing to pay him \$22,000 in lab fees. When a lawyer told the doctor that he would lose the suit, Harrington continues, the doctor pulled up stakes and opened an office in the next county.

Such examples would seem to back up Sen. Bennett's contention that PSROs must be spread around the country. The Utah senator also believes that the most important value of PSROs will be their impact in educating doctors in the latest wrinkles of medicine.

In New Mexico, Dr. Wallace Nissen, a former president of the state medical society who now works for the state government as a watchdog over the foundation, says that bad doctors are often placed on review committees "to try to teach them better medicine."

But Harrington feels that sometimes it just teaches bad doctors how to avoid being reviewed.

"I think the PSRO thing is going to be very traumatic for doctors and patients," says Harrington. "But if the doctors think with their minds instead of their emotions, it's going to come out all right."

Adds Kortzeborn: "It seems that review upsets some individuals who feel their professional competence has been challenged. Well, they're right. But it's better to guard our own flock than to have it guarded by the wolves."

SHOULD NATIONS CEDE SOME
SOVEREIGNTY TO THE U.N.

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent of mine, Mr. Nelson Migdal, who is a political science major at Hofstra University, was honored by the United Nations Association in having been selected as a finalist in the college category competition. The contents of his most interesting paper "Should Nations Cede Some Sovereignty to the U.N.," which merited this recognition, follows:

SHOULD NATIONS CEDE SOME SOVEREIGNTY?

In order to effectively answer the question, it is necessary to examine a few basic concepts of the United Nations.

Firstly, the United Nations was not intended to be a world government, but rather an organization of sovereign states. Furthermore, from its very beginning, it accepted the sovereignty of the states as supreme, except when it posed a threat to world peace and security, as provided in Article II, Paragraph Seven, Clause Three of the Charter.

For the United Nations to ask that all nations cede more sovereignty is impossible for two reasons. The first being that there is no absolute "some" in reference to sovereignty. The second being that for the U.N. to demand such a thing is in violation of the Charter!

Reason one: in order for Nations to cede some sovereignty, the United Nations as a whole would have to do many things.

It would have to establish the amount of sovereignty it wants from each nation, and in what form it should be. This level would have to be agreed on by the entire General Assembly. Once that is accomplished, amendments to the Charter providing more power to the U.N. would have to be drawn up, voted on, and executed. To put it into effect, a special task force would have to be created to assure that all nations have, in fact, ceded an equal amount of sovereignty. For as you can imagine, the United States will not want to give up more sovereignty than China or Russia. The problem with this, as you have probably realized by now, is that there is no way of measuring sovereignty. It is not an absolute, one nation's view of sovereignty, and its limits may differ greatly with the view of another. The size, power and interests of a nation play a great role in their view of sovereignty! In all probability it would take a great deal of time just to agree on a working definition of the word. So on the first level of examination, it seems impossible for nations to cede some sovereignty, due to the mechanics of it, as well as a wide range of variables which would have to be considered.

The second reason why nations should not cede some sovereignty is that as stated before, Article II, Paragraph Seven, Clause Three, provides for the sovereignty of the state to be supreme. This part of the Charter is especially important because without it many nations probably never would have joined the United Nations. For a nation to surrender its sovereignty is suicide. All nations must be allowed to pursue their vital interests as long as they do not destroy world peace. The United Nations is a group of sovereign states all of which have their own interests in mind, not a world government in which the interests of the larger, stronger nations can overshadow and hinder the interests of the smaller states. Be aware that if the provisions of the Charter fail to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

be protected and if the Charter is drastically changed, it would cause the fall of the United Nations and the destruction of whatever peace the world may now have.

In conclusion, although it may seem that the U.N. would function more effectively if it had more power to act in matters deemed to be within the domestic jurisdiction of a state, I do not believe that nations want to cede any sovereignty, and for this to be demanded is both mechanically impossible and in violation of the Charter. Perhaps the U.N. is one of those things which cannot be changed without destroying it and starting again.

OHIO FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, on May 4, I had the privilege to speak before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Spring Conference in Columbus.

As I spoke before a roomful of more than 500 women, I realized I was speaking to more than just a roomful of people. There was enthusiasm, exuberance, intelligence, and a keen awareness of the problems that confront our society today. I was proud to be among them, and prouder still when I listened to the prayer written by Mrs. Russell M. Walters, the president of the Mary Todd Lincoln Republican Women's Club. These words set the tone for their spring conference, I am sure, and I have found them inspirational ever since. I would like to share them with my colleagues:

PRAYER—OHIO FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB, SPRING CONFERENCE BANQUET, MAY 4, 1973

Almighty God, we pause now, in sincerity and quietness, to acknowledge Thee and to give thanks for the many blessings that Thou hast bestowed on us.

In our hearts we know that the destiny of this great nation is inseparably bound in loyalty to its national heritage and that that heritage is rooted deeply in Thee.

We are glad before Thee, that we are Americans—not glad in a boastful or arrogant manner—but with an appreciation that comes from the gratefulness that is inspired by our thankfulness to Thee.

We are glad that our spirits have been awakened to the realization that our greatest task as Republican women is to interpret for these times, the true meaning of "In God We Trust."

We would not pretend that all is well with our government and its people—but we do rejoice tonight—that after so many social ravages in the past—we can still glory in the fact that we are—still—"One Nation Under God."

Teach us—Oh Lord, to be proud of America and its Past—to have faith and vigilance for the present and to be hopeful for America's future.

Show us that it is more commendable to be respected as a nation and people than it is to be loved.

And Lord, we ask your help so that we may never forget that this nation, inspired by Thee, has been more generous to her enemies, more tolerant of its critics and more gracious to its detractors.

You have given us so much to work for, Lord, and You have blessed each of us with so much to give, that certainly, our life

should take on a new meaning and dimension with each new challenge.

God—we ask you again, to bless America, our home sweet home, not at the expense of other nations or for our self indulgence, but for the benefit of all mankind.

We ask these things in your most precious name, not because we deserve them, but knowing that Thou art so good. Amen.

LOSS OF NUTRITION PROGRAMS
BECAUSE OF OEO CUTBACKS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to enter into the RECORD an article from the April 1973, issue of Redbook magazine. The article, entitled "How To Save Babies for Two Dimes a Day," describes a successful infant feeding program in Memphis, Tenn.

Special note should be taken of the fact that the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, in connection with OEO Emergency Food and Medical Services Program—EFMS—helped to make this program a reality. It is also worth noting that this program, along with numerous other food and nutrition programs of demonstrated effectiveness, will die, unless the Congress acts now to provide funds for their continuation. As the article indicates, the perpetuation of such programs is an urgent matter.

The article follows:

HOW TO SAVE BABIES FOR TWO DIMES A DAY
(By Virginia M. Hardman)

December. A raw day. I am in Tennessee, walking through the South Memphis slum neighborhood. My companion, Mrs. Johnnie Mae Jones, is a member of Memphis Area Project South (MAP-South), a community self-help organization. Working jointly with the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, of Memphis, women like Mrs. Jones have brought large numbers of undernourished children into a special nutrition program. I have joined her to learn how the program operates.

Mrs. Jones seems to know almost every person, street and house in the area. We wait ten minutes at an unguarded intersection for a freight train to pass. She tells me that a child was killed here. In a half hour's walk, not a bus passes. Finally we reach our destination, a dilapidated frame house. It looks abandoned. Mrs. Jones knocks on the door.

"Come in," says the housewife, Mrs. Henry Trainer, who knows my companion well.

Inside, two little old men are sitting on a broken-down couch; the one sucking on a bottle is Bobby, aged three. He and his four-year-old brother, Ralph, stare straight ahead. They have the glazed look sometimes seen in the eyes of the aged who have lost interest in life, who expect nothing good ever to happen to them again.

Usually I get along better with children than with adults. Not this time. All my overtures meet with no response, and the children finally retreat to the kitchen, leaning motionless against a table while I talk with their mother.

She tells me that Bobby and Ralph were born in Memphis, the youngest of nine children, and she tells me a little about her struggle against poverty and despair. Although her husband works, the pay is low and the family so large that it qualifies for food stamps, which are issued by the Tennessee

Department of Public Welfare and bought at special branch offices in slum neighborhoods. Mrs. Trainer spends \$49 for food stamps a month. Most months. With the stamps she can buy about \$160 worth of food, which works out to less than 50 cents a day per family member.

As we sit there talking the wind blows through the flimsy walls of the five-room house. Mrs. Trainer explains that the family uses only three of the rooms in winter to save on heating. She ignores my next query, on the logistics of bedding down 11 people in three rooms. She has the strength of a countrywoman in imposing her silences. Then she opens a new subject, telling me what I already knew—that Bobby and Ralph are in the nutrition program.

"They much better than they used to be. Been on it 'most three years. They started giving me extra food for the five youngest all at the same time. Then couple weeks later they took the older ones too for a while. The older ones don't get it any more. They over six years old and get school lunches instead—'cept these two."

Bobby was three months old and Ralph 16 months when they came into the program. In Ralph's case the underdevelopment of his brain, caused by malnutrition, may be permanent.

Only when we are at the door and I call out to the children, "We're going now—come say good-by," do they venture out of the kitchen. Bobby, in a hoarse kind of whisper, seems to be trying to say good-by.

Out in the street with Mrs. Jones, I think about what I have learned so far about the effects of child malnutrition and about this nutrition program in Memphis, which has already decreased the yearly infant death rate in one area of the slum from 84 per 1,000 live births to 20 per 1,000, the same as the over-all infant death rate in the United States.

Malnutrition can kill. That is terrible enough. But malnutrition in children who survive it can disable them for life. It not only stunts physical growth and makes its victims sickly, but also its effect on brain-cell development in the first six months of life can be disastrous.

These facts had been given me by Dr. Donald P. Pinkel, medical director of St. Jude Hospital, and his associate, Dr. Paulis Zee, the hospital's nutrition director. It is their concepts in relation to nutrition that are being tested in the remarkable program operated jointly with MAP-South in the effort to save the lives and intelligence of preschool children in this Memphis slum.

The MAP-South project has a history dating to 1964, when the people of the area formed a community organization to find ways of breaking the poverty cycle in their neighborhood. This group evolved, with the support of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, into a highly effective institution that today includes full-time specialists, part-time neighborhood aides (recruited from impoverished families and counseled by professional social workers), as well as VISTA and citizen volunteers from the community at large. In the four years MAP-South has been working with St. Jude's, the program has restored some 4,000 children to health. And it was done by "prescription"—prescription for the only cure and prevention there is for malnutrition: food.

Special "prescriptions," signed by St. Jude physicians or specially trained nurse practitioners, are taken by poor mothers to a warehouse filled with surplus and donated foods and run by MAP-South personnel. There the mothers are given evaporated milk, enriched farina, a corn-syrup blend, canned juice, canned meat or poultry, canned vegetables, milk-beverage mix and instant nonfat dry milk.

And for infants there is Similac, a special formula reinforced with iron and containing protein, lactose, calcium, phosphorous and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

all the vitamins a baby needs, from A through E. Cost of the proper dosage for a baby? Twenty-one cents a day—\$37.80 for each child in the crucial first six months of life—\$37.80 to support the brain during its most critical growth period, to assure good physical growth, to prevent anemia and vitamin deficiency. This immensely valuable St. Jude MAP-South nutrition program is a pilot project, and it may pattern a pioneering new approach to the care and well-being of the infants of this nation.

Mrs. Jones and I continue on our way. Our next stop is the warehouse. I watch as the mothers hand in slips for their months' supplies and sign receipts. Sometimes the process is slow as a name is laboriously printed, or quick when an X is the signature, only a few seem to write with ease. The women wait on a bench while their orders are packed into cartons by two friendly and businesslike men.

"How do they get those heavy cartons home?" I ask.

"We're all apples off the same tree," says one of the men cheerfully. "We help each other manage."

In an adjacent office two women—employees of MAP-South—maintain the records of families with children on the nutrition program. They tell me that about 140 people a day come in for prescribed food. I leaf through a few case histories. I find that in a surprising number of families the husband is employed, but his wages are pitifully low.

There are the Fishers, for example. Mr. Fisher is a day laborer for a large barge company. He earns \$2.26 an hour. Mr. and Mrs. Fisher and their eight children occupy a four-room apartment. The eight-year-old twins each are blind in one eye. Both have been hospitalized for pneumonia at St. Jude. The other children have been treated there for an assortment of illnesses, including malnutrition.

Winter is especially hard for the Fishers because it is the off season in Mr. Fisher's work and he gets only two or three days of work a week. Sometimes he's laid off for a week or more. At such times, says Mrs. Fisher, the family would starve if St. Jude and MAP-South did not help with emergency food.

Mrs. Jones and I leave the warehouse and pay a visit to Mrs. Daisy Leonard. Daisy has worked hard most of her life. Her smile and slim body are girlish, but her eyes and hands belong to a woman of 50. In fact, Daisy is 26, and the head of a household of four small children. She has what she calls an "income" of \$1,740 a year—just \$33.46 a week to house, feed and clothe a family of five.

Daisy's schooling ended with the sixth grade, when she went into the fields and picked cotton with other members of her family, sharecroppers in Arkansas, who worked from dawn to dusk like beasts of burden. Seven years ago an older sister broke away and moved to Memphis, a distance of 150 miles. A year later she sent for Daisy, who was then 20 and the mother of two babies.

"It was another world. We stayed on because we have a better chance in the city. Everything's better here, especially for the kids. I did day work—cleaning houses and going out to chop cotton just over the border, in Mississippi. Me and my sister lived together, took care of each other's kids. But she got married and moved out, so now I can't work. Don't have anyone to mind my little ones."

There are four children now, Letty, Danny, Frankie and Ginny.

What does Daisy want for her children?

"The first thing, I want them to have a good education and stay out of trouble. That's why I scrimped and saved to get this TV; children gotta have something to do. Then I want them to be able to get good jobs and keep them. I want them to be happy. Strong too."

"My two youngest was real sick awhile back. If it wasn't for the hospital, I don't know if Ginny'd be here today. They took

care of Frankie too—operated twice for his eyes. They still feeding both children."

The two youngest children seem lively and healthy enough now. But Ginny was an undersized, irritable three-month-old with a swollen belly and spindly legs when a St. Jude nurse first visited the household, three years ago last summer. She was promptly hospitalized for treatment for severe malnutrition. Frankie's malnutrition was less critical. A nourishing high-protein diet with plenty of minerals and vitamins was prescribed for him.

"I knew something was wrong with the baby—she never acted right. Same with Frankie. But I didn't know what to do. Then that hospital came and found us like we were lost. They kept Ginny in St. Jude's awhile. I was scared just thinking about that tiny little baby of mine without her mother. I knew they were good to her. But I missed her. So I used to walk there every day to see her."

Isn't there a bus?

"Costs thirty-five cents. Each way."

So Daisy walked six miles in the blazing heat of a Memphis July to be with her baby. Every day for ten days.

The room in which we are sitting is the only warm one in the ramshackle house. A gas heater is going, and on top of it is a skillet of rice "because the kitchen is too cold to cook in." The stuffing is coming out of the couch, but the bed is carefully made up. The only other furniture in the room are a chair and a TV set.

Mrs. Leonard's monthly income of \$145 comes from the Aid to Dependent Children welfare program. She pays \$40 a month for rent. Gas and electricity run between \$30 and \$40 in this unheated place. After rent and utilities are paid, \$70 is left. Thirty-six dollars goes for food stamps, with which Mrs. Leonard buys some \$115 worth of food each month. With today's high prices, the food is insufficient to feed the family of five. If it were not for the nutrition program, Mrs. Leonard couldn't manage.

While we talk, Ginny and Frankie play cowboys. Daisy interrupts them to give Ginny a spoonful of peanut butter. Frankie claims and gets a spoonful too.

"They eat it like candy," Daisy tells me. "For a while, when we couldn't get it from the warehouse, I had to scrape up the money to buy it because the nurse said the children need it. It makes them grow."

I look at this young mother trying so hard—and alone—to bring up her children and at the roaches boldly crawling along the walls. Suddenly the vermin and the dilapidation sicken me. I want out. Instead I ask, "Wouldn't you like to move?"

"Into what? This here is the best place I ever had. We got our own toilet and running water—they're indoors and just for us. I'm happy here. I'm treated good, especially the children."

Danny Thomas Boulevard connects two worlds, the South Memphis slum and St. Jude, which is at the opposite end of town. The hospital was built in fulfillment of a vow to the patron saint of the hopeless made in 1940 by a young man desperately struggling to break into show business. Many people helped entertainer Danny Thomas build the hospital that is the fulfillment of that vow.

St. Jude Children's Research Hospital opened its door nearly 11 years ago as a research center for catastrophic childhood diseases, including leukemia and other forms of cancer, malnutrition and muscular dystrophy. No fees are charged. Patients come from all over the country, but only on referral by their own doctors. To Danny Thomas, "St. Jude Hospital is what democracy is all about—caring for each other regardless of race or creed, not thinking of pay."

On my second day in Memphis, late on the afternoon, I am in the office of the hospital director, Dr. Pinkel. He is a barrel-chested man in his mid-40s, with blue eyes as in

quisitive as a small boy's. He seems like an athlete eager to get back to the game. Despite his courtesy, it's clear that he doesn't enjoy talking to visiting journalists, just as it was clear in the clinic where we've already met that he very much enjoys children. He has nine of his own. After this one item of personal information is elicited from him, Dr. Pinkel takes over the interview, plunging into the subject of our meeting.

"Malnutrition is unconstitutional. It's also unethical and immoral.

"Every American child has a constitutional right to be adequately nourished. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are impossible if you're stunted in infancy, physically and mentally. I don't understand why the American Civil Liberties Union doesn't take this up."

This is no radical firebrand talking, as I already know, but a rather conservative, churchgoing pillar of society with impeccable scientific credentials. Everything about Dr. Pinkel seems conventional except his rage against malnutrition and his battle to save the children.

"Adequate diet is more important than compulsory education. For if the brain cells don't develop in the first six months of life, they never will. And without enough brain cells you can't learn. If you're anemic, as almost all malnourished children are, you don't even have the energy to try. Some folks opposed free schools a hundred and fifty years ago. Today some folks oppose free food for children. Yet an infant's diet determines his life. Poor diet makes for poor people."

How widespread is malnutrition among preschool children?

"Nobody's ever taken a census. But if you consider the number of working poor and welfare families and add to that the unemployed, and allow a margin for poor eating habits in the middle class, you'd get a high estimate."

As high as a million?

"I'd say many millions. There's probably no community in America in which some children are not suffering from malnutrition. It's a disease, a widespread disease. We need state laws guaranteeing every child's nutrition. There's enough inborn, genetic retardation about which nothing can be done. But the brain damage caused by poverty is preventable. All it takes is food. There are Federal standards for animal care, none for child care."

How did St. Jude get started on its nutrition program?

"We started by asking the community what was needed and then did a study. Once the facts were clear, we devised a method—food by prescription. We left initiative and control to the MAP-South people. They receive the food and distribute it and they maintain a constant alert for malnourished children. We provide the expertise—medical personnel, nurse practitioners, hospital facilities, medicine, vitamins, infant formula."

Can the Memphis program be duplicated elsewhere?

"Yes. And it should be. We've proved that nutritional needs of a low-income population can be defined and met—and at very low cost—if the community itself is enlisted from the start. Memphis isn't unique. Nor are the affluent immune to the effects of malnutrition, here or anywhere. Many middle-class people don't know the facts about good nutrition. Besides, no matter how far away you move from the source of infection, the economically comfortable family in East Memphis gets sick too, and often from a disease that began in the South Memphis slum. Poverty anywhere is a threat to everybody's children. The point is to go out into the community and do something there, where the trouble starts.

We're dealing with a catastrophic disease. And as we've proved, it costs very little to save the body and mind of a child. Why, it's the bargain of the century! In human terms the social costs of malnutrition are devastat-

ing. They're cumulative. If nothing is done, your kids and mine will have to pay the bill."

Dr. Zee, whom I meet next looks like a Dutchman—the lean, intense sort often seen in student cafés near the University of Amsterdam, from which Zee himself was graduated with an M.D. degree in 1954. He then came to the United States, acquired a Ph.D. in biochemistry, specialized in pediatrics and in 1963 became St. Jude's chief of nutrition.

Dr. Zee says that the big push for the nutrition program came after the assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, in 1968.

"We'd been working on the nutrition problem since 1964. But Dr. King's murder right here in our town was a kind of catalyst. People were in a state of shock. Then they said, 'Let's do something.' Med students volunteered. We went into the homes of the people—we were appalled by what we saw. And we started a clinic for poor families.

"Almost half of the kids—forty-four percent—had vitamin-A deficiency. That can be corrected—we are correcting it—for pennies a day. We began in a small way with whatever donated foods we could get. Then in 1969 the U.S. Department of Agriculture supplemental-food program enabled us to start a program for preschool children and for mothers who were nursing their babies. We still get donated food from time to time from private companies.

"Pregnant women began to concern us too, since brain damage can start before birth. We now have an arrangement with St. Joseph Hospital, about two hundred yards from here; they provide the facilities and we provide prenatal care, delivery of the babies and postnatal care.

"Children treated in early infancy do best," Dr. Zee continues. "Two- and three-year-olds, already stunted and debilitated by malnutrition, are difficult to treat and must often be hospitalized for a month or more. Half the indigent babies in the South Memphis area get Similac with iron, which means that anemia could be virtually eradicated in Memphis. It's ironic to be spending sometimes up to a hundred and fifty dollars a day on hospital care for a baby that has been damaged by a disease that can be prevented for a dollar fifty a week."

"It has been proved that with early treatment, two years' catch-up growth can be achieved in one year. But all indications are that if the children are not reached until after infancy, they will require help for five years or more to correct damage often caused by only brief periods of malnutrition. Infants respond rapidly to food; children over three do not."

"Let me show you some slides. You'll see what food can do."

I see and am condemned by what I see. Some of the slides could have been made in Biafra. Through some curious transposition we who eat three meals a day have convinced the hungry that it's shameful to be poor in rich America. Now it's I who am ashamed.

Dr. Zee, misreading my silence, tries to explain to me how it feels to go hungry day after day.

"Believe me, malnutrition is an affliction. I know. It happened to me when I was twelve, in the Second World War, just before the Allied breakthrough at the Ardennes. We lived in Hoorn, north of Amsterdam. My father was a physician, the family well off. We had books, records—Shakespeare, Beethoven, all the classics. But none of us read or listened to music. We sat in gloom, apathy. All we could think of was food, how to steal or beg sometimes to eat."

Dr. Zee abruptly changes the subject. Two years after the event, he is still incensed at the Department of Agriculture for removing peanut butter, scrambled-egg mix and dehydrated potatoes from the supplementary-food program. "That one act took out one third of the proteins and calories."

Peanut butter and scrambled-egg mix have since been restored, but from time to time

other crucial foods, such as canned meat, canned vegetables and instant dry milk, disappear from the list.

The regional office of the USDA holds that such items can be purchased with food stamps.

Dr. Zee points out that many mothers can't buy the stamps because their husbands may earn a fraction more than is permitted to qualify for the program, or because they cannot afford to spend for the stamps the minimum number of cash dollars per member of the family required under the program. Many who can buy stamps don't know enough about nutrition to buy high-protein foods.

The doctor's argument for education in nutrition as well as for more free, nourishing food for the poor is persuasive, but unfortunately the U.S. Department of Agriculture food program was designed primarily not to feed the hungry but to remove farm surpluses and support farm prices.

The Administration itself has bluntly observed: "Their [surplus foods'] primary thrust is to help balance the agricultural economy"

In contrast the U.S. Congress has given priority to nutritious food for infants, regardless of farm interests, and there is hope today that at least a beginning can be made to eliminate malnutrition in the children of the poor through projects similar to the St. Jude-MAP-South nutrition experiment. This hope is contingent on new legislation, enacted last fall, which enables local health or welfare agencies and private nonprofit groups to provide food to needy pregnant and lactating women and to infants who are "nutritional risks."

The Department of Agriculture is in charge of the operation, but the new program is not limited to surplus foods. The emphasis rather is on special foods that, as defined by the Congressional act, contain "high-quality protein, iron, calcium, vitamin A and vitamin C." Perhaps with reference to such products as Similac, the bill also specifies that at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture the program will also include any commercially formulated preparation designed specifically for the nourishment of infants.

Twenty million dollars is authorized for this purpose for each of two years—the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and the one ending June 30, 1974. This clearly is insufficient to solve the national problem of malnutrition, which affects millions of our children, but it could be a beginning—the start of what might be a great experiment.

The Department of Agriculture's lack of enthusiasm for this experiment, however, was made evident when by late January of 1973 it had failed to set up the necessary machinery for the special infant-feeding projects.

The success of the program authorized by Congress thus depends heavily on efforts by Americans to bring pressure on the Department of Agriculture; letters should be addressed to Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, urging an end to delays in feeding hungry children. Americans can also write to the President, their congressmen and senators in support of this special \$20-million infant-food legislation, which has bipartisan support. Women can help directly by stimulating the creation of projects similar to the St. Jude-MAP-South effort in their own cities and towns.

If you want to help, send to your congressman for a copy of Public Law 92-433. Read Section 17, entitled "Special Supplemental Food Program." Contact your local health or welfare department or hospital, or other social agency, and urge it to help you begin a community rescue operation in your town.

The legislative go-ahead from Congress is clear; citizen initiative and support can move that act into action. Successful feeding programs this year and next could be the basis for an ongoing national effort to

give every baby in the nation a healthful diet.

What a way to celebrate America's upcoming 200th anniversary!

We must see that the tragic reversal of priorities intended in the administration's dismantlement of the OEO, since declared unconstitutional by Superior Court Judge William Jones, is not sustained by this body.

**AN APPEAL FOR DANIEL
TEITELBAUM**

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel continues today. Despite a suspension of exit fees, it is extremely difficult for Soviet Jews to receive permission from the government to leave Russia. Indeed, those who apply for such permission may well find themselves charged with crimes against the state and placed on trial.

Daniel Teitelbaum, a 34-year-old engineer from Leningrad, has sought permission to join his sister in Israel for over a year. His application has been consistently refused, and his family has just as consistently been harassed by the police.

I am including here the appeal Mr. Teitelbaum's sister has issued for him, and I serve notice on the Soviet Union that any action taken against Daniel Teitelbaum will be broadcast throughout the world.

The appeal follows:

APPEAL FOR DANIEL TEITELBAUM

My name is Gessia Karmelsky. Two years ago I came to Israel from Russia. I have come here to plead for help for my brother, Daniel Teitelbaum, a 34 year old engineer from Leningrad. Daniel Teitelbaum's family consists of a son, Ilya, 6 years old, a girl, Sonya, 4 years old and his wife, Margarita.

It is already two years that Daniel has been asking—asking time after time—for permission to be allowed to leave Russia for Israel, and permission is refused.

I want to say a few words about my brother. He is more than a brother to me. He is like a son to me. In 1941, the Soviet Government banished our family to Siberia. For 14 years we did not see our father. We lived on the Taiga (a word meaning frozen wasteland) under the most rigorous conditions. We suffered hunger and extreme cold. There was always the horrible feeling that we did not know what tomorrow would bring. Our father was in a concentration camp. We children, I was 12 years, Daniel was 3 and my sister was 15½. We, that is, I, my sister and our mother were forced to go into the forest to fell trees. We suffered greatly from hunger and cold. Our mother was very ill. She died in a short while. I raised Daniel. When he did not have the strength to walk for lack of food, I carried him in my arms. When he was 4 years old, he lost his eyesight for a whole winter long, due to the rigorous conditions. Fourteen years later we were rehabilitated, and we lived in Riga. Daniel became part of my family. I married and continued to raise him. He attended school, graduated and then went to Leningrad for higher education.

This is a short biography. When I came to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Israel, I immediately sent Daniel an invitation to come to join me. And that is when his troubles began. His wife was forced off her job and he was given refusal after refusal. During his ordeal, he has been refused 12 times. Daniel wrote letters and telegrams. He appealed to Golda Meir, Zalman Shazar, to world opinion, to the American people and to Nixon. Just a few days before President Nixon was due to arrive in Russia, Daniel was summoned to the KGB and was told that if he were quiet and did not organize a protest in Moscow, as he planned to do, he would be granted permission to leave directly after Nixon's visit. May passed, so did June and July. Permission was not granted. In August he was refused again. In September, again. He was continually being put off, from one Friday to the next. In October Daniel, together with a group of Jews from Leningrad, traveled to Moscow to again ask that their papers and matter be reviewed, and they be allowed to leave. The point is that there is no reason why Daniel should not be allowed to leave. He is not connected with any secret work. There are no secrets about his work. He has never signed any documents, and no one ever mentioned to him that he was involved in secret work, work of a governmental nature. Therefore that cannot be the reason. When they arrived in Moscow, they were received at the OVIR office and were promised that in several weeks they would receive a positive answer. A week passed, two, three weeks and then a month. Again, no answer was forthcoming.

Then a group of Leningrad and Riga Jews again left for Moscow. Among them was the wife of Daniel Teitelbaum, Margarita Teitelbaum. She was removed from the train and forced to return to Leningrad. During January, February and March Daniel received no reply. He again wrote to the whole world. He wrote scores of letters to the government officials of Russia, to Brezhnev and Kosygin, and, again, received no reply. I, too, wrote. I wrote to the world, I wrote letters to Russia and got not a single answer.

Then came Purim, and in spite of the fact that a few days earlier Daniel was called to the KGB and had been told he should remain quiet, otherwise his situation would be made worse, that he should cease his activism and not attend any gatherings. People did gather at his house on Purim, they sang Purim songs, read the Megillah of Esther and sent a telegram to Zalman Shazar. One copy of the telegram they sent officially from Leningrad and a copy of the telegram was transmitted to me over the telephone. The telegram read:

"We greet you, Zalman Shazar, and your people, the Jewish People and Israel, on the beautiful day of Esther, on this beautiful day of Purim. The spirit of this fine holiday is embedded in our hearts. We believe that we will yet meet you in Israel, because Hamans disappear but Am Israel Chai! (The Jewish People live.)"

Several weeks passed and Daniel was again summoned, and his application was denied, denied for a whole year. He was told again that he must remain quiet, desist from any activism. They asked him to sign a document stating that he would, indeed, accede to their demands and if not they told him or, rather, threatened him that if he acted otherwise they would employ means at their command. Daniel, understandably, did not sign the paper, stating that he never did anything against the Soviet Government, never violated the laws of the Soviets, and that the only thing he ever did was to ask that he be allowed to leave Russia to join his people and his sister in Israel.

But truly I am more than a sister to him. The conditions for Daniel and his family are very bad. The conditions for Jews in Leningrad are generally poor, but especially for him it is horrible.

As his sister and more like a mother be-

cause I, indeed, raised him like a mother would, I beg you that you help Daniel, that you employ all means that the fate of this person not again be jeopardized. Fourteen years of his life were wasted in Siberia. I appeal to you. Help him. Do whatever is necessary to save this family.

**THIRD DISTRICT OF TEXAS SPEAKS
OUT ON ISSUES**

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, each spring I send a questionnaire to my constituents in the Third Congressional District. I have always found this one of the best ways for me to get direct feedback of my constituents' views on national issues. This spring in response to my questionnaire I received thousands and thousands of responses which I have tabulated. I am entering the results of this questionnaire into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today to officially record the views of the constituents of the Third District of Texas and in the hope that this information will be of value to my colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

Third District residents have clearly gone on record as being opposed to the United States sending money for reparations or any other purposes to North Vietnam. Many comments noted that in light of the torture of our prisoners of war, repeated and serious violations of the peace agreement, and lack of serious commitment, as promised, in the accounting of our missing in action, it would be singularly inappropriate; 90.7 percent of all respondents indicated that no money should be sent to North Vietnam.

In an issue also related to the Vietnam war, 69 percent of those indicated their opposition to the granting of amnesty for draft evaders, 8 percent supported amnesty for all and 23 percent favored amnesty based on certain conditions.

In answer to the question whether news reporters should have the right not to reveal their sources, 71 percent of responding Third District residents said yes.

In light of the recent transition of the U.S. Post Office Department from a Government agency to semi-independent public corporation, it is important to continually monitor the quality of mail service. Only 4.5 percent of Third District residents felt that service had improved since the creation of the U.S. Postal Service, 42 percent felt that mail service had deteriorated and 53.5 percent indicated that their service had remained about the same.

Perhaps the subject on which there is most unanimity in the Third District is capital punishment, 98 percent of those responding indicated that capital punishment is appropriate in certain major crimes.

Also, 79.5 percent approved of the President's decision to phase out the Office of Economic Opportunity—OEO—while 20.5 percent favored its retention.

Most respondents argued that the termination of this program was justified because of severe abuses within this program and duplication of services presently performed by other government departments and agencies.

The dissatisfaction expressed with the poverty program also extended to the present welfare system, 21.7 percent of those responding indicated that a reduction of welfare spending was the most important budget reduction that could be made, 35 percent argued for the elimination of foreign aid spending, and 17.5 percent listed the Federal bureaucracy as most needing reduction. Other budgetary items listed for reduction included farm subsidies and defense.

By a large margin, 31.5 percent, Third District citizens listed inflation as the gravest issue facing America today, and 11.5 percent pointed to a deterioration of the moral fiber of the country, while 8.6 percent listed crime. Many other subjects were mentioned including busing, the Supreme Court, drugs, poverty, and the Vietnam War.

It is with a great deal of gratitude that I thank those of my constituents who completed the questionnaire or sent letters setting forth their views.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this analysis of the views of the Third District of Texas will prove valuable to all Members of Congress.

SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE SPEAKS AT MONTACHUSETT REGIONAL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL IN FITCHBURG, MASS.

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1973, dedication ceremonies were held for the Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical School in Fitchburg, Mass. This excellent school serves over 800 students from the cities of Gardner and Fitchburg and the towns of Ashby, Barre, Harvard, Hubbardston, Lunenburg, Royalston, Sterling, and Winchendon.

I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks of Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE at the dedication ceremony. Senator BROOKE has presented a compelling case for more schools devoted to vocational and technical education.

I know that my colleagues will want to study Senator BROOKE's recommendations carefully:

REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE

Today we honor a dream finally and splendidly accomplished, and we pay tribute to the spirit of co-operation among the towns and cities who in concert have built Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical School. While I understand that almost \$1 million in federal aid helped make the school possible, I shall refrain from trying to give the impression that I personally printed each dollar bill, as one Senator reportedly always did on similar occasions.

I have come also to acknowledge a debt. On an ignominious day last fall in Fitchburg, I had to acknowledge that perhaps the candidate himself was not the most essential element in the operation of the Brooke campaign effort. Nothing so deflates a politician

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

as making a dramatic, superbly executed grand exit to a car which refuses to start. My efficient, if irreverent, staff tells me that if it had not been for the successful machinations of two Monty Tech students, Gary Favreux and Chet Marek, 512 people in this area would have later in the day escaped shaking hands with me for the third time during the course of the campaign and 214 people would have escaped my memorable remarks which (though ranking with the Gettysburg Address) were unfortunately uttered after the deadline for the evening edition and are thus lost to an unsuspecting posterity.

In 1957, the Russian Sputnik challenged American science and technology and gave particular impetus to the thesis that the proper emphasis of our education effort should be to prepare students for college, and increasingly, for graduate study beyond that. The period of the 1960's came to be known as the golden age for higher education, as we lavished our attention and our resources in large measure on that one segment of American education. In the process the myth took hold that a college diploma was the solution—for each individual and the nation.

But in the past two or three years, an awakening has occurred. Increasingly, facts and reality confirmed the warnings and questions which many of us had raised about the wisdom as well as the arrogance of trying to force all young people into the traditional college mold.

The first reality which cannot be ignored is the nature of the job market. In the 1970's only two jobs out of every 10 will require a college education. Yet, one-third of all young people in the 18-21 year old age bracket now go to college—and almost one-half of this age group will attend college for at least a short period. Our national belief in a college degree as a panacea, our mistaken insistence on credentials which are practically irrelevant to the actual performance of a job, is now undergoing a long overdue economic examination.

The second fact which can no longer go unremedied is the bias of our secondary education system. While we have diligently prepared students for our great institutions of higher education, we have all but neglected those who do not wish or cannot afford to attend such institutions. We must remember that at most three high school students out of 10 will go on to receive a college degree. As many as 80% should be receiving career training, yet as few as one-fourth of these students may be engaged in such activity. Hence, the majority of the students who experience some form of secondary education enter the labor market never having been shown the full range of job possibilities available in our complex economy. And they never have been taught a trade or marketable skills.

In earlier periods, a person of 17, 18 or 19 was regarded as an adult, an established wage earner, and possibly the responsible head of a family—with his or her schooling well over and adult life well underway. Today, most young people of this same age group find themselves in a strange, halfway world, neither fish nor fowl, neither child nor adult. Most have spent the required 12 years in a school system which has too often presented them with college preparatory courses in which they have little interest and which too often they correctly perceive as being of little, if any, use to them in life. This sense of frustration and malaise—the complaints that the schoolwork which they are being asked to do is completely irrelevant to the job of living—is far too commonplace today, not only amongst high school students and dropouts, but amongst college students as well.

I believe that the opportunity of a young person with the capability and motivation to attend college should not depend solely upon

his family's ability to pay the considerable sums now necessary to pay the costs of a college education. In Congress I have consistently supported federal programs of financial assistance to such students. But I reject the line of thought which holds that the only acceptable goal in educating an American child is the traditional college education. This assumption has cost the great majority of students dearly, for it has forced them into academic training in which they have little interest. And, more importantly, it has caused the interests and futures of what may be the majority of young Americans to be virtually ignored.

In addition to the costs to the individual student, inattention to training students for a career is a luxury which our national economy can no longer tolerate. The price we pay is in the large numbers of students who are turned onto the labor market to drift from one part-time, marginal job to another; the huge costs of manpower training programs which seek to teach a grown man or woman the skills they should have been taught in high school or post-secondary training courses; and in the lack of skilled and semi-skilled workmen and technicians in short supply today.

In the 1970's we must devote to the field of vocational career education, attention and resources similar to those we focused upon higher education in the 1960's. Further development of career education must reflect several considerations.

First, many students choose a career with little awareness of the full range of jobs now available in a modern technological society. Half a century ago, it is said that a "boy might observe the full range of his occupational expectations by walking beside his father at the time of plowing, by watching the farmers, blacksmiths, and tradesmen who did business in his hometown." I might add that a girl might have viewed the occupational choices open to her with even less effort. In modern society, however, over 3,000 new job classifications have been created since 1961. Only our schools can make young people aware of the full choice of job opportunities open to them.

Secondly, the career training taught in our schools must reflect the change in the nature of our economy. The original vocational fields were identified shortly before World War I as agriculture, industry, and home-making. Yet today less than five per cent of our population is engaged in farming, and jobs in manufacturing are steadily declining, a fact we in Massachusetts are all too familiar with. At present, less than one-fourth of American workers are employed in manufacturing. And the onslaught of automation has not relented. Yet automation, in turn, has created an entirely new field of employment, and attracts an ever larger percentage of persons who must perform a wide variety of services.

This is a reflection of the fact that, in the coming years, many of the emerging new jobs will require more mental ability and less reliance on sheer physical skills. A good example is the dramatic expansion in job opportunities in the field of health. In 1900, there was one health assistant for every doctor, today that ratio is 13 to 1. By the end of the 1970's it may climb to 25 to 1. I am particularly pleased to see that Montachusett has chosen to offer 8 post-high school health career programs in this new and rapidly developing career field.

Third, we must recognize, as Montachusett has, that career training must be made available during the whole course of a person's lifetime. In a fast changing technological society, jobs will become obsolete, and opportunities for retraining in other jobs will become more and more necessary. Students today may have to adjust to two or three occupational changes in their lifetime. Thus, vocational education may have to stretch intermittently over a lifetime; and vocational schools must serve the entire com-

munity, not simply isolate and train the young.

Fourth, vocational education must cease to be so male-oriented. Women already compose 40% of the work force. In a very few years, they will represent 50% of the employed. Many vocational programs reflect a subconscious male bias that women are destined by some inviolable law of nature to work in a limited number of occupations, too often at the lower levels, and almost always with the lowest pay.

I would like to close with a discussion of the role of the federal government in the labor market and in the field of vocational education.

At the most concrete level, the United States Office of Education at present spends only about \$500 million annually on vocational education. It is estimated that for every \$1 Congress has appropriated for vocational education, \$14 have been appropriated for higher education. Our national budget must more adequately reflect our national needs.

At another level, we must admit that perhaps the biggest failure of our manpower training programs has been the lack of jobs available at the end of the training period. If an adequate number of jobs paying an adequate salary are unavailable in our economy, manpower and job training programs become in themselves simply a form of make-work, and while preferable to unemployment or welfare, it may in the end serve only to increase frustration and an individual's doubts about his ability. Historians have said that the Great Depression of the 1930's was the last time that Americans were willing to accept unemployment as a sign of their own personal failure. Since then they have become more knowledgeable about the workings of our extremely inter-related and uncomplex modern economy. It is doubtful, for example, whether the American people will ever again accept a government induced business slowdown with its attendant unemployment as a palliative for inflation. Congress is now beginning to see the need for something more than temporary, piecemeal employment efforts and is beginning to examine the possibility of stimulating a Full Employment Economy.

It is time that the government and the citizens whose taxes subsidize these national programs realize more fully the relationship between our national goals as expressed in government programs, our manpower needs, and the consequent job opportunities which these programs create. Too often, for example, we think of government housing programs for low income families as benefiting only those on, or near, the poverty level. But if we chose to rebuild our decaying cities in the 1970's, full fledged housing programs could create jobs for as many as 10 million persons. Or if we decide to place a high priority on goals in health care in the 1970's, one consequence would be the creation of an estimated 2.3 million jobs performing direct health services.

It became briefly fashionable, a short while ago, to question the need for, and the value of, work. Those who did so failed to understand that the absence of meaningful work can deny a person a sense of purpose. For ability to do useful work—and do it well—can install a sense of worth and pride to a person's life. Today, we gather to dedicate this school which will instill in the lives of thousands of men and women that sense of purpose and dignity which has been the backbone of our nation's character. Not only the men and women who pass through these halls, but the entire nation, will benefit by the talents and skills developed here.

You, here in the Montachusett Region, have done your part. You have recognized an imperative need and have moved to meet that need with imagination, insight and a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

grasp of the economic, educational and emotional needs of young people.

I congratulate you, I pledge my unstinting efforts to increase Congress' awareness of and participation in this too long neglected area of American education. Our contribution must not start and end with dollars—though I do not minimize the salutary effect which dollars can have.

More research must be undertaken, more pilot and experimental programs launched—above all, we can help to re-orient and re-educate our people so that vocational education receives the respect and honor it deserves.

Then appeared in the Fitchburg Sentinel an article which states that "The construction of Monty Tech has involved about as much inspiration, dedication, perspiration—and exasperation—as the building of the Great Pyramid: In some ways the ancients had it easier since their project took only 20 years. After four decades, Monty Tech is transformed from vision into reality."

PERSIAN GULF ARMS RACE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, newspapers have recently contained confirmed reports about enormous arms agreements the United States is signing or planning to sign with several oil-rich states in the Persian Gulf. The following editorial by Robert E. Hunter which appeared in the May 31, 1973, Washington Post spells out some concerns about our role and involvement in a new and potentially dangerous arms race, and I would like to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

PERSIAN GULF ARMS RACE: A THREAT TO PEACE AND OIL

(By Robert E. Hunter)

A new arms race is off and running in the Persian Gulf. Earlier this year, the U.S. government reached agreement with Iran to sell it \$2.5 billion worth of arms. Last week negotiations were revealed that would provide \$500 million worth of arms each to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Britain has also been selling arms to Iran and Saudi Arabia. And the Soviet Union provides arms to Iraq. As a result, the Mideast may be on yet another slippery slope to crisis and conflict, with further dilemmas for U.S. interests and involvement.

For more than three years since Britain began pulling out of the Persian Gulf in 1969, the area had been relatively free of tensions and arms build-ups. American admirals who proclaimed a "vacuum" in the Gulf were overruled, and it was obvious that neither the Soviet Union nor the local states wanted any part of a competition in military presence by outside powers. Saudi Arabia and Iran, the two biggest states on the Gulf, settled down to a watchful concern with each other's actions and intentions, marked by Bahrain's independence, a scuffle over two tiny islands, and overriding interests in pushing up the price of oil through cooperation among producer states.

Then this year Iraq made yet another of its regular diplomatic and military feints toward its tiny but wealthy neighbor, Kuwait, and the issue of Gulf "security" was raised once again. Before the issue is settled, a lot more money will be spent on arms, a lot more will be written and said about Soviet influence and a "hand on the tap," and grave

risks will be run with regard both to peace in the area and to the flow of oil.

Typically, the United States seems to be blundering into involvement with the politics of a region that few Americans understand, and where we have compelling reasons to stay out. There has certainly been no public or congressional debate on our new arms policy.

The beliefs behind this policy are obvious ones: First, we must have oil from the Gulf, and can help pay for it with arms thus reducing trouble for our balance of payments. Second, if we don't sell arms—so goes a hackneyed argument borrowed from experience justifying arms sales to Latin America—then the sales will be made by other countries. Third, promoting an arms balance in the region is the best way to promote stability.

The "arms balance" argument is the most difficult to understand. First, there is little reason to fear a Soviet move against oil supplies earmarked for the West. For Moscow to use force against any oil producing state—or even be caught causing trouble—would destroy its relations with every other state in the area. Furthermore, it has every interest in behaving conservatively as a purchaser of oil and natural gas from Iran and Iraq, if it is going to be able to develop energy markets and earn hard currency in the West.

With regard to the local states, themselves, it has rarely proved possible in the developing world to prevent conflict through the supply of arms. The repeated tragedy of India-Pakistan wars should have taught us that lesson. Even where an arms balance has been possible—as in the Arab-Israeli conflict—it has proved precarious, a source of more tension, and dependent upon repeated demonstrations of one country's military superiority over the rest.

The Gulf does not provide the conditions, in terms either of countries or of geography, for an arms balance that can reduce the risks of conflict rather than promote them. It is not possible to argue that arms sales there are essentially "defensive." In the Gulf as in any area of short distances and flat terrain, high-performance weapons like jet aircraft can as easily be used to make war as defend against it. Furthermore, despite assurances to the contrary, it could prove impossible to ensure that arms provided to Gulf Arab states for one purpose would not one day be used for another—namely, in the conflict against Israel, with all the problems this would cause.

To be sure, the United States is selling arms, not giving them away and building up teams of military advisers that could begin our direct involvement in future conflict. Yet this is a distinction without a difference, if we help to bring about conditions that could make trouble for all concerned. To end our programs of grant military assistance, as Sen. J. William Fulbright is advocating strongly this year, would mean very little if we are also willing to sell arms to countries that are rolling in money. Our actions still have consequences—for us as well as others—even if we try to wash our hands of direct responsibility.

It also matters little that countries like Britain would be willing to sell arms even if we weren't. If that would happen, so be it; at least we would not be compromised by our role. We could then try to get agreement to desist among all potential arms suppliers. And we could encourage the states of the Gulf to work out their differences and disputes without first resorting to a risky and dangerous build-up of sophisticated and powerful modern weapons.

None of this is easy to counsel. There are serious problems in the Persian Gulf. Some of these reflect national ambitions and rivalries, and some reflect the continuing struggle between forces that can be loosely classified as "modern" (nominally reformist) and "traditional." It may be that conflict is inevitable, as these forces come into collision,

or that the smallest of the Gulf states will some day be absorbed by their larger neighbors, whatever we do. But our only real interest is to promote conditions that will let the oil flow with as little interruption as possible. It is very unlikely that actually increasing the level of arms in the area—and thus the intensity and damage of any fighting that does take place—will help to promote that objective. Certainly, as part of our concern with oil and with reducing Arab hostility over our role in the Arab-Israeli conflict, we will gain little in the long-term from continuing to appear as the enemy of internal change in the Arab world, whatever short-term benefits we might gain, say, in Saudi Arabia.

Thus, to refrain from selling arms to the Gulf states will not end our difficulties in the region, or ensure the flow of oil. But the reverse also promises no lasting solution, and contains far higher risks of open warfare and of our own direct involvement. Whatever benefit we might gain by selling arms to help our balance of payments could be wiped out by the extra trouble we would be buying. At the very least, we should depend on diplomacy, before reflexively reaching once again for military instruments of policy that have served us so poorly in other parts of the developing world.

DILLON GRAHAM

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I feel ambivalent about joining my colleagues in paying tribute to Dillon Graham of the Associated Press as he leaves Capitol Hill after 25 years.

We cannot help but feel joy that he is moving to well deserved rest and recreation in Myrtle Beach; but at the same time, we feel a sense of loss at losing someone who has been such an integral part of the Hill scene for a quarter of a century.

His dry wit, his pleasant manner—and primarily, his unflappable demeanor—

have added to the professionalism which he brought to every task. He has truly appreciated and practiced the highest tenets of journalism in recording the triumphs and failures of the politicians he covered. Not only have they held him in honor, but he has also held the respect of his fellow journalists who have often referred to him as a "reporter's reporter."

We welcome his successor, Bill Chaze, to the regional staff of the Associated Press on Capitol Hill and hope that Dillon's new spectator sport overlooking the golf course at Myrtle Beach will prove as satisfying as spectating on the workings of Congress.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WEST HIGH SCHOOL WARRIOR BAND

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the West High School Warrior Band of Torrance, Calif. has been invited by the city of Geneva, Switzerland to be the U.S. representative at the internationally renowned "Fête de Genève" in August 1973. The Warrior Band received this invitation because of their outstanding achievement in major band reviews and concert work this past year.

The 150 young people in the band will make a concert tour of Europe playing in Lucerne, Innsbruck, Florence, and Paris, in addition to being the only performing group from the Western Hemisphere playing at the silver anniversary of the "Fête de Genève."

I think that Warrior Band Director, Ron Large, deserves special praise for his efforts. Mr. Speaker, most importantly, I would like to commend the members of the West High School Warrior Band on this great honor and express my heartfelt wishes for their future success.

DILLON GRAHAM

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1973

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, our friend Dillon Graham will retire from the Associated Press after a 25-year assignment to the Capitol and after 45 years of continuous service with Associated Press.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay personal tribute to Dillon for his outstanding professional performance.

It has been my honor to know and work with Dillon since I first came to the House in 1967. He has always represented the finest aspects of a reporter and has been consistently fair and accurate in his reporting.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally congratulate Dillon on his well-earned retirement and wish him and his wife, Gigi, good luck. He will be sorely missed in the legislative branch of the U.S. Government.

DILLON GRAHAM RETIRES

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1973

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. Dillon Graham, a reporter for the Associated Press, will retire after 25 years of service as a Capitol Hill correspondent. His dedicated years as a member of the Capitol Press Corps has been but a part of 44 years of continuous service with AP.

Dillon Graham certainly will be missed in the House of Representatives, for men with his fine capabilities and his dedication to his work are always needed. I join with my colleagues in wishing Mr. Graham and his wife many happy years of retirement and in thanking him for a job well done.

SENATE—Friday, June 1, 1973

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE, a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded or put to shame, may that faith which supported them in trial and tribulation be sufficient to sustain us in our time of troubles. Grant us the courage to acknowledge and correct our defects. Give us also the grace to cherish and to cultivate the virtues and values tested and confirmed in the crucible of life's daily struggle. Give us a part in the recovery of confidence in the government of free men and in the redemption and renewal of

America's moral and spiritual life. Make us fit servants of the common good. By Thy grace enable us hour by hour to make a faithful and heroic effort for a social order of personal discipline, of self-denial, of partnership and cooperation for peace and justice in our time.

Hear us in the name of the Lord of Life. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1973.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE, a Senator from the State of Minnesota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MONDALE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask