

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 8579. A bill to establish a temporary embargo on the exportation of certain livestock feed grains; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CONLAN):

H.J. Res. 607. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 28, 1973, as "National Indian Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution to commend the U.S. Capitol Police force and the Capitol Police Board on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the designation of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol as the governing body of the Capitol Police force; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

245. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the right of the unborn human to life throughout its development; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

246. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

247. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged or the incapacitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

248. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the definition of tax effort under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

236. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the council of the county of Maui, Hawaii, relative to a Federal subsidy program for diversified farming in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

237. Also, petition of the board of trustees, town of Westcliffe, Colo., relative to a fuel shortage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AGRIBUSINESS GOT A FAIR SHAKE

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, last week while we were considering the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, I received a telegram from a constituent of mine expressing great concern. He asked me:

Why is the American Farmer, the food and fiber producer, looked upon as a lower class citizen in the American economic structure?

I felt this a very justified concern and a very good question. When we consider the disparity between what our Nation demands from its agriculture sector and the rewards that sector receives from meeting this demand, maybe we have treated our farmers as second-class citizens.

However, I sincerely believe that the passage of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 will mark a change in direction for our farming communities. I hope that the new provisions embodied in this legislation coupled with increasing demand and production give the farmer for the first time in years an equal share in the increase in our national wealth.

This is the first comprehensive farm program which is geared to expand the supply of food and fiber to meet the ever-increasing domestic and foreign demand.

The Secretary of Agriculture has already released an additional 43 million acres for production which puts a total of over 380 million acres in crop production for what he calls "the greatest production effort in the history of U.S. agriculture" to meet new areas of demand.

New markets have been opened up with new trade agreements with foreign countries. Old markets have expanded with a worldwide elevation of the standard of living, causing a spiraling demand for higher protein food, particularly in

the form of meat. In fact, meat consumption has doubled in Japan in the last decade and it is expected to double again this decade. Western Europe's market has expanded its meat consumption by 20 percent in the last few years. Most dramatic is the increase in per capita consumption of beef in the United States, an increase from 56 pounds in 1952 to approximately 116 pounds today.

The United States raises more meat animals and raises more of the feed grain to fatten these animals than any other country. Also, the highest protein supplement for meat is the soybean, of which 70 percent of the world's supply is grown in the United States. Since the rest of the world is not topographically or climatically suited to the growing of soybeans, the United States will continue to be a world supplier of this highly demanded feed supplement used to meet the continued increase in meat consumption.

What does this all mean to us? It means that the American farmer is the best producer of food in the world. One farmer produces enough to meet the needs of 51 people as compared to only 16, 25 years ago. With only 4.5 percent of our Nation's population our farm community has been able to not only produce enough to feed its fellow Americans, but it has produced enough to export sufficient food and fiber to whittle down our ever-growing balance-of-trade deficit. U.S. agriculture exports have almost doubled in the last decade and are continually contributing cash surpluses to our balance of trade. It is estimated that 1973 exports will be at \$11.1 billion and will contribute a \$3.3 billion cash surplus and that by 1980 our exports will be up to \$18 billion. This ability of our agriculture sector to be a continuing strong net exporter is an invaluable asset to our international trading posture. In fact it may be the only real reliable remaining economic leverage the United States has in terms of international trade.

The new farm program gives the farm community the financial incentive and protection to continue to be the largest

producer of food and fiber in the world. We have asked America's farmers to plant more acreage in the crop of their choice than ever before in history. We have further asked them to place their crop on the open market to receive their fair share of the market's wealth. We have asked the farmer, "With your great producing capacity, produce more than you ever have in history so that your Nation can take advantage of worldwide demands and help diminish our balance-in-trade deficit."

Mr. President, I submit that in view of all we have asked our farmers, we must accept our responsibility to provide them a means of protection in times of crises situations such as overproduction. By means of this legislation, we will provide this protection through the "target price" concept. By our action on S. 1888, we have told the farmer that if market prices rise above the target prices, they will receive a just reward for their productive capacity to the benefit of the entire world since there will be enough food and fiber to meet world needs at no cost to the taxpayer. If market prices fall below the target price, we, the taxpayers of America, will share in the risk we asked farmers to take in paying only the difference between market price and the target price.

Since this bill is designed to promote production and economic parity in the agriculture sector, an obvious additional benefit will be a greater share of the Nation's wealth going to our farm communities. This additional wealth will have a strengthening effect on our rural communities by eliminating various problems. It is my hope that the increase of money inflow to these communities will help stop the continued migration of people from our farm communities to the urban areas by enabling farmers to share their increased income with farmworkers and others who depend upon them. In short, there should be an increase in the quantity and quality of agriculture and agriculture-related employment opportunities.

Mr. President, it is my basic belief that it is the right of every American

to decide where he or she wants to live. Some may prefer cities, but if they prefer rural areas, they should be able to live there, with enough income to support a family and live a life of human dignity. In many parts of rural America, some in my own State, you can not do that, principally because there are no jobs. I know of areas in New Mexico where 38 of 40 high school graduates from a single year have moved away because—no matter how much they may want to stay—there is no way for them to support themselves decently.

These are times when farms and ranches find themselves caught in a squeeze between the cost of raising products and a sale price which offers too little profit. When that happens those in supporting businesses—the 50 percent of our rural families who do not live on farms—also suffer. So communities decline and the young move away, often to urban areas which are already overcrowded and certainly less healthy as areas in which to make a livelihood and a life.

So, Mr. President, it is my expectation that farmers will use some of any increase they will receive to pay competitive wages they have been unable to afford previously so that we might attract good young people to remain on the farm and create more permanent employment, thereby eliminating the vast problems of seasonal employment and migrant workers. By sharing the additional benefits which this bill is intended to create for them, owners and operators of agricultural enterprises will uphold the great American tradition of sharing good fortune with those dependent on you. This is an opportunity I know farmers have long sought and will take advantage of for the benefit not only of agricultural workers, but of the entire Nation—rural and urban.

AGAINST ENIWETOK TEST

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, for 27 years now the people of Eniwetok in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands have been denied the liberty to live on their native soil. They were moved to Ujelang, a smaller atoll because the U.S. Government had taken their island to detonate an atomic bomb in 1948. Still now we are planning more tests known as the Pacific cratering experiments—PACE—which would see the detonation of 26 surface explosions, using from 5 to 500 tons of TNT. Opposition to these tests from the Eniwetokese have been nearly unanimous. In view of this, proceeding with these tests could have a very serious effect on relations between the U.S. Government and the Micronesian peoples. The pending political status negotiations could well be affected. The United States had announced some time ago that former natives of Eniwetok would be allowed back onto their atoll by the end

of 1973. If this ill-considered experiment is carried out, the Eniwetokese will be frustrated in their longstanding desire to resettle on their atoll.

I submit the following statement of Dr. Leonard Mason, professor emeritus of anthropology of the University of Hawaii, who is well-acquainted with the plight of these people:

LEONARD MASON,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 25, 1973.

To whom it may concern:

The following statement is supplementary to verbal remarks I made the evening of April 4, 1973, at the Maluhia Service Center, Ft. DeRussy, in Honolulu, Hawaii, during a public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Air Force's Pacific Cratering Experiments (PACE) on Eniwetok Atoll, Marshall Islands.

A. ANTHROPOLOGICAL PARTICIPATION IN PACE PLANNING

1. Three anthropologists are listed on pages 2-10 and 2-11 of the draft EIS (February, 1973) as "Specialists Consulted in Planning PACE." They are Dr. Saul Riesenberger (Smithsonian Institution), Dr. Alexander Spoehr (University of Pittsburgh), and Dr. Leonard Mason (University of Hawaii). While the "contacts" with these specialists are reported as primarily a single telephone conversation with each, the implication of their being listed is that these anthropologists assisted in planning the PACE program. This was not the case.

2. I can speak only for myself, but I am reasonably certain that both Dr. Riesenberger and Dr. Spoehr are in agreement with my own position. In my opinion PACE 1 and PACE 2 both go contrary to the best interests of the Eniwetok Marshallese who were removed from their home atoll by the United States Government in 1947 and have lived since then on Ujelang Atoll. They are now in the process of planning their return to Eniwetok Atoll which will be available for their resettlement by the end of 1973. For myself, I am unalterably opposed to the PACE project for reasons stated below. I do not want my name associated with PACE planning in any way.

3. There are only three anthropologists who are sufficiently acquainted with the Eniwetok situation to make judgments about the impact of PACE upon the Eniwetok people. This knowledge in each case is based on extended field research during the Marshallese community's displacement on Ujelang Atoll. These anthropologists are Dr. Jack A. Tobin, Community Development Adviser, Marshall Islands District, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; Dr. Robert C. Kiste, Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of Minnesota; and Dr. Leonard Mason, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology, University of Hawaii.

4. Dr. Tobin's doctoral dissertation on "The Resettlement of the Eniwetok People" (unpublished, University of California, Berkeley, 1967) is included among the references listed on page R-10 of the draft EIS. It is cited only once in the text (page 3-11). Dr. Tobin has said that he is "biased against the PACE program" (see his letter to Mr. Harvey Segal, April 2, 1973, which I read into the record of the PACE public hearing on April 4). Tobin has charged PACE planners with ignoring portions of his dissertation that would have weakened PACE estimates of the environmental impact on the Eniwetok community.

5. Of the three anthropologists named in (3) above, Dr. Kiste is without doubt the best informed owing to his own intensive field research on Ujelang Atoll in 1964 and his subsequent analysis of the field data. This work is nearing completion in the form of a comprehensive monograph on the effects of displacement of the Eniwetok people from 1947 to the present. He is opposed to further

implementation of the PACE program as evidenced in his own remarks during the PACE public hearing in Honolulu on April 4, 1973.

6. In the Anthropology section (pages 3-12 to 3-14) of the Test Site Description, the only citations to anthropological research other than Tobin's are to an article by Dr. Alexander Spoehr on kinship systems in the Marshall and Gilbert Islands (1949) and to a report by Miss Margaret Chave on mixed-blood Marshallese (1947). Fieldwork by Dr. Spoehr (then with the Chicago Natural History Museum) and Miss Chave (a graduate student in anthropology at the University of Hawaii) was limited to about three months each in 1947 on Majuro Atoll in the southern Marshalls. Neither investigator had acquaintance with the Eniwetok Marshallese, who at that time had not yet been informed by the U.S. Government of the plan to move them from their home atoll to Ujelang Atoll. Text references in the draft EIS to the work of Spoehr and Chave are only generalized statements about Marshallese culture, and have no specific application to the Eniwetok situation.

7. The draft EIS in defining the cultural and environmental requirements of the Eniwetok people is superficial and completely inadequate, both as to their present situation on Ujelang Atoll and to their projected re-occupation of Eniwetok Atoll in the near future.

8. PACE planners can expect no assistance from anthropologists who are now knowledgeable about the Eniwetok situation, for the simple reason that PACE can in no way serve the interests of the Eniwetok people. In point of fact, the Eniwetok community does not require that anthropologists even speak on its behalf. The community's pointedly negative response to the PACE presentation at the public hearing on Ujelang Atoll, March 26-28, 1973, provides eloquent testimony to that group's own estimate of the impact of PACE should the project be allowed to continue.

B. POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS DEMAND NEW PRIORITIES

1. A year or two ago, when PACE planning was already underway, the project might still have been judged on purely scientific grounds without regard for human occupancy of the atoll. That situation changed overnight when Ambassador Franklin Haydn Williams, the President's personal representative for the Micronesian Status Negotiations, and Edward E. Johnston, High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, jointly announced that the U.S. Government was prepared to return Eniwetok Atoll to the Trust Territory by the end of 1973 for the early return of the Eniwetok people to their home atoll. Political considerations now demand a completely new look at the PACE project.

2. Dr. Ernst S. Reese, Professor of Zoology, University of Hawaii, summed up the changed situation very well in his letter of July 13, 1972, appended to the draft EIS:

"The crux of the matter is simply that the question is no longer a scientific one. The matter is now both political and moral. The question has become: do the objectives of the PACE program and geological data which will be gathered in the process outweigh the objections of the Eniwetok people? The answer to this question must be a political and moral one. It cannot be answered scientifically" (page H-2).

3. Dr. George S. Losey, Jr., Assistant Professor of Zoology, University of Hawaii, came to a similar conclusion in his letter of July 18, 1972, appended to the draft EIS:

"... the problem has now acquired socio-political importance which renders it difficult to decide on a scientific basis whether the PACE project should proceed" (page H-11).

4. Dr. Philip Helfrich, Associate Director,

Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology, University of Hawaii, wrote in the same questioning manner in his letter of July 20, 1972, appended to the draft EIS:

"I cannot make a judgment on the necessity of the PACE project because the total relationship of it to our national security is a complex one with all of the facts to be weighed known only to a few persons in our government" (page H-16).

5. To continue scientific debate on the possible effects of proposed PACE 1 and PACE 2 detonations upon the physical environment of Eniwetok Atoll is now but an exercise in futility in view of the new political and moral considerations. Indeed, PACE planners appear to have anticipated the new question and provided partial answer in a statement in the draft EIS:

"The information obtained during PACE 1 would be useful to scientists studying atoll geology but probably would have no direct use to the Eniwetok people" (page 7-1).

6. In another place in the draft EIS, the relationship and relative priorities of PACE 1 and PACE 2 are defined in such a way that the need to conduct PACE 2 is represented as less urgent:

"The PACE 1 program is in no way dependent upon PACE 2 high-explosive testing program. PACE 1 . . . is needed regardless of whether the PACE 2 program is carried out to completion. Results obtained from the PACE 1 program will, however, be useful in designing the high-yield explosive events of PACE 2" (page 2-4).

7. That the PACE 2 program is conceived as more directly supportive of U.S. national defense interests is confirmed by a statement in the simplified English equivalent of the Marshallese summary of the draft EIS:

"Very important to the PACE 2 program is the plan to use explosive shots to see how they are like the big atomic bombs. Since the United States has set off atomic bombs only in coral atolls, the PACE 2 explosives must be set off there also. The ground around these explosions must be studied very carefully. Also, the PACE explosions must be the same size as explosions being set off in the United States and Canada. Only then can we compare these shots to large atomic bombs. Thus, we can find out how atomic bombs will damage us in the different kind of ground we have. Hence, the doubts about U.S. defense will be less" (page 1-52).

8. There can be little doubt from the quotations in (5), (6), and (7) above that PACE has been planned for the sole purpose of answering certain United States security needs. The Eniwetok people can expect no benefits from a continuation of the PACE program. On the contrary, they will have to stand by and watch another major alteration of their home atoll at the very moment when they have been promised by the U.S. Government an early return to the atoll from which they were forcibly removed 26 years ago.

C. A HISTORY OF FORCED MIGRATION AND CULTURAL DISRUPTION

1. Eniwetok Atoll, like other island ecological systems in the Pacific, is a unique complex of living organisms and the non-living environment. Any atoll represents a functional system of interacting components that tends toward an equilibrium never quite achieved. The limited size of atolls makes almost any change, whether by the hand of man or by some natural agency, capable of extensive repercussions within the ecosystem. The land, reef, lagoon, climate, soils, vegetation, and animal life—all are elements to which the Eniwetok people have had to relate for they, like other living species on the atoll, also occupied a niche in the total ecological scheme. We have every reason to believe that with their pre-European technologies and organizational systems, the Eniwetokese had succeeded in maintaining a reasonably fine balance between their use of

the atoll resources and the influence of the atoll environment upon their customary behavior.

2. The Eniwetok population, numbering probably little more than a hundred persons, remained fairly well isolated from the rest of the world, through the German protectorate established in the Marshalls in 1885 and into the early years of the Japanese occupation of Micronesia after 1914. The atoll's inhabitants learned to make copra for export and came to depend in a minor way on trade goods to supplement their traditional subsistence economy. Continuing to live much as before, the atoll population was divided into two independent but cooperative chiefdoms based on the two main islands of Engebi and Eniwetok. Until the late 1930's no foreigners lived among them with the exception of a Japanese trader and his two aides.

3. For the Eniwetok Marshallese the nightmare of foreign military intervention began in the late 1930's. Thousands of Japanese military personnel, Korean and Okinawan laborers, and conscripted Marshallese workers from other atolls invaded Eniwetok to construct fortifications and an airfield on Engebi Island. Some Eniwetokese were also pressed into service, while others fled to islets elsewhere in the atoll. The Japanese operations eventually forced the Eniwetok inhabitants who still remained on Engebi to crowd together at the southern end of the island. Later, the entire Engebi community was removed to the smaller island of Aomon, which happened to belong to the chiefdom of Eniwetok and not that of Engebi.

4. As war came to the Marshalls, the Eniwetok fortifications were heavily bombed by the American forces. Many Eniwetokese were wounded or lost their lives during this period although they had no part in the struggle between Japan and the United States. In February, 1944, the Americans secured the atoll after several days of fierce fighting. Eniwetok Island was then transformed into a major advance base for air and sea attacks on Japanese military holdings farther west in Micronesia. The Eniwetok people were rounded up and concentrated in camp facilities on Aomon Island. One year later members of the Engebi chiefdom took up residence separately on Bijiri Island just south of Aomon in order to be on land belonging to them by island custom. Aomon and Bijiri together provided the war refugees with only 90 acres of living space as compared with 487 acres on the two large islands of Engebi and Eniwetok which had traditionally supported the atoll's inhabitants and which had now been denied them by the events of World War II.

5. The entire Eniwetok population was moved to Meik Island, Kwajalein Atoll, for one month in 1946 in the interest of their security while the United States tested an atomic bomb on nearby Bikini Atoll. A year or so thereafter, the U.S. Navy administration informed the Eniwetok people that their home atoll was required for an extension of the nuclear weapons testing on nearby Bikini Atoll. They were summarily resettled on Ujelang Atoll. There they have lived ever since in the never failing hope that one day the U.S. Government would end its weapons testing at Eniwetok and they could finally return to their native homeland. Their petitions toward that end have been increasingly aggressive in recent years. Ujelang has not been a happy home for them. A simple comparison of areas tells the story graphically. Total land area on Eniwetok Atoll is 2.26 square miles, but on Ujelang it is only 0.67 square miles. Total lagoon area at Eniwetok measures 387.99 square miles, while at Ujelang it only comes to 25.47 square miles. Finally, in April, 1972, the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory informed them that the time had arrived, and they could look forward to resettlement on Eniwetok in the very near future.

6. What can the Eniwetok people expect in available living space as they plan to return to the ancestral atoll? The April, 1972, announcement on behalf of the U.S. Government indicated that first priority will be given to the cleanup and rehabilitation of three islands—Parry, Japtan, and Anyaanli—in the southeastern part of the atoll. These three islands are almost the only ones out of some 32 in the entire atoll which have an appreciable portion of the original vegetation remaining after 26 years of U.S. military weapons testing. They are, respectively, the 3rd, 5th, and 21st largest islets in the atoll. Together they total 0.47 square miles, about 300 acres, and only 20 percent of the atoll total of 2.26 square miles of land area.

7. The community numbered 142 men, women, and children when it was relocated to Ujelang Atoll in 1947. Since then, it has at least doubled and possibly tripled in size depending on how membership in the community is defined. Obviously, living space for all will be the most critical problem facing the returnees, apart from the equally critical question of how much land may or may not be immediately available elsewhere in the atoll for the restoration of the mixed trade-subsistence economy which supported the human population prior to its displacement in 1947.

8. What is the condition of other islands in the atoll which at various times have served the Eniwetok people as residential sites? Eniwetok and Engebi Islands have already been identified as the two traditional settlements in pre-European times. Eniwetok is the larger. The land area is now almost completely paved over for the U.S. military airstrip and support facilities. Engebi's transformation into a Japanese wartime base and its subsequent bombardment by the Americans left the island virtually useless for Marshallese re-occupation until cleared of all military debris. Aomon and Bijiri Islands, never used for permanent residence in earlier years, did serve temporarily during and just after World War II for concentration of the displaced islanders. Islands smaller than the Eniwetokese do not consider suitable for more than casual habitation, as indicated by the names assigned to many of them which imply simply a "sand island" or a "sand spit."

9. The PACE selection of Runit, Aomon, and Eberiru Islands for investigation and high-explosive testing does not in fact critically restrict the possibilities for re-establishing permanent residential sites by Eniwetokese. Although Runit Island is the fourth largest in the atoll, nuclear tests in the 1950's scarred it badly and left a heritage of radioactivity that may make the land uninhabitable by Marshallese for years to come. Aomon's condition has already been discussed, and Eberiru Island is really quite small, only 26 acres. Proposals by PACE planners to restore the three islands at least to their condition prior to PACE testing are not particularly relevant to the primary need felt by the Eniwetokese as they look forward to their return. The critical question from their point of view lies elsewhere, as I will try to point out in the following analogy.

10. Compare the Eniwetok community as it waits on Ujelang today with a hypothetical American family in New England. This family has just received word from the Government that it may re-occupy its many-roomed ancestral home after an enforced absence of a quarter century caused by Government requisitioning of the building for official use. What reaction might you expect when the American family is confronted with the conditions detailed below?

11. The family's favorite living rooms in the large old house have been badly damaged or completely done over in a style the family finds distasteful. Many of the smaller rooms once used for special purposes have also

been severely abused and some, in fact, completely destroyed. However, the family expects to salvage some living space in other small rooms less altered. But as they prepare to move into the house and make a start toward something more suitable in the future, they find that the Government intends to reserve three of the rooms in the house for yet another year of newly programmed activity. It is true that the Government guarantees that its people will not be noisy nor intrude unduly on the family's activities. Some damage to the building is expected to result from continued use of the rooms, but the Government says they will be restored at least to the condition they were in before the new program got underway. Despite such assurances, members of the American family are crushed (like the Eniwetok Marshallese reaction?). Sad disappointment follows their heightened expectation that finally they would be moving back into the old house to begin to revive the old family living tradition. Blocked in this desire, their sorrow turns into frustration and then into anger. They seek legal assistance to oppose this continued Governmental intrusion into their anticipated privacy and seclusion to become master of their own affairs at long last. Can you blame them?

D. THE REAL ISSUE NOW IS LARGER THAN EITHER PACE OR ENIWETOK

1. A final decision about the PACE program can no longer be made solely on the merits of the experimental project or the arguments of the Eniwetok plaintiffs. Continued military activity at Eniwetok in the face of opposition by the Eniwetok people is now but one of a number of related issues undergoing review in negotiations between the United States Government and the people of Micronesia concerning the political future of the islands.

2. The fact that Ambassador Franklin Hadyn Williams, personal representative of President Nixon for the Micronesian Status Negotiations, was party to the joint announcement about the return of Eniwetok Atoll to its former inhabitants is indicative of this greater significance of the Eniwetok issue. The announcement was made in the Trust Territory immediately following the Fourth Round of Talks in Koror, Palau. Tentative agreement had just been reached between the two negotiating teams to develop a Compact of Free Association with the United States. The sensitive topic of military leases and options had been examined carefully on both sides. In the discussions, the United States representative had attempted to alleviate the very considerable concern by Micronesians about future military intervention in Micronesian affairs.

3. While progress in the negotiations continued during the Fifth Round of Talks in Washington in July, 1972, an impasse later developed which caused negotiations to be broken off in the Sixth Round at Barbers Point in Hawaii in October. No firm announcement has been made at the present time for resumption of the negotiations. Micronesian independence is now in strong competition with free association with the United States. The U.S. military role is a principal issue in the present postponement of negotiations. On both sides, suspicion of the other's motives is great.

4. The PACE program has assumed a symbolic significance in which good faith on the part of the U.S. Government stands on trial. Micronesians expect that in any future association that may be formed between Micronesia and the United States the two parties will work together as equals. Such a partnership demands constant evidence of good faith on both sides if it is to remain viable.

5. At the PACE public hearing on Ujelang Atoll in March, 1973, the Eniwetok people expressed without reservation their negative response to the continuation of PACE. In

the face of the opposition, the United States must now declare its good faith in dealing with a Micronesian people. Not only the Eniwetok Marshallese are watching to see what decision the U.S. Air Force Command will make in regard to PACE. Micronesians in all six districts of the Trust Territory are watching. Whatever decision is made to continue PACE or not to continue it, Micronesians everywhere will view it as a straw in the wind indicating the mood of the U.S. Government in future decisions about U.S. military activities which are opposed by the island peoples.

6. In the present case, the U.S. Government dare not "shake a big stick" in the face of Micronesian opinion if it expects to win Micronesian cooperation for a Compact of Free Association. To make such a unilateral decision about the PACE program will very likely provide exactly the support desired by Micronesians who are advocating independence, both complete and immediate.

7. Regardless of the merits of Micronesian independence, now or at some future time, the United States cannot afford to take a hard line on the PACE program unless the latter is considered by top-level military chiefs to be absolutely essential to the maintenance of U.S. national security. And if this be the case, the U.S. Government must be prepared to take the consequences in the loss of respect and good faith on the part of the Micronesian people.

The PACE program, cast in the light of much larger issues, appears to me to be of no significance. To continue the PACE program would, in my opinion, be a "bad show." Let's consider the larger issues which are of real significance in Micronesia.

As an anthropologist I would be shocked and as an American citizen I would be ashamed if the U.S. Air Force decides to go ahead with PACE.

Sincerely,

LEONARD MASON,
Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, University of Hawaii.

CONTROL OF THE PURSE STRINGS

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. President, since coming to the Congress, I have sent a regular newsletter to citizens of Virginia and I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of the June 1973 newsletter.

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

CONTROL OF THE PURSE STRINGS

Activities on the Senate floor predominate in this month's newsletter. Of course, I would welcome your views on these or other matters.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACT OF 1973

Congress has a Constitutional responsibility to impose taxes and to control spending of government funds although in present practice it seems to merely refine the recommendations of the President. Much of the eroding power of Congress over government finances can be traced to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which increased the role of the President in pulling together a federal budget and weakened the power of Congress in this area of fiscal management. The Executive Branch, through the Office of Management and Budget, sets priorities, includes items it chooses in the budget and excludes items it does not favor.

A few days ago, however, I introduced a measure to transfer the Office of Management and Budget from the Executive Branch of government to the Legislative Branch and to establish a permanent joint committee of the Congress on the budget. The Senate Republican Leader, Hugh Scott, was kind enough to co-sponsor the measure. This proposal would not only tighten Congressional control of fiscal matters but would give Congress a positive role in supervising the preparation of a federal budget since the Legislative OMB would be under the direct control of Congress through the Joint Committee on the Budget.

Under this proposal, each department and independent agency of the government would submit its needs directly to the Legislative Office of Management and Budget which would make decisions as to priorities and prepare the federal budget under the supervision of the Joint Congressional Committee. It is proposed that the Joint Committee would consist of members of the Congress serving on the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the Appropriations Committee of each body. The Committee would consist of twelve members divided equally between the majority and the minority parties.

In my opinion, the only way for Congress to control the purse strings of the government is to have the machinery for establishing spending priorities as well as authorizing the funding responsibilities. This is a decided change from the present practice. The proposal was studied by our staff, the Library of Congress, and the Senate Legislative Counsel for a period of some weeks before being introduced. I hope it will receive serious consideration. Should you desire a copy of my remarks and the bill, please let me know.

VIRGINIA TOUR

As you know, I serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee and Virginia has a large number of military installations which are both important to our national security and to Virginia's economy. In order to become more familiar with these bases, I spent May 14-18 visiting a large number of them. Among the installations visited were Fort Belvoir, Quantico Marine Base, Naval installations in Norfolk and Little Creek, Fort Monroe, Norfolk Naval Air Station, Langley Air Force Base, Fort Lee, Fort Eustis, and the Richmond Defense Supply Agency. While at Langley, I also visited the NASA Research Center.

The authority of several of the military commands extend beyond Virginia and even outside of our national boundaries. The visit afforded me an opportunity to see some of our weapons, military housing, repair shops, and to generally become better acquainted with matters which will come before our committee.

NORFOLK HOSPITAL

One of the issues the Senate recently acted upon related to Public Health Service Hospitals. These hospitals primarily serve merchant seamen, Coast Guard personnel on active duty, and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service. Although there were once thirty Public Health Service hospitals in operation, most of these have been closed with only eight remaining open, including the one in Norfolk.

The Administration has proposed the closing of the hospitals for a number of reasons. They noted that the declining number of eligible persons, the costs of maintaining the hospital facilities, and the rising costs of specialized medical care make it impractical to continue operating these federal hospitals.

This is part of an overall effort of the Administration, which has my support, to reduce the cost of government and to have our economy operate on an efficient basis.

During the debate on the Emergency Medi-

cal Services Act of 1973, Senator Magnuson proposed an amendment to keep open the Public Health Service Hospitals. This amendment was passed by voice vote and was made a part of the Senate bill on final passage. The House has also acted favorably on the bill and it must go to a conference committee.

I understand the contemplated closing will not deprive the primary beneficiaries of essential medical care as in-patients. They will continue to receive care through government purchase of equivalent service in hospitals in their own community through contracts negotiated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

As you know, appropriations are made to operate the government on the basis of fiscal years commencing July 1. It is invariably necessary to make additional appropriations prior to the end of each fiscal year for matters not considered in the original Appropriations Act or for additional funding of a specified activity.

The 1973 Second Supplemental Appropriations bill was for more than \$3 billion for various departments and agencies of the government. While this is a considerable amount of money, the primary debate on the measure related to a prohibition of spending "to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over or from off the shores of Cambodia, or in or over Laos by United States forces." I have always supported the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam and feel that he deserves considerable credit in obtaining a peace agreement and the return of our prisoners of war. Nevertheless, the people of the country appear to be tired of our continued involvement and concerned with the lack of assistance from other freedom loving nations. There is also a concern that bombing is continuing without congressional authorization and the thought that it could result in more prisoners of war being taken. While I voted against limiting the authority of the President on this measure, notice was given that I would not support further bombing operations without specific authorization from Congress.

EMERGENCY PETROLEUM ALLOCATION ACT

Congress is presently considering an act authorizing and directing the President to prepare priorities, schedules, plans and regulations for the allocation and distribution of crude oil and refined petroleum products which may be in short supply nationally or in any region of the country. The bill would regulate the major producers and importers and compel them to sell at least as much of their products to independent dealers as was sold to such dealers during the period from July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972.

No one questions our need for more petroleum or that some shortages exist. There is doubt, however, of the desirability of the government interfering further with the mechanisms of the marketplace in the allocation of scarce energy resources. It might even be argued that past government interference with the market is in large part responsible for the shortages we now experience. Perhaps we need to find ways to increase domestic production, to reexamine environmental constraints and imports from other countries. In any event, there is a sharp division as to the action which should be taken which may stay with us as long as the fear of an energy shortage continues to exist.

POSTCARD REGISTRATION

The Senate recently passed a Postcard Registration bill by a vote of 57-37. There may be major opposition to the bill in the House of Representatives but the Senate has completed its consideration. I voted against the measure and would be glad to forward a copy of my remarks during debate on request.

As you know, voter registration has generally been considered a State matter. How-

ever, this proposal would establish an office within the U.S. Census Bureau and periodically furnish postal cards to citizens throughout the country to permit them to register to vote. There would appear to be a considerable danger of fraud in permitting people to register by mail rather than register in person as required under Virginia law.

Moreover, the party in control of the Executive Branch of our government might show favoritism in the use of a national voters' list and we would be creating a new federal agency at the cost of many millions of dollars at a time when, in my opinion, we should be curbing government spending and reducing the cost of government.

Of course, I favor the widest possible participation in the election process and urge all qualified persons to register and vote in all elections. Active participation in the election process by all of our citizens results in better government. Nevertheless, Virginia does afford wide opportunity to register and vote. Each county or city has a central registrar with assistant registrars in the various neighborhoods of our more populous counties. However, we have had vote frauds in the western part of our State which have been related to voting by mail and I am concerned that a general mail registration conducted by the Bureau of the Census throughout the country would considerably increase the prospect for fraud and additional irregularities in the voting process.

The Census Bureau, the Postal Service and the Department of Justice all opposed this measure and it appears to be wrong for the federal government to invade a field previously reserved to the States. This measure even seeks to supervise the selection of delegates to party conventions and caucuses. There is strong indication that the President will veto it if passed by the Congress.

FLAG DAY

On June 14, by an appropriate display of our flag, let us all join together in remembrance of those things that have made our country great. If you would like information on the proper display of the flag, our office will be happy to send you the booklet *Our Flag*.

LES AMIS DU VIN

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of being honored at the first national convention of the members of the Les Amis du Vin—Friends of Wine.

As chairman of the Wine Committee of the California delegation in Congress, this meeting which was held in San Francisco the week of May 21, 1973, was most interesting for these reasons: First, Les Amis du Vin is a national organization with over 15,000 members, and second, it is an organization with an educational bent in the area of understanding and helping their members become knowledgeable about the hundreds of vintages of both American and foreign wines.

The bimonthly newsletter of the society is full of news about their 164-member chapters in 34 States. It also advises their membership of the market values at retail level and warns them of any deception in label or price. Mod-

eration and proper use of various wines is also a strong motive in the educational exposure which is reported in their news releases and newsletters.

The program of speakers, of which I was one, consisted of some of the great names in the wine industry and all topics were covered with great professional accuracy. Leading the panelists at the nine seminars was Mr. Harry Waugh, the distinguished British wine authority. His subject was "The Wines of Bordeaux." "California Wines" was the subject handled by Dr. Maynard Amerine, professor of enology at the University of California at Davis. Mr. Steven J. Schneider, economist, spoke on "The Current Market Trends in Wines." Mr. Julius Wiles' seminar subject was "From the Vineyard to the Table" and Mr. Robert Gourdin developed well, his topic of "Champagnes and Sparkling Wines." Peter Sichel took the seminar on a tasting tour of "Wines of Germany." Mr. Alfio Moriconi, executive director and wine adviser to the Les Amis du Vin membership, addressed the seminar on the subject of "Psychology of Wine Drinking" as well as an interesting aside on the improvement of Italian Wines.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I must give a vote of praise to the great pastry chef, Otto Eckstein, as well as Executive Chef Klaus Scheftner, of the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco, for their artistic and delicious achievement of a cake shaped in the form of the early California wine cask and decorated to symbolize founding of the California wine community.

I thought Alfio Moriconi summarized the convention very well when he said:

We at Les Amis du Vin voted to hold our first national convention in San Francisco because it is the gateway to the American Wine Industry.

Members of Les Amis du Vin also toured vineyards and visited Wente Brothers, Paul Masson, Mirassau, Hanns Kornell Mondavi, and the Sabastiani wineries.

ELECTION OF NEW MEXICO OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend a constituent of mine, E. K. Hagsdale, of Raton, upon his election as president of the New Mexico Optometric Association for the 1973-74 term. This association has long devoted much effort to the improvement of vision in the State of New Mexico; members of the NMOA have worked hard to uplift the consciousness of New Mexicans on the importance, in fact, the very basic necessity of vision.

Dr. Ragsdale, a 1964 graduate of the Pacific University School of Optometry previously served in the U.S. Army from 1948 through 1953. Upon his settling in Raton, he has provided its inhabitants with quality optometric vision care and through that practice aided countless persons to pursue their life goals more effectively.

This is a tremendously important field.

As we in Congress are more and more involved in legislation dealing with the health of the Nation, we must keep in mind the relation of vision to learning, to personality development, to successful life achievement, to adjustment to ensuing old age.

My congratulations to Dr. Ragsdale and the New Mexico Optometric Association.

TAX REFORM AMENDMENTS TO DEBT CEILING BILL

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8410, continuing the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, is scheduled for floor action on Wednesday, June 13. Representatives Brock Adams, John E. Moss, Frank Thompson, Jr., and I offer two tax reform amendments to H.R. 8410. To do this, we will attempt to vote down the previous question on the rule and amend the rule to make in order the tax reform amendments.

The text of our proposed amendments to the rule and to the debt ceiling bill follow:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. — OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVES ADAMS, MOSS, REUSS, AND THOMPSON

Page —, line —, after "five-minute rule." insert the following:

"It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, the text of the bill H.R. 8282, and the text of the bill H.R. 8283, as separate amendments to the bill H.R. 8410."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8410 OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVES ADAMS, MOSS, REUSS, AND THOMPSON

Page 3, after line 9, insert the following additional section:

AMENDMENTS TO MINIMUM TAX FOR TAX PREFERENCES

(a) Section 56(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to imposition of minimum tax for tax preferences) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the other taxes imposed by this chapter, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year, with respect to the income of every person, a tax equal to the applicable percent to an amount equal to the sum of the items of tax preference."

(b) Section 56(b) of such Code (relating to treatment of net operating losses) is amended by striking out "in excess of \$30,000" and by striking out "10 percent" in each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the applicable percent".

(c) Section 56(c) of such Code (relating to tax carryovers) is hereby repealed.

(d) Section 56 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) APPLICABLE PERCENT.—For purposes of this section, the applicable percent shall be a percent equal to one-half of the highest for the taxable year under section 1, section 11, section 511, section 594, section 801, or section 851."

(e) Section 58 of such Code (relating to rules for application of the minimum tax) is amended by—

(1) striking out subsections (b) and (c) and redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as (b) through (e)

and by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—In the case of an estate or trust, the sum of the items of tax preference for any taxable year of the estate or trust shall be apportioned between the estate or trust and the beneficiaries on the basis of the income of the estate or trust allocable to each," and

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

"(f) ELECTION NOT TO CLAIM TAX PREFERENCES.—In the case of an item of tax preference which is a deduction from gross income, the taxpayer may elect to waive the deduction of all or part of such item, and the amount so waived shall not be taken into account for purposes of this part. In the case of an item of tax preference described in section 57(a)(9), the taxpayer may elect to treat all or part of any capital gain as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in section 1231, and the amount treated as such gain shall not be taken into account for purposes of this part. An election under this subsection shall be made only at such time and in such manner as is prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary or his delegate, and the making of such election shall constitute a consent to all terms and conditions as may be set forth in the regulations as to the effect of such election for purposes of this title."

(f) Section 443 of such Code (relating to returns for a period of less than 12 months) is amended by striking out subsection (d) thereof and redesignating subsection (e) as (d).

(g) (1) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) In determining the deferral of tax liability under section 56(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the necessary computations involving such taxable year shall be made under the law applicable to such taxable year.

(3) There shall be no tax carryover under section 56(c) or 56(a)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any taxable year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8410 OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVES ADAMS, MOSS, REUSS, AND THOMPSON

Page 3, after line 9, and after any amendment heretofore adopted, insert the following additional section:

REASONABLE ALLOWANCE FOR DEPRECIATION

(a) REPEAL OF ASSET DEPRECIATION RANGE.—Section 167(m)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to class lives for depreciation allowance) is amended by striking out the following: "The allowance so prescribed may (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) permit a variance from any class life by not more than 20 percent (rounded to the nearest half year) of such life."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only to property—

(1) the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which is completed by the taxpayer after the date of enactment of this Act, or

(2) acquired after the date of enactment of this Act, (if the original use of the property commences with the taxpayer and commences after such date.

In applying this section in the case of property described in paragraph (1), there shall be taken into account only that portion of the basis which is properly attributable to construction, reconstruction, or erection after the date of enactment of this Act."

L.B.J. SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS GRADUATES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor and pleasure of speaking to the third graduating class of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs of the University of Texas at Austin. This graduate school was conceived by the late President Johnson as an institution where talented and public-spirited young people could be specially trained to become leaders in our Federal, State, and local governments.

I lauded the birth of the L.B.J. School; I am sure we all share the belief of the late President in our young people and their ability to become, with proper training and encouragement, the capable leaders of our society. I have observed the growth of the L.B.J. School; and I say with pride that President Johnson's hopes are being fulfilled. The hard work and devotion of the administration, faculty, staff, and students to the late President's ideal is paying off. I have worked with L.B.J. students in the past, and have been pleased by their ability and enthusiasm. After speaking to this year's graduating class, and learning of their past accomplishments and future plans, I am even more enthusiastic and hopeful for their futures and the future of our country under their leadership.

I would now like to take this opportunity to present to my colleagues the names of these graduates with a short summary of their accomplishments so that my enthusiasm will be shared, as follows:

Mrs. Paulette Alexander from Chelsea, Ala.: BS in Math & MA in Bus. Statistics from the Univ. of Alabama. Summer Intern with the Interagency Regional Planning Committee. Presently Intern in the Texas Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Participated in Research Seminars State Tax Policy and Programs and Texas Property Tax Administration.

Miss Sharon L. Bechtold from San Antonio, Tex.: BA in Government from The University of Texas at Austin. Member of National Political Science Honor Fraternity. Summer Intern at the State Department of Public Welfare in the Deputy Commissioner's Office. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and Social Services Delivery Systems.

Mr. Mills B. Boon from Arlington, Tex.: BA History from University of Texas at Arlington. Served with the Peace Corps in Nepal. Community Mental Health Trainee under National Institute of Mental Health. Summer Intern at the Legislative Property Tax Commission. Presently Intern in the Office of Comprehensive Health Planning. Participated in Research Seminars State Tax Policy & Programs and Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. Dean G. Breiting from Hayward, California: AB in Political Science from Duke University. Worked with New York Metropolitan Regional Commission on Council's Urban Corps Program. Summer Intern in the Dallas Office of the City Manager. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Texas Property Tax Administration.

Mr. Jack Brock from Austin, Texas: BBA in Accounting from Texas Tech University. MBA in Management from The University

of Texas at Austin. Summer Intern in the U.S. Accounting Office Comptroller General. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Trial Court Management.

Mr. Robert N. Campbell III from San Antonio, Tex.: BA in Business and History from Austin College. President, Austin College Student Body. Summer Intern with the State Department of Public Welfare in the Office of Deputy Commissioner. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Social Services Delivery Systems.

Mr. Harlan T. Cooper from El Paso, Texas: BA in Philosophy from the University of Texas at Austin. Worker as Copywriter, KBAR Radio. Lt. in the U.S. Army and served in Vietnam. Summer Intern at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Participated in Research Seminars State Tax Policy and Programs and Social Services Delivery Systems.

Miss Derrell B. DePasse from Chappaqua, N.Y.: BA in Government from the University of Texas at Austin. Worked as Legislative Intern for Congressman Paul Findley. Also worked as a Junior Analyst in the Management Consulting firm C. W. Robinson, Inc. Summer Intern in the Office of the Honorable Wright Patman. Participated in Research Seminars State Tax Policy & Programs and The Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Miss M. Colleen Dolan from Amarillo, Texas: BA in Government from Mt. St. Scholastica College. Student Body President. Worked for the City of Amarillo Tax Office. Summer Intern at the Office of the President, Oakland University. Presently Intern in the Office of Personnel, Oakland University. Participated in Research Seminars State Tax Policy & Programs and The Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. Michael D. Donovan from Somerville, Mass.: BA in Financial Management from Boston College. Served in the USAF. On the Board of Directors in Laredo JC's. Summer Intern in the Office of Deputy Director of Personnel, Office of the Mayor, Boston. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and State Planning for Nuclear Power.

Mrs. Alicia D. Essary from Austin, Texas: AB in History from Brown University. Participated for two years in Intercollegiate Debate. Summer Intern with the Capitol Area Planning Council. Participated in Research Seminar Municipal Land Use Policies and Social Services Delivery Systems.

Mr. Bruce H. Esterline from Claremont, Calif.: BA in History from Stanford University. Served in the U.S. Army. Active in the 1968 Presidential Campaign, worked for Senator Humphrey. Summer Intern with the Humphrey for President Committee. Presently Intern with the Department of Early Childhood Development. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and The Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. Kenneth F. Ferguson from Austin, Texas: BBA in Management from University of Texas at Austin. Worked for Bandlin Co. Real Estate Agency. Summer Intern in the Dallas Regional Office of GAO. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and State Planning for Nuclear Power.

Miss Sharon Gillespie from Austin, Texas: BA in Government from Rice University. Summer Intern at the Brookings Institute. Participated in Research seminars Policies for Child Development and Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. William C. Hamilton from Houston, Texas: BA in Government & Economics from Austin College. Student Body Vice President, Austin, College. Intern with City Manager in Sherman, Texas. Summer Intern with the Southeast Texas Regional Planning Committee.

Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Texas Property Tax Administration.

Mr. J. Graham Hill, Jr. from Houston, Texas: BA in History from University of Texas at Austin. Worked in various political campaigns writing speeches as youth coordinator.

Summer Intern at the Legislative Council. Participated in Research Seminars State Tax Policy & Programs and The Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. David D. Jolly from Santa Clara, Calif.: BA in Economics from University of Santa Clara. Worked as Tutor for Project 50; high school minority college preparatory program. Summer Intern with the Department of Administration, Office of the Governor, Wisconsin.

Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and State Planning for Nuclear Power.

Mr. Howard R. Lemcke, Jr. from Naperville, Ill.: BS in Mechanical Engineering, Utah State University. Summer Intern in the City Manager's Office, Corpus Christi. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and Trial Court Management.

Mr. John B. McCammon from St. Petersburg, Fla.: BA in Psychology from Davidson College. Worked as Davidson College Urban Recreation Worker in St. Petersburg and a Member of Activities Grant Foundation. Presently Intern in the Division of Planning and Coordination, Office of the Governor.

Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Texas Property Tax Administration.

Mr. Jon Michaelson from San Diego, Calif.: BA in History from Pomona College. Worked as VISTA supervisor, trainer, and volunteer. Also Researcher for Scripps Institute of Oceanography. Participated in Model UN Activities at Pomona College. Summer Intern at the National Academy of Sciences, Div. of Behavioral Sciences. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Trial Court Management.

Mr. George Muller from Austin, Texas: AB in Political Science from Rutgers University, LLB-JD from Columbia Law School. Worked as a Corporate Lawyer for the firm Hahn, Laeser, Freedheim, Dean & Wellman. Also worked as an Attorney-Advisory to the Review Board of the Federal Communications Commission. Mid-Career student sponsored by the Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Research Associate with the Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. Joseph O'Neill from Dallas, Texas: BA in Government from Harvard University. Worked for the City of Dallas Urban Planner and was a member of Goals for Dallas Welfare Commission. Summer Intern with the CEMSA/MSO Project, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center. Presently Intern in Senator Lloyd Bentsen's Office. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and The Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

Mr. Milind Patil from Bombay, India.: FY & BT in Science and Engineering from the University of Bombay and Indian Institute of Technology. Worked as Assistant Project Manager in Indian Electronics and as a Company Representative in Air Frame Products. Summer Intern with the State Department of Public Welfare, Deputy Commissioner. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and State Planning for Nuclear Power.

Mr. Paul E. Shoemaker from Albuquerque, N.M.: BS in Physics from N.M. Institute of Mining and Technology. Worked as Administrative Assistant to the President of the College. Intern in IRS in Washington, D.C. as Systems Analyst Trainee. Also Summer Intern to IRS, Southwestern Regional Office.

Participated in Research Seminars State Tax Policy & Programs and Social Services Delivery Systems.

Mr. James H. Thurmond from Refugio, Texas: BA in Government from Texas A&M University. Worked as Intern in Bryan City Manager's Office. Summer Intern in Dennison City Manager's Office. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Texas Property Tax Administration.

Miss Barbara J. West from Fort Worth, Texas: AB in Far Eastern Language and Civilization from the University of Chicago. Member, Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars. Presented on Japanese Nationalism, University of Chicago Symposium. Summer Intern with the Mexican American Council of Economic Progress. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and Trial Court Management.

Mr. Gregory G. Young from Fort Worth, Texas: AB in Government from Dartmouth. Worked two summers for HUD, Director of Operations of HUD for hurricane in Corpus Christie one summer. Summer Intern with the Area Office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and State Planning for Nuclear Power.

Mr. Robert Young from Austin, Texas: BA in Government from The University of Texas at Austin. Worked on campaign staff to reelect Jeff Friedman. Summer Intern with the Honorable J. J. Pickle. Participated in Research Seminars Municipal Land Use Policies and Texas Property Tax Administration.

Mr. Thomas F. Zelenka from Portland, Oregon: BA in Government from Oberlin College. Worked as Research Assistant for North Portland Community Action Program. Summer Intern with the Legislative Property Tax Commission. Participated in Research Seminars Policies for Child Development and The Impact of Environmental Impact Statements.

EXTENDING LEGAL SERVICES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have come upon an interesting and enlightened editorial from the Minneapolis Star, dated June 2, 1973. It endorses H.R. 77 and opposes any attempt to amend it. It is significant since H.R. 77 will be on the floor of the House tomorrow.

EXTENDING LEGAL SERVICES

A bill to improve legal services that passed the Senate 79 to 15 is now before the House, where it deserves similar success.

There is no disagreement that all citizens should have a chance to get competent legal services, but the cost is beyond the purse of an estimated 150 million Americans with moderate incomes. While that does not mean to suggest people at the lower income levels are fully served by federally-funded and other "poverty laws" plans, the stress of the bill is to fill a gap that isn't understood or as dramatically portrayed.

As the House Education and Labor Committee's report noted, moderate-income Americans have the same need for adequate legal help as the poor in such areas as landlord-tenant, credit-squeeze, consumer, property and family law situations.

The bill amends the Labor Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions to jointly administered trust funds set up by unions to defray the costs of legal services for workers, their families and dependents. Except in workmen's compensation cases, the bill bans use of such funds against employers.

An effort to weaken the legislation by giving the employer a free hand to refuse to bargain at all about such plans lost 26 to 66 in the Senate. The same kind of amendment is expected to come up again in the House, where it should again be defeated.

HIGH-RISE FIRE SAFETY

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to require compliance with the National Fire Protection Association's Life Safety Code for all multifamily housing facilities for the elderly. This legislation also provides adequate and reasonable financial assistance to the owners or sponsors of these facilities for the purchase of the necessary fire safety equipment.

This bill represents the culmination of more than 6 months of study into the fire safety problems associated with senior citizen housing. After the tragic fires in New Orleans and Atlanta during the last week of November 1972, intensive inquiries were made with a view toward strengthening those fire safety standards currently applicable to housing for senior citizens.

As a consequence of the New Orleans fire and the Atlanta fire, 16 persons were killed and 33 persons were seriously injured, while the total property damage exceeded \$1 million.

Unfortunately, this kind of senseless fire loss is not uncommon in the United States. The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control estimates that more than 12,000 lives are lost each year in this country as a result of fire, while property losses from fires exceed \$3 billion annually.

There can be no question of the Federal responsibilities in this area. The Baptist Towers in Atlanta is reserved exclusively for tenants over the age of 62, and the facility was financed through the Federal Government's section 236 interest-subsidy program.

When fire broke out in the Baptist Towers, the building had only been occupied for 8 months, and it was in full compliance with State and local building codes. Yet 10 persons died in that building on November 30, and 31 more persons were seriously injured. Clearly, something is wrong.

Moreover, the fire in the Baptist Towers broke out on the seventh story—within reach of the firefighters who were able to rescue some individuals from their windows.

What if this fire had broken out on the 10th floor, or the 11th floor—beyond the reach of conventional firefighting equipment?

Clearly, something needs to be done to prevent future tragedies of this kind. While single-fire deaths are probably inevitable, multiple-fire deaths are avoidable if proper fire safety techniques are employed.

The need for constructive solutions to this problem becomes even more ap-

parent when considering the special needs and circumstances which accompany old age. Older persons are often the victims of physical handicaps. Many have difficulty walking; many suffer from hearing impediments; and others have impaired vision.

If the Federal Government is going to assist in providing low-cost housing for our Nation's elderly, then clearly we have an obligation to assure that such housing is in conformance with adequate fire safety standards.

Specifically, there are three broad categories of senior citizen housing which require our attention: those facilities which are in the planning stage, those facilities which are under construction at this time, and those facilities which have already been completed and which are now occupied.

On January 20 of this year, the Office of Technical and Credit Standards of the Federal Housing Administration published in the Federal Register a draft copy of revised fire protection standards for multifamily housing for senior citizens. I believe these proposed standards, to govern the construction of future housing facilities for the elderly, are meaningful and adequate.

These standards, however, reflect no ongoing effort to strengthen the fire safety standards applicable to existing senior citizen housing. Nor do these proposed standards reflect any effort to improve the fire safety conditions of senior citizen housing now under construction.

It is certainly recognized that where existing contracts are in force, between the Federal Housing Administration and the owners or sponsors of existing projects, there are limitations on what may be accomplished in this area.

Given this situation, and given these problems in developing meaningful and fair solutions to the fire safety problems in senior citizens housing, I am today introducing legislation which will accomplish the following objectives:

First. All multifamily housing facilities which are occupied in whole or substantial part by senior citizens, on the date of the enactment of this act, where such facilities have been constructed with Federal financial assistance, shall be in compliance with the provisions of the Life Safety Code. Two years from the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall publish in the Federal Register a complete list of all federally related housing facilities which are not in compliance with these requirements.

For those senior citizens housing facilities which are already in existence or under construction, this will be accomplished to the extent possible and to the extent feasible under existing law. For senior citizen housing which is to be constructed at some future date, this requirement will be absolute.

This requirement will be applicable to all facilities constructed under sections 221(d), 231, and 236 of the National Housing Act—mortgage insurance programs governing senior citizen housing—section 202 of the National Housing Act of 1959—a program of direct loans for sen-

ior citizen housing—and the U.S. Housing Act of 1937—a program for low-rent public housing.

Facilities which do not comply with these requirements may not receive mortgage insurance, direct loans, or any other type of financial assistance from the Federal Housing Administration.

Second. In order to facilitate compliance with these requirements, title II of this legislation establishes a program of insured loans, and where appropriate direct loans, to be granted in accordance with fair and reasonable standards, to the owners or sponsors of senior citizen housing facilities.

Where these requirements apply to facilities constructed under a mortgage insurance program, authority is given to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to extend the program of mortgage insurance to include loans made for the purpose of purchasing fire safety equipment necessary to comply with the provisions of the Life Safety Code. Such mortgage insurance shall be granted with a view toward assuring the continued availability of low-cost housing for the elderly.

Where these requirements apply to senior citizen housing constructed under a direct loan program, authority is given to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to extend direct loans to the owners or sponsors of the facilities for the purpose of purchasing the fire safety equipment necessary to comply with the Life Safety Code. Again, these loans are to be made in an amount which takes into consideration the necessity to assure continued availability of low-cost housing for the elderly.

In the case of low-rent public housing, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall have the authority to make loans to the appropriate local housing authority, or other authorized public agency, for the purpose of upgrading those facilities.

This legislation states that no assistance to any public agency with responsibility for low-rent public housing may provide a basis for increasing the amount of rent levied on occupants on this public housing.

This legislation also states that nothing in the above authorization for assistance shall be construed to effect the eligibility of any facility covered under the act for assistance currently applicable under any other Federal program.

Third. This legislation further authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, upon a finding that any housing facility covered under this act is not meeting the requirements of the Life Safety Code, to take such action as may be necessary to secure from any U.S. district court, or any other court of competent jurisdiction within the United States, an appropriate order requiring compliance with such requirements.

If the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development wishes to require more stringent standards than those of the Life Safety Code to future senior citizen housing projects, this will present no conflict with the provisions of this legislation.

With respect to existing senior citizen housing, and such housing now under construction, when there are instances where present law will allow the Secretary to impose additional fire safety requirements on the owner or sponsor of the facilities, this bill will require the Secretary to act.

Where such additional requirements may not be imposed, due either to lack of authority by the Secretary or due to a binding, existing legal contract, it is hoped that the reasonable loan and loan guarantee provisions of the bill will provide the incentive necessary to make senior citizen housing facilities safe from the hazards of fire.

Taking the long view, I believe that several years from now, with the expected large numbers of senior citizen housing facilities which will be in compliance with the Life Safety Code, the very existence of these facilities should bring competitive pressures to bear on those facilities which are not in compliance with the code's fire safety provisions to make use of the reasonable loan features set forth in this bill.

It should be emphasized that the Life Safety Code is not an overly restrictive, unreasonable set of fire safety standards. The Life Safety Code of the National Fire Protection Association contains numerous built-in trade-offs, specifically designed to provide a reasonable and fair measure of those fire safety standards which taken together constitute effective fire protection conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic fires in Atlanta and New Orleans which claimed the lives of 16 persons should serve as a grim reminder of the work which needs to be done in this area. We have a responsibility to assure that our Nation's elderly, who present some very special fire safety problems, are not housed in facilities which offer substandard fire protection.

I believe the enactment of this legislation will bring us further toward the goal of fulfilling our responsibilities to our older Americans, and I urge the Congress to act promptly in order that we may avoid future tragedies of the kind which occurred in Atlanta and New Orleans.

FOOD PRICES

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, increased food prices, complaints from consumers, and the desire on the part of Congressmen who represent largely urban districts to do something to satisfy these complaints causes me to fear that this Congress may overreact and pass hasty legislation in times of high emotion which will not only do damage to rural America and hurt our economy, but will hurt the consumer in the long run.

As one who has been a farmer all of my life and only recently a Congressman, perhaps my thoughts might be looked upon as being prejudiced. But at a time when both this Congress and the country

are growing more urban by the minute, we need to listen to those close to the soil to get a better understanding of the production process lest we make urban judgments to solve rural-based problems.

The first thing we must recognize is that while food prices are higher than they have been in the past, this does not necessarily mean they are higher than they should be in comparison to the cost of other goods and services. If we found food costs too high in this country compared to food costs in other countries, too high in comparison to the cost of other goods and services, or too high in comparison to the cost of production, then we could legitimately say food costs are too high.

Until we can do these things, we should look elsewhere before being so quick to point to the price of food as the reason the consumer has trouble balancing the home budget. Trying to repair a watch or TV that is not broken in the first place is expensive, produces no benefits, is disruptive, and often leaves the TV or watch in worse condition than it was in the first place. Before one opens up a fine timepiece, he had better be sure it is first in need of repair.

I say this because most of the legislative approaches that I have heard which are designed to "repair" the food-producing mechanism in America offered results only in discouraging production, which not only means higher food prices in the long run but also means a lessening of our ability to reverse the runaway balance of trade deficit with the one product we produce cheap enough to be competitive on the world market.

There are four things I would like to briefly discuss with the Members of this body. One is what caused food prices to go up. The second relates more specifically to what caused food prices to go up so suddenly. The third deals with the big question of whether or not food prices, which admittedly are higher, are too high in relation to food costs elsewhere, in relation to cost of production, and in relation to the costs of other goods and services. The fourth point I want to discuss has to do with the short and long term effects of some of the legislation designed to lower food prices which this body will be asked to consider.

In looking at the cause of the increase in food prices, we find a combination of economic factors rather than a conspiracy on the part of the farmers of America. Most of these factors increased the demand for food which drove food prices upward and if the market is permitted to work its will without outside interference, these higher food prices will be sufficient incentive to the producer to increase his production which in turn will drive food prices downward.

Among those economic factors which brought about increased demand for food is that of increasing income. In the last 25 years, per capita disposable income in this country has increased 223 percent. In the last 20 years, wages have gone up 2½ times. Since 1965, per capita income has increased 62 percent. Minimum wage laws—recently increased by this body—have increased the ability of

those in the lower earning bracket to buy more food. A higher proportion of each new dollar added to those in lower income levels go for food than do comparable dollar increases to those in higher income levels. A person in the higher income bracket can eat only so much food.

Starting in September 1972, we pumped \$10 billion more into our annual expenditures for social security and medicare benefits. When the elderly get additional income directly through social security or indirectly through medicare, which frees income from other sources, they usually do not spend it on a bigger car or bigger house. Much of this money went into the market to bid up food.

Last year we had a 17-percent increase in the volume of food stamps issued. Of course, all of this went into the market to bid up food. We had a change of policy in Russia and China relative to their attitudes in feeding their people which was accompanied by a change in their trade attitudes toward the United States, which was also accompanied by bad crop years in these two as well as other countries. Had they bought grain elsewhere instead of the United States, it would have had a similar effect of driving up the price of grain on the world market.

All of this was accompanied by an increased standard of living throughout the world, especially in the have-not nations where we find a high percentage of the increased income—similar to increased incomes to lower income persons in this country—going for food.

To fan the fires of consumer demand for food, we have had two devaluations of the American dollar in 14 months which made American-produced food a better buy abroad and we have had runaway inflation which has put more dollars on the market to bid up the price of food.

Now you may ask, Why have food prices increased so suddenly? If we could explain this to the consumer, she would not be so angry at the producer. The answer is quite simple: Demand for food is inelastic. As we seek ways to handle the gasoline shortage, we may find that demand for gasoline is also inelastic.

Technically, the relationship between price and purchasing rate, which is known as the elasticity of demand, expresses the percentage change in the buying rate divided by the percentage change in price.

In simpler terms, where increases in price are not met by comparable decreases in purchases, we recognize this as representative of inelastic demand for that particular product or line of products.

In times when more money is available the consumer may buy more food, but not much more, because one can only eat so much food. This is why a higher proportion of increases on the lower end of the wage scale—as opposed to those on the higher end—find their way into the food market.

Because of inelastic demand for food, this also means that a slight increase in food supply results in sharply decreasing prices. Again this is true because one can

only eat so much food. By the same token, slight decreases in food supply result in sharply increasing food prices. It is thought a 1 percent decrease in the supply of food results in a 3 or 4 percent increase in price. If demand for food were elastic like demand for many other products, we would find a 1 percent decrease in supply would bring about a comparable 1 percent increase in price.

When we have a slight decrease in supply and prices go up sharply, we find people buying almost as much food as they did at lower prices because people must eat.

Two things affect the elasticity of demand. One involves the essential nature of the product or service and the other involves the price as it relates to the role performed by the product or service.

Water, air, and food are all essential to human beings. People must have them regardless of the price. The less essential the item, the more elastic the demand for the item becomes. Gasoline is not as essential, but it is certainly more essential than many luxury items. It is also priced low in relation to what it does for the consumer.

If you increase gasoline prices slightly, it is doubtful that many people will reduce their purchases of gasoline accordingly. Here we are not speaking of an absolutely essential item, but one priced low enough that slight increases do not result in a similar decrease in demand. If you were to increase gasoline to a dollar a gallon, you might find you would have altered the cost-benefit ratio of gasoline to the consumer to such a degree that it would meet with a more elastic demand. At this point—and probably sooner—people would buy smaller cars, take fewer trips, live closer to their work, and so forth.

In food we have a product that is essential. It is not essential in its convenience form—a chicken cut in the pieces you like and ready to serve as opposed to a live chicken the consumer would have to kill, clean and cook—but like gasoline the convenience is priced low in relation to its value to the consumer.

All of this is meant to say that slight decreases in food supply result in sharp increases in food prices because of the inelasticity of food demand, and that the demand for food is inelastic for the reasons I have just mentioned.

To protect both the consumer and producer from such widely fluctuating market conditions, the Government has often been more involved in the farming picture than either the producer or consumer would have liked. Keep in mind that millions of independent producers—American farmers—cannot be as accurate in predicting not only what the consumer will demand, but what they—the producers—will eventually produce, as can the four major automobile manufacturers in America.

Our Government has also been involved because it knows the important role farm exports play in our balance of trade and that to maintain a good export market we must be able to guarantee our foreign buyers a steady supply. A foreign business can tell its buyer to wait a few weeks for a particular manu-

factured product, but it cannot tell its buyer it is out of food and to come back in a few weeks. Food demand abroad is inelastic too, you know.

At this point I think it would be well to inject a thought that is perhaps overlooked by some. Cries against any Federal expenditure designed to help the farmer often are the loudest in those areas with a higher than average proportion of people in the low income bracket. And yet any such expenditures, which reduce the cost of an essential item like food which must be purchased by both the rich and the poor, help the poor far more than the rich since a higher percentage of their income goes for food.

This, then, takes us to the third point—is food too high in this country compared to food costs elsewhere, too high in comparison to the cost of other products and services, or too high in relation to the cost of production?

The answer to all three is no. When traveling abroad an often asked question is—why do Americans have so many nice things? Of course there are many reasons. One big reason is because only around 16 percent of the disposable income of the American consumer goes for food. In England it is 25 percent, in Japan it is 35 percent, in Russia it is 58 percent and in Asia it is 80 percent. When 50 to 80 percent of your disposable income goes for food, you do not have much left over. But when only 16 percent goes for food, you have enough left over to buy such things as a second car, a color TV, and many of the things Americans are known to own. Why do Americans have so many of these luxury items—one reason is because of low food prices—the lowest in terms of percent of disposable income of any country in the world.

With a higher percentage of their income going for food in other countries, increases in food prices in other countries would work a far greater hardship on the average citizen than would be the case in the United States. From December 1971 to December 1972, while food prices were going up 4.8 percent in the United States, food prices went up 7.7 percent in Canada, 7.9 percent in the United Kingdom, 8 percent in Germany, 8.4 percent in Italy, and 8.7 percent in France.

In the last quarter of 1972 sirloin steak averaged \$1.69 per pound in Washington, D.C., \$1.88 in London, \$2.08 in Bonn, \$2.57 in Paris, \$2.79 in Rome, and \$11.90 in Tokyo.

In 1930 the American public spent 24 percent of its disposable income on food products. In 1940 it was 22 percent, in 1960 it was 20 percent, in 1971 it dropped to 15.8 percent, in 1972 it was 15.7 percent, and in 1973 it is estimated to be 15.5 percent.

Not only is the average American consumer spending less and less of her disposable income—in terms of percentage—each year on food and less than the average consumer—again in terms of percentage of disposable income—in any country in the world but she is getting more and more in terms of quality, convenience, and variety.

The 16 percent of the disposable income buys a chicken cut in the pieces

desired, cooked, seasoned, and ready to serve. The 80 percent of income in Asia buys a chicken hanging by its neck from a roadside market.

While percentage of income spent for food in America has been dropping, the quality of the food has been increasing—along with the convenience side of it. In 1972, 65 percent of the beef produced in the United States was of choice or prime quality, four times the percentage produced 20 years earlier. And yet when beef prices at the farm level in 1972 reached their previous high of 20 years earlier, people complained. What else sells at the price it sold for 20 years ago even without quality improvement?

It is true food prices in the last 25 years—1947-72—have increased 74.9 percent. It is also true that during the same 25-year-period, per capita disposable income increased 223.2 percent. It is true food costs to the consumer are one-third higher than they were 20 years ago, but it is also true that wages are 2½ times higher. It is also true that retail food prices since 1965 have increased 33 percent, but during this same period, per capita income has increased 62 percent.

By the end of 1973 food prices are expected to be 43 percent higher than they were in 1963. That is an annual average increase of 4.3 percent. However, per capita disposable income increased 73.4 percent—an annual increase of 6.7 percent—between 1960 and 1971, and social security benefits for retired persons increased 84 percent—an average annual increase of 7.5 percent—during the past 11 years.

Twenty years ago the average household spent \$985 per year for food. In 1972 this had increased to \$1,311. Had food prices risen as much as industrial wages, the family annual food costs would have increased to \$2,365 instead of \$1,311.

During the boycotts, proud farmers and their families watched in dismay as boycotters shouted on TV that they could not boycott meat because it was already so high they could not afford it. And yet the facts are that in 1950 the per capita consumption of beef in the United States was 63.4 pounds and in 1972 it was 115.9 pounds.

An hour's wages—private, nongovernment, nonagricultural, and nonsupervisory workers—buys nearly 3 pounds of beef today compared to 1.8 pounds in 1950. An hour's wages for construction workers bought 2.5 pounds of beef in 1950 and now it buys 4.9 pounds. If beef prices had increased as much in the past 20 years as wages, they would be more than twice as high at the farm level.

When you look at the job the farmer has done at the farm price level, you realize how unfair some have been to accuse him for the food price increases or to want to hurt him economically as would much of the legislation that has been proposed.

For example, farm prices for food are only up 6 percent over 20 years ago while wholesale food prices are up 20 percent and retail food prices are up 43 percent. While the total cost of a loaf of bread rose from 13½ cents in 1947 to 24.8 cents in 1971, the total wheat cost per loaf

dropped from 2.7 cents to 2.6 cents. If the farmer gave his corn away, we could reduce the cost of a 32-cent box of corn flakes by 8.2 cents. The box costs more than that. We could also reduce the cost of a dollar's worth of canned corn by 11 cents.

We have known for some time that farmers were receiving less for their labor than nonfarmers, almost irregardless of what formula you used. Most formulas were not favorable to the farmer. Often his income was figured on the same base as a laborer even though the farm should be figured as a business just like General Motors, with consideration given for return on capital, management and labor.

For example a farmer with assets of \$200,000 should receive \$14,000 a year income—a 7 percent return on his investment—before you even start figuring his return for management or labor. Some economists use 5 percent of gross to establish a return for management in some fields. Many who compute the farmer's income omit consideration for either management or return on his investment and compare his return on an identical base with the average workingman, including omission of consideration for hours worked on the farm by members of the family.

Here on the floor of the House we heard many of our colleagues recently speak on the subject of minimum wages. We heard it said by many Congressmen that \$1.60 per hour was below the poverty level and that in 20 of our States, this is less than one receives when on welfare and food stamps. Based on the vote of 287 to 130 to increase the minimum wage from \$1.60 to \$2.20, it would appear that this body feels \$1.60 per hour is not high enough.

It may surprise this body to learn that in 1971 after giving the farmer a 7-percent return on his business assets—near the level of return the farmer could expect to get if he sold out and just drew interest without much risk, management or labor—he received a total of 74 cents an hour for his labor. This is not figuring a penny for his management. Last year's figure was 81 cents an hour. I hope those who voted for minimum wage increases will keep this in mind when a farm bill with support prices at break-even levels is brought before this body.

If the farmer is doing so well, why is it that tens of thousands of them are leaving the farms every year? Why have we lost an average of 100,000 of them annually since 1960? If the farmer is doing so well, why has his farm debt since 1960 increased 400 percent? If the farmer is doing so well, why is it his nonfarm income—that of those classified as farmers—has averaged greater than his farm income since 1960?

Inflation has caused higher food prices as well as higher prices of other goods and services. Is the farmer to blame? What causes inflation? It is caused by a shortage of goods and services in relation to dollars. The man-hour output of the farmworker has increased more than twice as much as the nonfarmworker in the past 20 years. If the nonfarmworker has increased his productivity as much as the farmworker, inflation would not

be a problem in America today and neither would we be experiencing such a trade deficit.

Were it not for farm exports, our Nation would have had a balance of trade deficit of \$10 billion last year. As it was, the deficit was \$6.8 billion. It was \$2.4 billion in 1971. The last 2 years were the first years since 1893 that the great productive America has bought more goods than it sold.

Some fear we will have a trade deficit in oil alone by 1980 of \$18 billion. Some economists say that without increasing our exports, this level of added imports would bankrupt our country. Where can we go to reverse our trade deficit? As I said earlier, we had a deficit of \$10 billion in manufactured goods last year. This leaves only farm goods where we had a surplus of exports over imports of nearly \$3.2 billion—after eliminating a billion in concessions.

I might add that in most cases, foreign countries are far tougher on our farm exports—in terms of quotas and duties—than they are on our manufactured goods, and they often do far more to subsidize their producers. In spite of this, our farm goods still compete. As a group, if they can compete under these conditions and produce a surplus in trade while manufactured goods represent a \$10 billion deficit, how can anyone say our farm goods are too high? How can they be too high if they represent the one area of production in this country priced cheaply enough to compete on the world market?

There was a time when there were sufficient numbers of Congressmen from farm districts to see that legislation damaging to rural America did not pass. Such is not the case today. In 1960 there were 31 U.S. Congressmen from districts with more than 25 percent of the population being rural-farm. Today there are only five, and my district is not one of the five. My district has less than 15 percent rural-farm. In 1960, 230 Congressmen had districts where more than half of their population lived on farms or in towns of 2,500 or less. Today there are only 85. In 1954, 165 Congressmen had districts that were 20 percent or more rural-farm and today there are only 14.

What does this mean? It means that if rural America is to have a standard of living anywhere near that of urban America and the American farmer is to be granted a reasonable level of income, it will happen because of an understanding urban Congress.

It also means that if urban America is to be well-fed, this same urban Congress must be able to understand the farm production process and those factors which influence this production.

For example, we recently went through a situation where consumers were boycotting meat. Some encouraged this. Prior to the boycotts the cattlemen and farmers in my district were talking about keeping back heifer replacements, saving cows, buying additional females, increasing their investments in both cow herds and machinery to feed them. They were doing this because beef prices were going up and it appeared a stable market for beef was ahead.

When I returned to my district during the middle of the boycotts, I found farmers and cattlemen selling heifers they had originally intended to keep to produce more beef in the future. Money that was to have gone for machinery to feed increased beef cow herds was being diverted to other areas. The consumer, along with urging from others through her boycotts and television statements, had succeeded in discouraging increased beef production instead of encouraging it, and this means she will get higher meat prices or meat shortages for her efforts.

Beef cattle represents a high-investment industry. To make long-term investments in beef, one must anticipate a good and stable market in the future. With boycotts, along with threatened ceilings and rollbacks, farmers were not encouraged to make long-range beef investments.

On March 15, 1973, the President said food ceilings would not work. On March 29, 1973, he placed a ceiling on meat prices. On May 1, 1973, soybean meal had increased \$100 per ton and corn had increased 35 cents per bushel. Since then corn and soybean meal have continued their climb. Other feeds have also increased. Farmers and feeders are squeezed between increasing costs of production—including a higher minimum wage imposed by this body—and a ceiling price on their end product.

Who is being hurt? The consumer may think she is benefiting by the ceiling. She may also think the farmer is the one who is being hurt. While the farmer is being hurt, he is not being hurt nearly as much as the consumer.

The farmer and feeder is no dummy. When his cost of production exceeds his income, he sells. When he loses money each time he puts on a pound of beef on a critter in the feedlot—which is the case today depending on the price of the feeders—he sells. When he sells a steer at 900 pounds instead of 1,200 pounds, that is 300 pounds that will never see the light of day.

The calves following their mothers in pastures throughout rural America represent the beef we will have available in American supermarkets in about a year. There is nothing we can do within reason to increase their numbers. Right now we permit an unlimited amount of beef to come into this country without any quota or duty. We can decrease their numbers as was the case this winter due to weather. And we can decrease the tonnage they produce by imposing ceilings which make it unprofitable for feeders to feed them to heavier weights.

The rollback would have been even more disastrous by putting tens of thousands of producers out of business overnight.

We face a dilemma today. Consumer demands for food are increasing both at home and abroad. We need to attack inflation by being more productive, and who is more productive than the farmer? We need to stabilize the weakening American dollar, reverse the trade deficit, offset the oil imports that are sure to increase, and reverse our balance-of-payments situation.

In view of these pressing needs, now is not the time to be talking of boycotts,

ceilings, rollbacks or other intimidations of the farmer which instead of encouraging him to produce more, serve only to discourage him from increasing production. Given proper profit motive, understanding on your part, and a reason to believe that he can look forward to a good market in the future, you will see the American farmer produce like he has never produced before.

SAMPLING OF RETURNS IN THIRD DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE OPINION POLL QUESTIONNAIRE REVEALS STRONG FEELINGS ON VITAL ISSUES

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, residents of the Third District of Tennessee are now returning their ballots in my third annual opinion poll and I find that they are taking strong positions on several of the most pressing issues of the day.

Tabulation of a representative sample of these returns from all 11 counties of the Third District indicates that my constituents are firm in their opposition to making strikers eligible for food stamps. They are as overwhelming in their stand against giving aid to North Vietnam as they are in granting amnesty to draft evaders in this country. They are also against any increase in taxes even if it means sacrificing some of the Federal programs now in operation. They look with skepticism on the fairness of news reporting and my constituents have taken a stand against a disaster fund to be underwritten by a surcharge on casualty insurance premium plus a contribution from the Federal Government.

The sample tabulation shows that the residents of the Third District are in favor of reinstating the death penalty for certain crimes. They also favor the legal right of a nonunion worker to keep his job even though a majority of the workers have voted for a closed shop.

In the ballots tabulated so far, there is approval for President Nixon's action in withholding funds to terminate a number of federally sponsored social programs, and by a closer margin, they do not feel that the Watergate incident is a reflection on the President's integrity.

It is the opinion of my constituents as reflected in this sampling that we should return to mandatory wage and price controls on all goods and services as a means of combatting inflation. They also feel that a newsman should be required to reveal the sources of his published statements where slander is involved.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this is a representative sampling of the returns to date, but it does indicate as I have stated, an unmistakable trend of opinion on pressing issues. I am including the overall percentages on all 12 of the questions in the poll. On each of the ballots, there is a space for both husband and wife to vote, and on many of them

I have found a decided difference of opinion. The tabulation is continuing and the complete results of the poll will be announced when this work is completed. The return has been excellent and I expect additional thousands of ballots in the days ahead.

The questions asked in this third annual poll with the "yes" and "no" percentages on each of the questions are included herewith so that my colleagues can see how opinion is running in the Third District of Tennessee:

LAMAR BAKER'S 1973 OPINION POLL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Should strikers be eligible to receive food stamps?

[In percent]

Yes ----- 19
No ----- 81

2. Should we return to mandatory wage and price controls on all goods and services?

Yes ----- 54
No ----- 46

3. Would you favor U.S. assistance in rebuilding North Viet Nam?

Yes ----- 6
No ----- 94

4. Would you support establishing some conditions whereby amnesty could be extended to draft evaders?

Yes ----- 15
No ----- 85

5. Should the death penalty be selectively reinstated?

Yes ----- 86
No ----- 14

6. Do you consider the Watergate incident a reflection on the President's integrity?

Yes ----- 42
No ----- 58

7. Would you favor establishing a disaster fund financed by a surcharge on casualty insurance plus a federal contribution?

Yes ----- 40
No ----- 60

8. Should a newsman be required to reveal the sources of his published statements where slander is involved?

Yes ----- 64
No ----- 36

9. Do you consider newspapers and T.V. as fairly presenting all sides of most news issues?

Yes ----- 30
No ----- 70

10. Should a non-union worker have a legal right to work on a job even though a majority of the workers have voted for a closed shop?

Yes ----- 78
No ----- 22

11. President Nixon has withheld funds which might terminate a number of Federal social programs. Do you approve of this action?

Yes ----- 73
No ----- 27

12. Would you be willing to pay more taxes to keep all of the Federal programs intact without increasing the Federal deficit?

Yes ----- 1
No ----- 99

POLLUTIONLESS POWER SOURCE TESTED

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the benefits of our national space program are all around us in our daily lives.

Many have received almost immediate application throughout our industry. There is also a large group of developments which hold great potential for future importance to this Nation and the world. Among these are devices called fuel cells which produce clean electric power. Mr. Robert W. Wells, in a May 12, 1973, article in the National Observer, describes the adoption of the fuel cell technology by American industry and its willingness to invest in fuel cell technology based on the successes of using these devices in our national space program. The article follows:

[From the National Observer, May 12, 1973]
POLLUTIONLESS POWER SOURCE TESTED: FUEL CELLS FOR HOME USE?

(By Robert W. Wells)

Fuel cells, the devices that were the main source of electrical power for the Apollo space craft, hold promise as one way to produce electricity without polluting the environment much. The main problem is that for now the method is too expensive for widespread use.

But some gas and electric companies aim to market a practical, commercial fuel-cell system by 1976. Their first major efforts to do so have just ended, and a spokesman proclaims "dramatically encouraging results."

Fuel cells convert chemical energy into electrical energy through separation and combination of hydrogen and oxygen. In one experiment here, the Wisconsin Gas Co. says fuel cells provided about 75 per cent of the power needed by four mobile homes for four months.

John Brady, assistant vice president of the company, says similar experiments were conducted in 37 other locations in the United States, Canada, and Japan by a nonprofit consortium of 35 gas and electric companies.

SOME PROBLEMS DISCUSSED

"I don't think there's any question but that the fuel cell will work technically," Brady says. "The only real problem left is to reduce the cost."

There were a few problems in the Milwaukee experiment. Brady says the cells broke down six times during the experiment, forcing an automatic switch to power-company lines. But he says causes of the breakdowns were known and could be eliminated. Once a water line connected to a cell froze. This was corrected by improved insulation.

"Then the weather turned unexpectedly warm and it overheated," says Brady. So other insulation was developed that worked in either hot or cold weather.

Once, a cell was shut down accidentally by a radio transmission. This was corrected by adding shielding.

One purpose of the experiment was to discover such "bugs" and find means of remedying them. So the occasional problems that arose did not mean the experiment was not a success, Brady adds.

The fuel cells here were shut down after about 1,850 hours because they were beginning to die out. It had been hoped they would last for 2,000. Nevertheless, the consortium's over-all goal of 100,000 hours of cell use in the international experiment was exceeded.

About \$50 million has been spent in development of the 60 units that were tested, including the 4 used here. Officials say the price must be brought down to \$1,000 a unit before the cells can compete with other power sources.

HOW FUEL CELLS WORK

The fuel cell takes hydrogen from natural gas and oxygen from air. The gases are first separated into carbon dioxide, oxygen, and hydrogen in a device called a reformer. Then the separated gases are fed into the fuel cell,

which forces the oxygen and hydrogen electrons to make a detour before combining. The electrons' motion along the way produces electricity.

The result is direct current that is sent to an inverter. The inverter changes it into alternating current. The cell supplies electricity only when it is needed and is able to provide power almost instantaneously to meet load demands. The cell's only emissions are carbon dioxide, water, and heat.

Each test unit is about the size of a home central air-conditioning unit and was supposed to produce about 12 kilowatts of electricity, enough to supply two or three average homes. The cells have no moving parts and are almost noiseless.

The cells are said to be about one-third more efficient than more conventional steam-generating methods and can be strung together for additional power.

The principle is not new. The first crude fuel cell was produced 133 years ago by a British scientist, Sir William Grove. He combined oxygen and hydrogen to produce water and a little electricity.

A Milwaukee company, the Allis-Chalmers Corp., began doing fuel-cell research in 1958. It produced an experimental tractor operated by a fuel cell producing 20 horsepower, but it was never developed further for practical use.

STATE BAR UNIT BACKS PREPAID LEGAL SERVICE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have come across a recent New York Law Journal article by Associate Publisher Nelson Seitel. The article, which cites support for H.R. 77 by a New York State Bar Association's special committee, is most appropriate as that bill will be on the House floor tomorrow:

STATE BAR UNIT BACKS PREPAID LEGAL SERVICE—ALBANY, CONGRESS URGED TO APPROVE MEASURES ON INSURANCE PLANS

(By Nelson Seitel)

Legislation at the federal and state levels to permit the establishment of prepaid legal services programs has been recommended by the Special Committee on Availability of Legal Services of the New York State Bar Association.

At the federal level, the committee recommended an amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act to allow employer contributions to trust funds for the payment of legal services and amendments of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude such payments from the gross income of the employee and to allow the deductibility of such payments from the gross income of employers.

STATE LEGISLATION

At the state level, the committee recommended legislation to authorize the issuance of legal services insurance contracts by insurance companies and legislation to exempt from the Insurance Law legal services insurance plans offered by state, city, or county Bar associations.

A bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, as recommended by the committee, has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Frank Thompson, Jr., D-N.J. Hearings on the bill were held in March before the House special subcommittee on labor headed by Rep. Thompson.

The bill (H.R. 77) would specifically per-

mit the establishment of joint management and labor-administered trust funds to defray the costs of legal services. The Taft-Hartley Act now permits such jointly administered trust funds for more medical care programs, retirement pension plans and other specific programs which do not include legal services.

The legislative program spelled out by the committee is in response to the deepening concern within the legal professional that nonindigent, moderate-income persons are not seeking legal services because of the high costs involved. In order to determine the extent of such unmet needs for legal services, the American Bar Association last year appointed a Special Committee to Survey the Legal Needs of the Public.

According to Chief Judge David N. Edelstein, of the U. S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, a member of this ABA committee, its task is two-fold: "To design and execute a survey of the public and to report the findings of the study and make appropriate recommendations." Judge Edelstein is "hopeful that the study will lead to reforms that will assure that no person is deprived of the help of a lawyer when needed."

LOUISIANA PROJECT

An experiment in prepaid legal insurance has been operating in Shreveport, La., since 1971, under sponsorship of the local Bar, with financial support from the American Bar Association and the Ford Foundation and the cooperation of a local union and employers. Under this plan, membership is available to the union members who voluntarily participate by authorizing a payroll deduction of two cents an hour.

Coverage under the plan includes reimbursement for legal fees incurred by the insured or his dependents up to specified maximums. There are no restrictions under the plan upon the free choice of a lawyer. Similar programs that have been established elsewhere utilize the concept of a pre-selected panel of lawyers.

The State Bar Association Special Committee on Availability of Legal Services is headed by Edwin L. Gasperini of New York City. Members of the committee from this area are Mary B. Lehman, John J. Munnely, Frank W. Ford, Jr., Gail J. Koff, James W. Lamberton, Nathan Ritzer, Richard H. Sauder, Robert Schutzman, Susan S. Topper, Harold Tompkins, and Edward R. Yamin.

NO TIME FOR TALK OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1973

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from California, Mr. McCloskey, appears to be a direct intellectual descendant of the frontier judge who assured the folks "the criminal will get a fair trial before he is hanged."

I make no claim to omniscience, nor am I privy to any special knowledge regarding Watergate and related matters. It would appear to me that this House might well await the myriad court proceedings before it decides to act in so grave a matter.

I await protestations from the defenders of the rights of the accused. They have remained strangely silent through

much of the talk of impeachment, and one wonders if the spectre of discrimination lurks, when they clamor for these rights in police court, and ignore them when the highest office in our land is at stake.

CREDIBILITY OF McCORD AND DEAN IN THE WATERGATE MESS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, American people are becoming more confused each day about the Watergate scandal. Seven men were indicted, pleaded guilty, and were convicted for the June 17, 1972, burglary and bugging. Certainly any others who were involved should, if sustained by competent proof, receive similar treatment.

Some witnesses have been obviously fair and truthful; others have been of very doubtful veracity.

Out of this mass of confusion, aside from those indicted, others appear to have had advance knowledge of what was planned, and others appear to have engaged in coverup schemes designed to prevent public disclosure of those who may have condoned or encouraged the burglary.

PUBLIC MUST SIFT MOTIVATIONS

The atmosphere has thus been polluted by investigations, hearings, rumors, interviews, contradictions, jealousies, and the most astounding array of hearsay and double hearsay probably ever before developed on one subject—not even excepting the Kennedy assassination in Dallas or the Kennedy coverup at Chapquidick.

In presenting the case to the public, the news media has been both responsible and irresponsible. To some segments it has provided a Roman holiday, with a wide range of stories predicated upon "a source reported," "White House informant," "a former associate," "reported to have been told to the grand jury," and any number of other background sources designed to avoid names and lend a tone of credulity to the contents. Vendettas were launched against the President by certain TV outlets, columnists, and such newspapers as the New York Times and the Washington Post.

It was in the coverup area that the confusion has been compounded by a parade of witnesses whose credibility leaves much to be desired.

MCCORD'S MOTIVATIONS

But what about other witnesses who have eagerly sought public exposure? For example, take the case of James W. McCord, one of the seven who pleaded guilty after being caught in the act. But before the judge decided on penalties he would assess, McCord hurriedly wrote him a letter and said he would like to talk about others whom he said were implicated.

That was well and good. But what were his motives? Why did he wait until after his conviction before he developed

an urge to talk? His explanations have been rather incoherent.

The press revealed that McCord had insisted the White House save him from prison—or else. Does that mean that had he been saved, he would not have talked? If so, in his subsequent sensational disclosures, was he or was he not moved by a stricken conscience?

Or, can it be that he envisioned that by talking—generously—such conduct might cause the judge to favor him on judgment day?

It is well to keep in mind that McCord's former chief counsel has stated categorically, under oath, that McCord had lied in several vital respects—and that attorney bears the trappings of an honorable man.

And observers have been unable to learn of any rational reason why McCord, after assuring Judge Sirica he wanted to tell all, in the hours and hours of intensive grilling which followed failed to recall his more recent claim that he was told by a man who had been told by someone that the President would, after imprisonment, grant him executive clemency.

It would seem that this contention, directly refuted by McCord's alleged informer, plus McCord's failure to disclose it to the grand jury where he testified, and in his first appearance before the Ervin committee, raises grave questions of credibility and motivation.

MCCORD'S BOOK ON WATERGATE

Moreover, Senate committee testimony revealed that McCord long ago—even before his trial—decided to write a book on Watergate. Can it be that in order to obtain national prominence and enhance the sale of his forthcoming book he was prompted to grab the headlines, get the maximum of free TV coverage, and embellish his script in a way that would tend to make him a national celebrity and perhaps create a scramble for his autograph? Indeed McCord may very well hope for a best seller and he may dream of vast profits.

The man may have told the truth, up and down the line, but his eagerness and generosity in forming his own conclusions not based upon personal knowledge, along with signs of personal animus, makes it necessary to scrutinize his testimony and public declarations with unusual care and caution.

MCCORD CLAIMS BURGLARY—BUGGING LEGAL

One other thing: McCord was probably the best trained of the 7 culprits, in terms of expertise in what the law does or does not allow security operatives to do in a legal manner. He had spent years in the FBI and in the Central Intelligence Agency. He is no dummy. In fact, he appears to be an unusually intelligent man.

Yet, when asked why at 2:20 in the morning he stealthily broke into the Watergate headquarters, taking precautions to avoid detection, he insisted he did not think he was violating any law.

To me such an assertion is utterly preposterous, regardless of any excuses. As I see it, any person with sense enough to get in out of the rain knows that Mc-

Cord knew he was violating the law when he joined in that postmidnight break-in. Yet McCord swore he believed at the time that he was engaged in a perfectly legal action.

For a mature, intelligent man, with no previous history of mental disorders, to make such contentions is simply beyond belief.

There is an old saying in law that a man who falsifies in one respect can hardly be believed in other respects, short of solid corroboration.

JOHN DEAN'S DESPAIR FOR PRISON

Now, let me refer to John Dean, a former White House counsel, who was fired and then went on a shopping tour, offering to talk aplenty to anybody who would offer to keep him out of the penitentiary. He seems to have gone from door to door, offering his will talk wares to the highest bidder—or to any bidder in a position to engage in a trade-out or an offer of immunity from prosecution for his own misdeeds.

That is well and good—if he tells the truth, and if what he tells is worth the price. But, as in the case of McCord, what are his motives?

In all court trials where a witness testifies, the very first question that arises, bearing on veracity and credibility, is: What are that witness' motives?

The press reported that Dean made it known he had an obsession against going to prison. One reason he was said to abhor the prospect of going to prison was that he said he feared his handsome looks and youthful appearance would make him a likely sex target for other prisoners.

In this backdrop, it follows that anything John Dean says is somewhat suspect—to say the least. Perhaps he will tell the truth, and we can only hope he does. But his credibility is severely clouded. Without adequate corroboration, who could afford to believe anything he says?

The groping and floundering of John Dean since the finger of suspicion first pointed his way have been on the ludicrous side. With no apparent reason he rather defiantly informed the press, even before he lost his job, that he would not be a scapegoat.

Perhaps Alsop's June 6 column contains a paragraph or two which typifies Dean's modus operandi—as follows:

In the course of this search for a promise of immunity, Dean has also changed his story radically—at least if the New York Times is to be believed. Some time ago, the Times reported that in long interviews, both federal and Senate investigators had discovered Dean had no evidence to link Mr. Nixon either to prior knowledge of the Watergate bugging or to any subsequent cover-up.

Apparently, however, John Dean was lying then, unless he is lying now. This choice is unavoidable, since Dean has now told the Senate investigators that he has quantities of evidence of just the kind he formerly denied having.

In addition, there is another choice between Dean's current story being a fabric of untruths, or the President of the United States being a liar.

Thus, we find Dean following the pattern set by McCord, of giving birth to after-thoughts which presumably would add to their studied desire to create favorable images and enhance their known desires and hopes to escape punishment for their own misdeeds.

It is unfortunate that witnesses, free of ulterior motives, cannot be found to give the public the full unvarnished truth about Watergate. Perhaps better evidence will be forthcoming. We can only hope so.

Thus far the public has admittedly been plagued with an avalanche of evidence. Much of it incompetent as legal evidence, and personal conclusions which do violence to basic rules of law.

The Senate committee hearings, controlled by no rules of evidence, open a Pandora's box for hearsay charges and unfounded conclusions. It enables the media to magnify and headline statements which any presiding judge would abhor and never allow to be recorded as competent evidence.

This procedure can play havoc with established processes of justice and can do serious and unwarranted damage to the reputations of innocent people.

I have no quarrel of the congressional investigatory procedure. But when carried on in public, particularly with nationwide TV coverage, it can be terribly abused and their real purpose and justification can so easily be submerged in the mounting of incompetent evidence that is fed into the RECORD and into the minds of listeners.

And we are told such fishing expeditions may, unhappily, seriously interfere with law enforcement and the normal administration of justice.

HALE BOGGS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the late Hale Boggs was a close friend of mine, and I join my colleagues in paying tribute to his distinguished and dedicated service to the citizens of our great country.

I shall always remember the time that we revived the legendary Order of the Rose. Realizing that our Nation was encountering particularly difficult periods of unrest, we sought—through the Order of the Rose—to reaffirm the fact that most Americans do have deep feelings for the great principles upon which the United States was founded. The small rose attached to one's clothing on the side of the heart would indicate one's belief in those higher principles.

Hale Boggs never lost sight of our strength and our heritage, and he always attempted to do his part in keeping the good vessel United States on a proper course. We owe much to his leadership, and I am confident that this Chamber will always keep alive the spirit of our good friend Hale Boggs.

FEDERAL COURTS REJECT IMPOUNDMENT IN EIGHT OF NINE CASES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, despite all of the so-called justification and precedent cited by officials of Office of Management and Budget before committees of the Congress in support of the impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress, the Federal courts have repeatedly held that the arbitrary withholding and freezing of funds is illegal.

Federal judges have ruled impoundments unlawful in cases involving water pollution, highway construction, veterans' education, welfare and social security, Indian education. Eight of nine court tests have resulted in rulings that impoundments are illegal and the courts have divested that funds appropriated by Congress be released.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place in the Record herewith an article concerning these court tests of impoundment published in the Washington Sunday Star and News.

The article follows:

COURTS REJECT IMPOUNDMENT IN EIGHT OF NINE CASES

(By Fred Barnes)

The Maryland Department of Employment and Social Services, its treasury increased by some \$20 million, will send out welfare checks as usual tomorrow.

But the stipends will be provided only because two federal courts last week forced the Nixon administration to fork over the \$20 million, which it had impounded for several weeks.

The Social Security Act required the administration to hand over the money, said Judge Edward S. Northrop of U.S. District Court in Baltimore in ruling on a suit filed by Maryland officials.

And the 4th U.S. Court of Appeals, rejecting a request by Justice Department attorneys representing the administration, refused to block Northrop's order while the administration works up a formal appeal.

The Maryland case represented another embarrassing court defeat on impoundment for the administration—its eighth loss in a row.

Federal judges have ruled that impoundment was unlawful in cases involving water pollution, highway, Indian education, veterans education, housing and welfare funds.

Clearly, impoundment has turned into a legal disaster area for the administration. Its overall court record is 1-8, with the lone victory coming in April 1972 when a federal judge in San Francisco upheld the impoundment of federal housing funds.

Besides the Maryland case, the administration has suffered these recent court defeats on impoundment:

The 8th U.S. Court of Appeals, in a ruling chastising the administration for changing its argument in midstream, declined to tamper with an order instructing the administration to turn highway construction funds over to Missouri officials.

Prodded by Judge Gerhard Gessell of U.S. District Court here, the administration was forced to begin spending \$25 million appropriated to spur college enrollment by Vietnam veterans. The money had been im-

pounded after Congress refused to withdraw its appropriation of the funds.

Judge Robert R. Merhige Jr. of U.S. District Court in Richmond, calling impoundment a "flagrant abuse of executive discretion," ruled that the administration must immediately release Virginia's share of impounded water pollution control funds.

The political or ideological persuasion of the federal judge involved in an impoundment case apparently makes little difference. Both liberals and conservatives have ruled against impoundment.

Gessell and Merhige, for instance, are two of the most liberal judges in the federal judiciary. But Northrop and the judges on the 4th U.S. Court of Appeals are among the most conservative.

For the administration, things may soon get worse. At least a dozen impoundment suits are now pending and others are expected to be filed by state and local governments whose hopes have been buoyed by the recent rulings.

In a suit filed in U.S. District Court here on Friday, Pennsylvania and the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh are seeking \$380 million in impounded education funds.

The other pending impoundment suits involve funds for highway construction, water pollution control, education, environmental assistance, rural electrification and land grant colleges.

The administration has already appealed what is perhaps its worst impoundment defeat in court. That was the ruling by Judge Oliver Gasch of U.S. District Court here that the administration must release \$6 billion in water pollution control money.

The Gasch ruling has been challenged before the U.S. Court of Appeals. The Maryland case, once it is appealed by the administration, will be heard quickly by the 4th U.S. Court of Appeals, with a ruling expected late this summer.

TO EXTEND AND AMEND THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2246, a bill to extend and amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The administration has offered no sound arguments for terminating the economic development assistance program. It has claimed that the accomplishments of EDA programs have fallen far short of expectations, that the programs lead to Federal involvement where it is not needed and might lead to a distortion of local priorities, and that there is a great deal of functional overlapping which results in wasteful duplication at the local level.

The charge that the achievements of EDA programs have fallen short of expectations is just not correct. Because this legislation created a new and experimental means for stimulating economic growth, many evaluations have been conducted, including those by the EDA, by outside consultants, and by the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the House Public Works Committee. These studies have all demonstrated that these programs have been

successful in stimulating the economic growth of the target areas and in promoting permanent jobs in those areas. It has done this despite the fact that the administration has funded it at only one-third its authorized level.

The claim by the administration that EDA's programs cause Federal involvement where it is not needed and that this could lead to a distortion of local priorities is also false. EDA's policy has always been oriented toward local communities, with spending decisions made locally. EDA is a valuable planning and technical assistance vehicle that is needed by hundreds of communities across the country to implement the priority projects they support and need. In fact, the EDA, with its veto power, serves to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful Federal spending in local communities.

The statement of the administration that there is too much overlapping and duplication of function is illogical in light of its own proposals. It wants to amend the Small Business Act, the Rural Development Act, the Housing and Development Act, and pass the urban community development special revenue sharing proposal in order to give HUD, and the organization that will be established by the Rural Development Act, the legislative authority and funding authorization that EDA already has. This will only mean more duplication and more overlapping.

The administration has no mechanism to implement its program if Congress does not pass special revenue sharing. Secretary Dent, testifying before the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the House Committee on Public Works, answered the question of what the administration would do if Congress dares not to pass revenue sharing by saying:

There will be a review of the situation at the time.

EDA is needed, at least until special revenue sharing is passed and implemented to take its place.

Even if revenue sharing is passed by Congress, it cannot take effect until July 1974. The authorization for existing economic development programs terminates on June 30, 1973. This 1-year gap could severely cripple this program and quite possibly wipe out the economic gains that have been made. Economic development is a slow, careful, step-by-step process that is very vulnerable to any changes in policy. A 1-year interruption of the program, followed by a swift shift from one agency, with expertise and experience in the area, to several agencies that will have to acquire the expertise, could prove to be a devastating shock, setting economic development back, rather than moving it forward. At the very least, the existing legislation should be continued for another year in order to provide for an orderly transition of economic development programs.

Public facility assistance under the Rural Development Act is primarily a nationwide rural loan program. This is not a satisfactory substitute for existing programs. Many areas that are econom-

ically distressed are urban, not rural. Both urban and rural areas need assistance through grants, not loans. Many of these areas cannot afford loans and would receive no assistance under such a loan program.

The President's proposed allocation of an additional \$10 million for the Housing and Urban Development Act's section 701 planning program is not a satisfactory substitute for the title V regional commissions of EDA. This is an 80 percent reduction in funding, and would mean the virtual elimination of the regional commissions. Without the power to make grants, the Federal portion of the existing Federal-State partnership would become an impotent planning mechanism. Local officials have stated repeatedly, in the Subcommittee for Economic Development's hearings on EDA, that the partnership is an effective and efficient mechanism for economic development. It should not be abandoned.

The amendment proposed by Senator KENNEDY requiring a study of the economic impact of base closings is very important for improving our Nation's economy. Over 42,000 civilian and military jobs will be lost nationally. This is also a major blow to many local economies that we cannot ignore.

High unemployment, aging capital stock, and astronomical energy costs are only a few of the economic problems that face New England. With a loss of 34,000 civilian and military jobs in New England, caused by the base closings, our economic situation is approaching a crisis. A study of the economic impact of the base closings would open up possible avenues which could be taken to help alleviate the detrimental effects of the massive job loss. These avenues could then be implemented by refunded and effective title V regional commissions.

We spend billions annually to fund the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Perhaps if more than one-tenth of one percent of what we spend for the military was spent on EDA, we could achieve economic progress as spectacular as our military failures in Vietnam.

SHOPLIFTING HAS A PRICE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association has launched an important campaign throughout the State of Illinois to alert young people to the high cost they will be asked to pay for shoplifting.

The men and women of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association are to be congratulated for sponsoring this campaign which has brought its message to young people in all parts of the State.

By distributing a thoughtful and attractive pamphlet entitled, "Everything Has a Price," the antishoplifting campaign, sponsored jointly by the Retail

Merchants and Chicago Radio Station WLS, has helped to make students aware of the great risk entailed in breaking the law.

This pamphlet informs them that, You can be arrested at any age. A store official can stop, detain, and have you arrested if there is reasonable evidence that you have taken something. Stealing is a crime whether the item is worth 5 cents or \$500. More and more specialized surveillance and detection equipment is being installed in stores. Everything has a price. Shoplifting can cost you plenty.

Many young people are unaware of the damage which may be done to their future lives by shoplifting. This pamphlet informs them that,

Immediately when the police are called a file is started, even if the store doesn't press charges. Your record is permanent if convicted. Even if not convicted, it may be permanent. A criminal record automatically closes many job opportunities. And nobody, including your friends, trusts a known thief.

I wish to share with my colleagues the text of the pamphlet being distributed by the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and WLS Radio, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

EVERYTHING HAS A PRICE

JUDY'S PEACH TURNED INTO A LEMON

It seemed like such a cinch. Why pay for a candy bar when you work at the local grocery store three times a week? But Judy's lifting got a little too heavy. Her part-time job turned into part-time robbery. Finally her sticky fingers got stuck.

The store manager was watching her for some time before he caught her in the act. She was fired immediately. Then he called the police and turned Judy over to the juvenile authorities. One year probation followed.

Funny how Judy's friends seemed to dwindle. Maybe because suddenly a probation officer was limiting her activities, her hours, her freedom. Maybe some people are just picky about who they call friend. Judy paid the price.

Steal, stole, stuck.

FACT

You can be arrested at any age. A store official can stop, detain, and have you arrested if there is reasonable evidence that you have taken something.

Stealing is a crime whether the item is worth 5 cents or \$500.

More and more specialized surveillance and detection equipment is being installed in stores.

Everything has a price.

Shoplifting can cost you plenty.

JEFF TRADED A RECORD FOR A RECORD

When Jeff went into the store that Saturday, stealing an album was the farthest thing from his mind. But a dare from his two friends was too much to take. He wasn't chicken. Until a man stepped out from behind a two-way mirrored door. And brought him into his office. And called his parents. And the police.

He was brought to the station, and his record filed in the juvenile division. Unluckily, the juvenile court sent him to a community agency. Jeff paid the price.

A little pressure from his friends, and Jeff didn't have the guts to keep his hands to himself. Now he has free room and board. Such a steal.

FACT

Immediately when the police are called, a file is started, even if the store doesn't press charges.

Your record is permanent if convicted.

Even if not convicted, it may be permanent. A criminal record automatically closes many job opportunities.

And nobody, including your friends, trusts a known thief.

Everything has a price.

Shoplifting can cost you plenty.

FRAN'S FINGERS GOT OUT OF HAND

Maybe Fran thought the store would never miss a few pieces of clothing. Or perhaps she was just looking for a bargain. It was a real steal, all right. Little did she know that when she put her own clothes over some that weren't her own, that they were electronically treated. The store knew.

Fran's bargain turned into a burden. She was caught. And from then on everything went wrong. She was 17—eligible for women's court. And the time she had been caught stealing a tube of lipstick came back to haunt her.

Fran's now in a women's penitentiary. And will be wearing the latest in gray for a year. Fran paid a high price for her lifting. A real steal is often a gyp.

FACT

When convicted, depending on your record and the seriousness of your theft, you can be:

Fined up to \$500.

Sent to a penitentiary.

Sent to a correctional institution.

Referred to a public or private agency.

Put on probation, under the constant surveillance of a youth officer.

Shoplifting losses force stores to increase prices and cut jobs. Young people with part-time jobs or new, full-time jobs are the first to go.

Everything has a price.

Shoplifting can cost you plenty.

I.R.M.A./WLS Radio Anti-Shoplifting Campaign

Illinois Retail Merchants Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

WLS Radio, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60601 (312) 782-2002.

FEED GRAIN EXPORT EMBARGO

HON. E. C. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain a most urgent piece of legislation I have introduced today and to ask you to support its passage at the earliest possible moment. The bill would impose a 120-day embargo on the export of certain key feed grains—soybeans, corn, and wheat—beginning 10 days after its enactment. This is a drastic step which I believe warrants some explanation.

First, I think it would be in order for me to give you some numbers. Last year, the United States produced a record crop of soybeans, some 1.283 billion bushels. At the same time, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, based on 1971 estimates of 1973 soybean demand, idled some 60 million acres of soybean cropland. Furthermore, of the nearly 1.3 billion bushels, an estimated 475 million bushels, over one-third of the total crop, were scheduled for export. Unfortunately, those 1971 estimates did not anticipate certain other elements which, as it turned out, sharply changed the 1973 demand picture.

I think it is necessary in this discussion to understand the significance of the soybean, although the same is true, to a lesser extent, of the other feed grains. The soybean contains a high percentage of vegetable protein and is the leading meat substitute as a source of protein. It is a vital component of livestock and poultry feed and is the main source of protein for many farm animals that subsequently become protein sources for humans. Agricultural products directly affected by the soybean include beef, pork, chickens, turkeys, eggs, and milk.

Here in the United States, one unanticipated development was a rise in discretionary income during 1971 and 1972. The people had more money to spend on food. As a result, the demand for the agricultural products I listed a moment ago climbed well above that anticipated by USDA in 1971. So we got into a shortage situation on these products. Farmers, in turn, attempted to expand the supply, once the situation was finally recognized, and that created an excessive demand for soybeans and other key feed grains.

This situation was aggravated by a number of other developments overseas. For some unknown reason, the Humboldt current off the South American coast began warming up. This affected the plankton on which the fish feed and so the fish supply there diminished. The fish catch off Peru was down sharply, a serious development because Peruvian fish catch, in normal years, is an important source of protein in a number of parts of the world. Then adverse weather conditions reduced the Argentinian soybean crop. There were serious droughts in Australia, China, and the eastern Soviet Union, usually major producers of soybeans and feed grains. All of these factors combined to produce a worldwide protein shortage of crisis proportions. This is the situation we find ourselves in right now.

The results of this, here in the United States, have been disastrous. Prices of the key feed grains have gone up precipitously. Soybeans were up over 30 percent; corn, up 81 percent; livestock feed, up 60 percent; poultry feed, up 91 percent. Poultry and livestock producers found themselves in a situation where not only had their entire profit margin disappeared, but they literally could not afford to feed their stock. It makes me heartsick to report to you what is happening now. Left with no other alternative, livestock producers, poultry producers, egg and dairy producers are now slaughtering their stock because they either cannot afford to feed them or they cannot even get the feed grains to feed them. Dairy cows are being slaughtered for meat. Egg laying chickens are being killed and sent to market. Valuable breeding herds that were to produce our future meat stocks are being killed. Do you realize what this is going to mean in a few months? It means that you may be paying a dollar a dozen for eggs by August. It means that what meat is available will cost astronomical prices that you would not believe today. In my home State of Pennsylvania, milk and dairy products are our single largest agricul-

tural product and we are one of the Nation's major milk producers. I know what is happening to our dairy herds and it sickens me to think about it.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing an incredible food crisis and that crisis is now. We cannot wait until the anticipated bumper fall harvest because it will be too late by then. Our food producing herds and flocks will be decimated by then. And they will not be so easily rebuilt. It will take many years to restore our cattle herds. It will take at least six months to a year to rebuild the swine herds. It will take at least 4 to 6 months to restore the poultry flocks. Thus, the Nation will be faced with a protein crisis at least through the fall of 1974. Protein products simply will not be available except perhaps on a ration basis. This is the crisis that faces us.

Now let us look at what has been done so far and what options are open to us. The USDA has released all of its feed grain stocks and emptied its silos. That has helped. The Department also has revised its set aside requirements so that an additional 45 million acres has been brought under cultivation. As a result, the fall soybean crop is expected to be in the area of 1.5 billion bushels. This is all good but it is not enough.

Right now, we are continuing to export our feed grains even as this terrible shortage exists at home. And here is a further irony. The necessity to ship these export grains to ports of entry is tying up railroad boxcars to the extent that even where feed grain is available for our farmers, they cannot get it. Some of our feed grain is actually rotting in the silos. Meanwhile, every day, our herds and flocks are being cut back. Farmers are going into bankruptcy or simply getting out of the business. And I think you gentlemen realize that once out, it is going to be very difficult to bring these farmers back.

Now you may ask, why has not the administration imposed a temporary embargo on grain exports, the clearly obvious thing to do. It already has that power under the Export Administration Act. I will tell you why. Not only is it more concerned about the balance of payments than about the American consumer, it is also deeply concerned about those export markets that USDA has worked so very hard to develop and nurture over the years. I acknowledge that this is a reasonable concern, but I believe it to be unrealistic, shortsighted, and a matter of distorted priorities. I disagree on several points. I do not agree that if we simply delay our export shipments for 120 days until we get our fall crop harvested that these export markets will go away. Those markets exist, because there is a tremendous worldwide demand for American grain. That demand is not going to disappear overnight. In fact, all projections I have seen indicate that the rest of the world is going to be turning more and more to us for food and grain. And we will still be able to satisfy our export commitments. My bill simply delays those shipments.

Second, I believe that the policy is

shortsighted, because it is going to sharply reduce domestic demand for feed grain in the future. This will happen in two ways: By fall, our livestock and poultry population will have been reduced significantly. They will need less feed grain, much less. So where are the feed grain farmers going to sell their bumper crop of grain when they harvest it this fall? Is it good economic management to go from extreme shortages to extreme surpluses when that is avoidable? The second way it will reduce domestic demand for food grain is that by that time, many people will have gotten into the habit of eating less meat and eggs. We are seeing that process under way right now. It began several months ago when protein product prices began to go into orbit. Every national poll indicates that people are now eating less meat, that they are getting used to it, and that they do not intend to increase their meat consumption even after prices have fallen. Thus the demand for protein products is going to decline, which means that just as our feed grain stocks are increased to satisfy current demand for protein products, that demand will have been reduced.

I wish to stress this point because I want to make it absolutely clear that the temporary embargo proposed in my bill is definitely in the interest of the feed grain farmer. Our failure to impose this embargo now will do serious damage to his future markets. I also am pleased to inform you that I have firm estimates from the USDA that feed grain farmers will earn more money this year with their increased production at lower prices than they would with lower production at higher prices. I pressed USDA on this point and they were firm in that judgment.

My third objection to current USDA policy with regard to an export embargo is that it represents distorted priorities. When I questioned USDA about high food prices, I got the distinct impression that they were not overly concerned about the prices that the American consumer is now paying in the supermarket. They seemed to be saying to me that yes, prices are up, but they really are not too high. And then they quote figures about what percentage of the typical American income goes to food compared with other countries. Well, I do not care about those other countries. I care about the United States of America. And in the United States of America, food prices are too high; and it is not the farmers' fault.

I think that USDA is really saying that those export markets are more important to them in their narrow little world than is the American consumer. So they are fighting to preserve those markets and letting the American farmer and the American consumer pay the freight. And that Mr. Speaker, in my view, is a grossly distorted priority. I do not buy it. It is high time that we started taking care of Americans first and then concerned ourselves about problems in the rest of the world.

Now this brings me to the effects of my bill. If we are able to enact this into law quickly, here is what will happen. A

substantial portion of the 475 million bushels of soybeans and similar fractions of other feed grains scheduled for export will immediately become available for domestic consumption. The boxcars now tied up in carrying grain to the various ports will be diverted to carrying grain to American farmers. Feed grain prices will decline immediately. Most importantly, with the assurance that feed grains will be available at reasonable prices, farmers will immediately halt the slaughter of their critical herds and flocks. This will have the effect of preserving demand for feed grain beyond the fall. Once the fall harvest is in, the embargo will be lifted and exports can begin again. The deferred export shipments will provide an extra demand in the fall for that bumper harvest. Finally, as farmers begin shipping to market protein products that were fed on more reasonable priced feed grain, food prices will begin to decline as well.

It should be clear then that one effect of my bill would be a major reduction in the cost of meat, poultry, eggs and milk, and in the case of the latter three, that effect may be felt almost immediately.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of all American farmers and the American consumer, I urge the adoption of this bill at the earliest possible moment.

THE DEATH OF MR. JAMES D. ASHER

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a man who both gives of himself to his friends and gives of his talents to his community is a very rare man indeed. Today, I would like to honor a man who did both these things to the utmost of his ability, Mr. James D. Asher of South Weymouth, Mass., who died on June 2, 1973.

Mr. Asher was a very dear friend of mine, and I consider his death not only a personal tragedy, but a great loss to the community as well.

James Asher was the founder, president, and treasurer of the South Shore Broadcasting Co. in Quincy, Mass. It was at great personal sacrifice that Mr. Asher established the broadcasting company, putting in extra time and effort back in 1947 so that the south shore area of Massachusetts might be provided with an efficient radio broadcasting system. He even went so far as to assemble the transmitter himself, so that the project might be achieved more rapidly. Today, as a result of his dedication and hard work for more than 20 years, the South Shore Broadcasting Co. has expanded its operations to two stations—WJDA in Quincy and WESX in Salem. All this from the almost single-handed efforts of one man.

Few men are so selfless as to dedicate their lives to the betterment of others' lives—those they will never personally know. Mr. Asher never came in contact with a great majority of the lives he touched, but he served the public with a

zeal and intensity that was characteristic of him.

The South Shore Broadcasting Co. will serve as a living memorial to James D. Asher, and justifiably so. Even though he is no longer physically present with us, his memory will always be kept alive by the continuing and ever-improving radio broadcasts to the south shore community.

I would like to submit the following newspaper clippings and editorial that express so well how extensively Mr. Asher's life touched the lives of the community:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Sun, June 7, 1973]

JIM ASHER

Like most men, Jim Asher had his special dream.

Most men don't get to really see their dreams come true. But he did.

While doing graduate work at the Harvard University School of Business Administration, the young Kansas native became acquainted with the Boston area.

And in the late 1930's, he was a clothing salesman in Boston and here at a Quincy store.

He thought the Quincy area had good business potential. But instead of opening up a clothing store he decided to try a radio station.

He had a fascination for the No. 13. So on Sept. 13, 1947, WJDA went on the air—at 1300—on the dial.

"We had about \$130 [that number again] in the bank and a lot of hope," he once recalled.

He didn't know much about radio. But he was willing to try.

And he ignored some of the so-called experts who were predicting WJDA wouldn't last six months. Quincy was too small and too close to Boston for a station of its own, they insisted.

What they didn't take into consideration was Jim's drive and determination. He made it. Today, the station that couldn't last is in its 26th year and one of the most successful in the nation.

Jim's dry wit and his homey broadcasting style made getting up early a must for many listeners in the area. During his "Breakfast With WJDA" from 6:30 a.m. to 8 a.m. [until his illness in 1972] Jim's listeners got much inside low down on the latest cribbage match with John [Zep] Duane or what Freddy Lane in the control room was doing for excitement, or they chuckled over Belinda, the mooing cow, who sounded so real people wanted to know how much hay she ate.

Jim, people have said, was a success in life.

But he was much more than that. He was a success as a human being.

True, he was a sharp businessman who could be tough when needed. But he was a good family man, a square shooter who believed in fair play, and was always ready to offer a helping hand.

Jim, for an example, was an inspiration to us in founding the Quincy Sun.

Our decision to bring a community oriented weekly newspaper to Quincy was made with the realization that he had blazed the trail before us. He had proved there was room here for a radio station. We both thought there was now room here for a weekly newspaper, too.

Jim offered us encouragement before and after we started The Sun. He did this despite the fact that we were going to cut into the existing advertising dollars in the area.

That didn't bother him.

He went out of his way many times to "plug" The Sun on the air quoting excerpts or asking, "Did you see that item in The Sun?" His frequent mentioning of us helped make many people aware of the fact that there was another newspaper in town.

We will always be grateful to Jim for his kindness to us. He was a good friend.

The Quincy-South Shore area has also lost a good friend. Both he and WJDA have been active in many civic causes.

Jim is gone, but he leaves his radio station as a legacy for us all.

The station's call letters WJDA, of course, are his initials—James Dudley Asher. Many people will remember him that way.

But having his own initials for call letters didn't impress him that much. In fact, it was only one of several submitted to the FCC for approval. They gave WJDA the green light.

What he was really proud of was what he once told us: "We're a family station."

Men like Jim Asher don't come this way very often. Quincy is indeed fortunate that he did.

So long, Jim.

HENRY BOSWORTH,
Publisher, Quincy Sun.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger,
June 6, 1978]

rites for James Asher attended by over 200

WEYMOUTH.—More than 200 persons filled the Church of the Holy Nativity in South Weymouth yesterday for funeral services for James D. Asher, a community leader and founder of the South Shore Broadcasting Co.

Burial was at Blue Hill Cemetery in Braintree.

LONG ILLNESS

Mr. Asher, 59, of 313 Central St., died Saturday morning at the South Shore Hospital after along illness.

The South Shore Broadcasting Co. operates radio station WJDA in Quincy and radio station WESX in Salem.

Until last year, when he was succeeded by his son James D. Asher Jr., Mr. Asher had been president of both firms.

The many persons attending the service "Gave testimony how his life touched others," said the Rev. James Nelson, rector of the church, during the service, adding that Mr. Asher had a "good, full life."

George Gellinas of South Weymouth, a long time friend of Mr. Asher, and a lay reader at the church read the 23rd and the 121st psalms from the Book of Psalms at the funeral service.

Many civic, business and community leaders were among those attending the service.

RADIO STATIONS

The owners of three Massachusetts radio stations, and members of the Massachusetts Broadcasters Association, of which Mr. Asher was a former president, were present. They were Israel Cohen of WCAP in Lowell, Douglas Rowe of WGAU in Gardner and Thomas M. McAuliffe of WSRO in Marlboro.

Mr. Cohen, who had known Mr. Asher for more than 20 years, said of him "In the association he was always there when you needed him. He was one of the older breed of people who really started in the business."

Two former mayors of Quincy, Amelio Della Chiesa and Thomas Burgin were among those present as was former Quincy City Manager Edward T. Lewis.

Quincy Fire Chief Edward F. Barry lead a delegation of Quincy fire fighters and several members of the Massachusetts Ancient and Honorable Artillery Co., including Lt. Ernest Montilio of Quincy, a long time friend of Mr. Asher, attended.

LINED SIDEWALK

Following the church service, the members of the Quincy fire department and Ancient and Honorable Artillery Co. lined the sidewalk at the church as the casket was removed and the mourners passed.

Some of the original sponsors of the South Shore Broadcasting Co. in 1947 were also in attendance. They included Frank Duggan

and Ambrose Duggan of Duggan Bros. in Quincy and Joseph Jannell of Jannell Motors Inc. of Weymouth.

Among the Quincy business men present were George Bonsall, Matthew Cushing, I. Forrest Neal, Henry Bosworth, William J. Martin, George Reardon, Robert Faxon, Louis Cassani, John Blake, Chester Weeden, Heslip Sutherland, and Leslie Brierley.

Also, the Rev. Chester Porteus, rector of the Christ Episcopal Church in Quincy, Edward T. Moore, who represented Rep. James A. Burke of Milton; William Delargy, retired police reporter for the Boston Record American; Herbert Hollis, former state representative of Braintree; and Norfolk County Sheriff Charles Hedges.

Also, WBZ television and radio weather forecaster Don Kent, who had been a weather forecaster at WJDA several years ago, and Nelson Bragg.

LODGE REPRESENTATIVES

Representatives were present from the Aleppo Temple, Wessagusset Masonic Lodge, Quincy Rotary Club, Wollaston United Commercial Travelers, Quincy YMCA, Colonial Federal Loan and Savings Co., the Milton Bank and Trust and South Shore Publishing Co.

Also, Charles Keenhan, vice president of the Yankee Atomic Energy in Beverly, and Edward J. Barrett, former executive of the Penn Central Railroad.

In a tribute by Rep. Burke to Mr. Asher, Rep. Burke stated that "Jim Asher was a long time friend and he was not only a capable and successful broadcasting executive, but also an objective and fairminded newsman."

"His concern was always for the welfare and betterment of his community and nation, and what is more—he worked at it."

"He shall be greatly missed by all who knew him or ever had contact with him."

Quincy Mayor Walter J. Hannon said yesterday Mr. Asher was a long time personal friend and that the death of Mr. Asher "is a great loss to all of us on the South Shore. My deepest sympathy goes to his wife and members of his family."

CIVIC INVOLVEMENT

"Because of his dedicated service and involvement in civil and community life, he will be sadly missed by all who knew and admired him."

Born in Lawrence, Kansas, Mr. Asher received a BS degree from Kansas University School of Business Administration and later did graduate work at Harvard University School of Business Administration.

He did public relations work during World War II with Gen. Benjamin Lear's Second Army and at Harvard University Training Army School and the War Department Personnel Center at Fort Devens.

Mr. Asher founded Radio Station WJDA on Sept. 13, 1947 on Brackett Street in Quincy while the building of the station had not been completed. The transmitter had been constructed by Mr. Asher himself, with supplies which had been donated by the late John J. Duane of Quincy.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Ruth (Stoddard) Asher; a son, James D. Asher, Jr. of South Weymouth; a daughter, Miss Joan Asher of New York City; his mother Mrs. Dudley Asher of South Weymouth; a brother, Charles E. Asher of Gardner; and a sister, Mrs. James R. Wilkinson of Atlanta, Ga.

Funeral arrangements were completed by the C. C. Shepherd Funeral Home, 134 Pleasant St., So. Weymouth.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Sun, June 7, 1973]

JAMES ASHER, EULOGIZED AS MAN WHO
"PASSED TRUTH, GOODNESS TO OTHERS"

James D. Asher, founder and moving spirit behind Radio WJDA in Quincy, was eulogized Tuesday as a man who "from his life passed truth and goodness into the lives of many others."

Asher died Saturday at 59 in South Shore Hospital after a long illness.

The Rev. James L. Nelson, pastor of the Episcopal Church of the Holy Nativity in South Weymouth said at the services "the large crowd is testimony" of the kind of life he led.

The church was filled with persons from all walks of life.

First Lt. Ernest Montillo and other members of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, of which Mr. Asher was a member, formed an honor guard for the body of their comrade leaving the church.

Burial was in Blue Hill Cemetery, Braintree.

Mr. Asher founded the South Shore Broadcasting Co., WJDA, which went on the air Sept. 13, 1947. Two years later, he acquired the North Shore Broadcasting Co. WESX in Salem.

He was on the air himself, hosting the program "Breakfast with JDA," daily Monday through Friday, from 6:30 a.m. to 8 a.m. until January, 1972.

A native of Kansas, he was a graduate of Kansas University and a public relations officer with the U.S. Army during World War II.

He leaves his widow, Ruth [Stoddard] Asher of South Weymouth; a son, James D., Jr., also of South Weymouth; a daughter, Joan, of New York City; his mother, Mrs. Dudley Asher of South Weymouth; a brother, Charles, of Gardner; and a sister, Mrs. James R. Wilkinson, of Atlanta, Ga.

Among the mourners were former Quincy Mayors Thomas S. Burgin and Amelio Della Chiesa, former City Manager Edward T. Lewis, former State Rep. Herbert B. Hollis of Braintree, Norfolk County Sheriff Charles W. Hedges.

Administrative Assistant Edward Moore and Mary Touhey of Congressman James A. Burke's office, John Blake, president of the South Shore Chamber of Commerce; former Quincy School Committeeman A. Wendell Clark.

Don Kent, former WJDA meteorologist now with TV Channel 4 in Boston; Lester Glasser, husband of the late Ida Newman Glasser, who conducted the Ida Newman Show on WJDA for many years.

Representatives of the Massachusetts Broadcasters Association, Israel Cohen of WCAP, Lowell; Douglas Rowe of WGAW, Gardner; and Thomas M. McAuliffe of WSRQ, Marlboro.

Forrest I. Neal, Jr., director of the MBTA; William DeLargy, retired police reporter for the Boston Record American; Irving Greenblatt, president of the South Shore Publishing Co.; Henry Bosworth, publisher of the Quincy Sun.

The Rev. John D. Banks, pastor of Bethany Congregational Church, Quincy; the Rev. Chester Porteus of Christ Church Episcopal in Quincy; Charles Pearce, president of the Quincy Savings Bank.

Past Presidents George Bonsall, Matthew Cushing, Heslip Sutherland and Louis Cassani of Quincy Rotary; George Reardon of President Chevrolet; Edward Percy, president of the Quincy Rotary Club.

Ambrose and Frank Duggan of the North Quincy Garage; Joseph Jannell of Jannell Ford, South Weymouth; Henry Hoffman of A. E. Barnes Insurance Co.; William J. Martin, former president of South Shore National Bank.

Chester Weeden and Leslie M. Brierly of Hancock Bank and Trust Co.; Robert Faxon of Faxon Trust Real Estate; Clyde W. Morrison of Electroschwitch Corp.; Albert E. Spencer, Jr. of Old Colony Landscaping Service.

Charles Keenhan, vice president, Yankee Atomic Energy, Beverly; Edward J. Barrett, former executive of the Penn Central Railroad.

Quincy Fire Chief Edward Barry headed a delegation from the Quincy Fire Depart-

ment and there was also a delegation from the Quincy Police Department.

Representatives were also present from Wessagusset Masonic Lodge AF and AM; Aleppo Temple and the Quincy YMCA.

RAY McHUGH WRITES ABOUT IRAN

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, a news commentator the other day said that so much news is being generated just now it would be nice if we could put some of it in the deep freeze, and save it for a slow weekend. He was quite right, of course. Events tumble so fast on the heels of other events we barely absorb a fact before another crowds in. And most of what we are having to absorb is bad news.

It was heartening and encouraging to me, therefore, to be privileged to read two articles by Mr. Ray McHugh, of Copely News Service, concerning our allies in Iran. Mr. McHugh is extremely knowledgeable in world affairs, and without exception I have found his analyses in that area penetrating and objective. I have known Ray McHugh for a number of years and am as honored to call him a good friend as to label him an excellent writer.

I include Mr. McHugh's reports on his recent visit to Iran in the RECORD at this point:

IRAN'S NATURAL GAS: IT MAY BE A KEY IN U.S. ENERGY PLANS

(By Ray McHugh)

ANWAZ, IRAN.—"Captain Butterfly" lifted his Alouette helicopter gently over another of the tortured Khuzistan mountain ridges, then banked suddenly and allowed the craft to fall toward the meandering Khairabad River below.

Two startled shepherds looked up as their sheep and goats scattered along the shallow river.

The red-faced Hungarian pilot whose real name is Janos Batorfi handled the turbine copter as if it were one of the Stukas that he flew against the Russians during World War II, or perhaps like the MIG he flew to Austria during the 1956 Hungarian revolution.

Leveling off finally, he pointed at a cluster of rocks several hundred yards ahead.

"The bridge," he shouted.

As we approached, skimming the reed-filled, green-gray water, the rocks sorted themselves into the shape of an ancient span. Three graceful, Moorish-looking arches were still intact and they poked halfway across the river. A crumbling watchtower on the other bank looked Roman.

The bridge that somehow has survived for more than 2,000 years in the heart of southern Iran's desolate oil-and-gas wilderness is a tangible link between past glory and 20th Century prosperity.

According to Persian history, Alexander the Great and his army passed over the bridge in his march to the Persian Gulf that climaxed his conquest of the known world 324 years before the birth of Christ.

Khuzistan then was described as a land of rich farm valleys and rushing rivers, but its face has been remade by wrenching earthquakes that left spectacular scars on its mountains and dried up most riverbeds.

For almost 2,000 years it was literally forgotten by history. Even today the indigenous population huddles in little mud hut villages and struggles with subsistence farming and grazing.

But Khuzistan and other similar forgotten regions of once-proud Persia now hold the key that can solve much of the world's energy crisis and perhaps unlock the door to new glories for Iran.

Oil and gas pipelines and high-voltage electric lines crisscross its mountains and valleys. Gas flares burn like a hundred ancient campfires. Roads push through seemingly impenetrable terrain. Microwave radio towers crown its highest peaks.

At a desolate clearing known as Bid Boland stands a \$200 million natural gas refinery, the largest in the world and the pride of the National Iranian Gas Co.

Bid Boland is the heart of a 1,200-kilometer, \$700 million system that pumps a billion cubic feet of gas a day to the Soviet Union and distributes 600 million cubic feet a day to Iran's major cities and industries.

Tomorrow it may become a key element in American and Japanese energy planning.

Iran ranks second only to the Soviet Union in proved natural gas resources. New test drilling indicates a "virtually unlimited" supply. One new field is already earmarked for the Japanese market. Work has begun on a huge methanol plant where gas and methanol will be mixed for shipment in giant tankers and use in power stations.

Plans also are under way for a huge gas liquefaction complex. Methanol gas cannot be used in domestic lines without first going through a regasification process that is prohibitively expensive.

Natural gas, however, can be liquefied by reducing its temperature. It could then be transported to American and Japanese ports or offshore terminals in new-design, refrigerator-like ships called "LNG" carriers. The LNG can be released directly into existing domestic supply systems.

Officials of the National Iranian Gas Co. are currently discussing plans with U.S. shipbuilders, Washington officials and American utility companies for a fleet of perhaps 20-24 giant 160,000-cubic-meter LNG ships that would carry the gas from the Persian Gulf to East and West Coast ports and to Japan. T. Mossadeghi, managing director of NIGC, said his firm and the Iran government are anxious that the ships be built in the United States to take advantage of advanced American technology.

Preliminary talks have already been held with Commerce Department, Interior Department and Federal Power Commission officials in Washington.

A project of the scope envisioned by the Iranians, several American public utilities and distribution firms and the shipping industry would amount to several billion dollars and would require a major increase in shipbuilding subsidies to offset the difference in construction costs in American and Japanese or European yards.

It might be necessary to build one or more new American shipyards to handle the project, according to Edwin Hood, president of the American Shipbuilders Council.

Mossadeghi said the Iranians are working to develop their LNG capacity by 1977 and that they hope giant carriers will be available by 1980.

The NIGC also is waiting for clarification by the Nixon administration on new regulations covering American imports of natural gas. In his energy message to Congress, President Nixon urged a stepped-up gas exploration program in the United States free of FPC price controls, but he did not indicate the White House attitude toward imported gas.

Mossadeghi said he is confident that the United States will have to turn to Iran and-

or to the Soviet Union to augment its supply of gas, despite the fact that the United States is the third largest producer.

"You simply use tremendous amounts of gas," he explained, "and your demand increases constantly because of the environmental factors involved in other fuels. Even the biggest exploration program in America is not likely to meet your requirements."

"Naturally, the cost of gas must increase. The transportation is the expensive item. But the decisions cannot be postponed."

Mossadeghi says those decisions should be made this year. He estimates Iran by 1977 will be able to supply some 3 billion cubic feet of gas daily. He points out that Russia already wants to increase its gas imports from Iran, but he indicated the Iranians also want to renegotiate their price agreements with the Soviets and they want to protect their growing domestic market.

Their capital city of Tehran with a population of 4 million is powered almost entirely by natural gas.

"The important thing to us," he said, "is that we make allocations of gas now for the future. We must plan. The kind of facilities that are needed take time to build. An American allocation might require an investment by your firms of \$600 million to \$700 million in plants and equipment, but remember that only about 15 per cent of that would be spent in Iran. The rest would go directly into the American economy."

Mossadeghi and aides also emphasized that they have U.S. balance of payments worries in mind when they propose that the LNG fleet be built in American yards.

Russia with known reserves of 550 trillion cubic feet of natural gas leads the world, but much of its reserves lies in very difficult regions of far Siberia, explaining the Soviet purchase of low-cost Iranian gas in exchange for steel mills and other heavy industrial plants that the Shah of Iran wanted badly to stimulate other sectors of his economy.

There are at least hints in Tehran that Iran would like to restrict its commercial dealings with the Soviets in light of the two countries' traditional political problems. (Russia feeds Iranian gas into its Crimean system that leads eventually to markets in Western Europe.)

Iran's proved reserves are set at 315 trillion cubic feet, but new fields now being explored prompt officials to claim that reserves may be virtually without end. American reserves are estimated at 300 trillion cubic feet.

Algeria ranks fourth with 130 trillion; Holland has 82 trillion—mostly offshore, and then national totals drop sharply.

Political uncertainties in the Arab world also have helped focus American attention on Iran as a dependable supplier of both oil and gas. A natural gas contract was negotiated with Algeria recently but New England utilities had to weather a series of frustrations and delays that are still not totally resolved.

Saudi Arabia, the No. 1 U.S. source of oil in the Middle East, has hinted at restricting the supply in retaliation for American support of Israel. The Saudi threats are largely discounted in this part of the world as "lip service" to Palestinians and Arab radicals, but the threats themselves point up Middle East tensions.

Although it is a Moslem country, Iran is not Arab and the Shah has steadfastly remained aloof from the Middle East crisis.

And despite recent moves to assert Iranian control over the sale and distribution of its oil and gas supplies, Iran remains in close partnership with a producing consortium that is dominated by Anglo-American interests. Americans and Europeans also remain in key positions, although Iran has steadily built a national cadre of middle and top management personnel.

"Iran probably has the best-trained oil and gas people anywhere outside the United States or the Soviet Union," said a U.S. Em-

bassy petroleum expert. "A very high percentage of them trained in the United States or Europe and they have technical schools of their own now that assure a steady supply of local talent."

Credit for the development of Iran's self-reliance in the oil-gas area is given to Dr. Manuchehr Eghbal, chairman of the board and general managing director of the National Iranian Oil Co., the parent of both the oil and gas operations.

Eghbal was prime minister of Iran from 1958 to 1962 before his appointment to the NIOC.

"He is not a technician, but he's the perfect man for the job," said Mossadeghi. "He is an administrator and he has a flair for the political side of things that escapes so many engineers. He has done a great deal to make the world appreciate Iran's resources and he has made all of us in the industry realize the important role we play in the development of our country."

Eghbal sees Iran's gas system as the link that is tying Iran together and making it possible to realize the Shah's "white revolution."

"In laying this giant pipeline across some of the roughest country in the world, Iran has driven a broad path of progress through the nation," the chairman said, "giving many isolated mountain villages for the first time, road access, abundant power and immediate opportunity to improve the standards of living, while the capital and the main industrial cities along the route will have their future fuel supplies assured."

It could well be that Iran's prodigious pipeline also is an important key to the solution of America's energy crisis—certainly it already has impact far beyond the world of Alexander the Great.

THE INDIAN OCEAN III: IRAN MAKES BID FOR POWER

By Ray McHugh

ABADAN, IRAN.—The miles of yellow lights and the flickering gas flares that deny night to Abadan and the world's largest refinery signify more than a hungry world's appetite for oil.

They signify, too, a Shah's appetite for the glories that once were Persia's.

Nowhere on the sweeping littoral of the Indian Ocean is one nation pouring so much into its own development. Not even giant India can match Iran's determined effort to establish itself as a local power in an area that has become a geopolitical vacuum and a world question mark.

The Shah of Iran and his government cannot be accused of hoarding oil and gas dollars for speculation in international money markets.

"Iran spends every penny before the ink is dry on the checks," said an American diplomat in Tehran. "Sometimes you have to wonder if the Shah can keep pace with the expectations he has aroused in these people, or the role he wants them to play."

Military analyses of the Indian Ocean usually begin and end with the United States and the USSR, the two powers that boast the naval and nuclear strength to "police" the area. But it would be wrong to overlook Iran.

No tears were shed in Tehran when Britain finally was forced to withdraw from the Persian Gulf and its old bases "east of Suez." For two hundred years London had practiced what former U.S. Ambassador Douglas MacArthur III called "plate glass diplomacy."

"It was as if the British built a glass wall around the area," MacArthur once told the writer. "It was a true Victorian concept. If anyone dared throw a rock at the wall, from inside or out, he immediately felt the full weight of the British empire."

"As long as that power was available, the countries around the Persian Gulf were cowed. Once that power was gone, they sud-

denly had to search their hearts for their own real identity and aspirations."

Iran's reaction to the British withdrawal is remarkably similar to that in the Malay Peninsula and in the countries of East Africa. The first impulse is to continue close contacts with London, but as time passes Britain is seen more realistically as a comparatively small island nation that no longer possesses the resources to help ambitious independent states reach full development.

Iran was introduced to American technology and military might during World War II when it was the "back-door" route for supplies to the Soviet Union.

It has moved close to Washington.

The shah has built a potent military machine with U.S. help and has just negotiated to buy \$4 billion in British and American ships, planes and weapons to modernize his forces. Britain is building a destroyer and four frigates that will be the core of Iran's Persian Gulf fleet. U.S. sales include sophisticated helicopter gun-ships and even guided "smart bombs."

When the shah's program is completed in 1977, Iran will rank second only to Russian-equipped India as a local Indian Ocean power. According to Iran's Washington ambassador, former foreign minister and former son-in-law, Abashir Zahedi, the shah hopes to match India's overwhelming presence with a special Indian Ocean arrangement with South Africa, Australia, and Japan.

Japan, in particular, has a vested interest in the Persian Gulf. More than 80 percent of its oil supplies originate here. Iran is the world's No. 1 oil-exporting nation and may rank No. 1 in natural gas reserves.

As Iran looks at the world, it is literally threatened on four sides. Despite polite relations with Moscow and a commercial agreement that pipes a billion cubic feet of natural gas into the Crimea every day in return for Soviet steel mills and other heavy industry, Tehran maintains a "profound distrust" of the Russians.

It has not forgotten Soviet attempts to claim Iran's northernmost provinces after World War II. Any appearance of Russian naval squadrons near the Persian Gulf sets off talk of a Soviet "pincers" movement.

"We want no foreign presence in the gulf," the shah has warned.

Iran also has a running dispute with Iraq over navigable waters that mark the two countries' frontier. It is angry over radio Baghdad's attempts to fan rebellion in Baluchistan near the Pakistani border and it is keenly aware of Moscow's arms shipments to Iraq's radical Baathist regime.

Even more immediate is concern about India's pressures against Pakistan. There is real fear in Tehran that the forces set in motion by Pakistan's December, 1971, defeat by India during the Bangladesh war can literally tear Pakistan apart. Russian, Afghani and Indian agents are allegedly working inside Pakistan to incite minorities against President Ali Bhutto. Bhutto is a frequent visitor in Tehran and he and the shah are described as "in full agreement."

In recent interviews with Western newsmen, the shah has warned that Iran will not stand idly by if Pakistan is threatened with another partition or civil war. He has hinted strongly that his army would move swiftly to annex Baluchi areas in south Pakistan. Such a move would bring the Iranians face to face with India.

There is little concern shown in Tehran about Communist China, despite Peking's attempts to stir unrest in tiny, feudal oil states along the gulf.

Instead, China is looked upon as the major Asian balancing factor that can blunt both Soviet and Indian ambitions. But Peking's inaction during the 1971 India-Pakistan war also is noted.

"In a crisis," said one official, "we must

look first to the United States. The CENTO agreement (Central Treaty Organization) is meaningless, but the United States has clear national interests in Iran. No president could ignore them."

AGNEW ON THE MEDIA

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to accompany Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW on a trip to Arkansas in April. Mr. AGNEW's address was on the occasion of the National Education Program for the Freedom Forum, an annual event at Harding College in Searcy, Ark.

As a result of that speech, Mr. AGNEW was subsequently interviewed by David S. Broder, a respected journalist on the Washington Post staff. Mr. Broder, whose work as a columnist is highly regarded on Capitol Hill, has conducted an excellent interview on a timely topic. I therefore want to share this dialog with my colleagues:

AGNEW ON THE MEDIA

(An Interview With David S. Broder)

In an April speech at Harding College in Arkansas, Vice President Agnew said, "The government and the media must put aside their visceral reactions and engage in a productive, intelligent discussion of their differences."

Washington Post staff writer David S. Broder contacted the Vice President's office and suggested that a conversation on some of the issues of press-government relationships which Mr. Agnew had raised over the years might usefully be aired. The following transcript, edited from a one-hour conversation, represents the substance of the Agnew-Broder talk.

Q: I thought perhaps a useful starting question would be to ask you about a statement in your Harding College speech about the opinion-making media. Making the point that the administration wants to be fair to them, you say, "We do not think they have yet diversified their undertakings sufficient to fairly report the activities of government to the American people." What do you mean by that statement, and how do you see this process of diversification possibly coming about?

A: Well, what I meant was that there seem to be general thrust lines that develop in the opinion-making media. And at the point that the thrust line develops, the information-gathering process seems to adhere to that particular area of inquiry. Many other areas of inquiry just don't seem to come out.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. There are many, many important matters of community development going on right now. There are matters of the "new federalism" going on, general revenue sharing is being tested, and we're trying to complete the legislation on special revenue sharing. And yet, with the exception of certain people who've turned to this as a line of special reporting, these matters do not really get the kind of positioning in principal organs or ongoing attention on television needed to make people realize how important they are.

I'll give you another example. It relates to the practice of extrapolating one attention-getting segment and excluding the substance of the prepared remarks of a governmental official.

Yesterday I talked to the Atlanta Cham-

ber of Commerce on an economic theme. Economic speeches are very deadly, so before I started out I tried to put them at ease with a little levity. And the levity went something like this: "Before I left Washington the President asked me to say a few kind words about John Connally. And I will—but not today."

Now, that was all there was to it. That got a nice laugh and they relaxed. I turned on CBS radio last night and this is the way my economic speech was handled: "Well, today it was politics as usual for Vice President Agnew, who had the following to say . . ." and on came what I just told you. Not a word about the forum, not a word about the subject of the speech. Well, surely you can say if you use that kind of material, you've got to expect that's what they're going to publish. But is it really? Does it have to be that way? Is the humor more important than the substance of the speech?

As far as television's concerned, there is almost—well, I won't say blanket unanimity, but there is what you might call consensus with regard to public events and how they should be construed. I don't think you'd find John Chancellor disagreeing essentially with Walter Cronkite, or with Harry Reasoner, for example, on what's important to talk about.

And on the talk shows you have basically the same thing going on. You may say you have a liberal and a conservative on the Agnew show. But what you really have is a Washington-oriented enclave focusing in on what's been reported in Washington, instead of moving out and diversifying their discussion. I can tune in that program and almost tell you what's going to be discussed that week.

Question: Do you think that's because the basic agenda for most newspapers are the AP and the UPI budget summaries which come out every morning and every afternoon saying, "These are our major stories for the next cycle?"

Answer: I suppose that's got something to do with it.

Question: But does that reflect anything other than news judgment as to what are major stories?

Answer: No, but what is news judgment and who decides on news judgment?

Question: Well, would you make the same criticism that you've made of the anchormen of, say, the news editors of Associated Press and United Press International? I think the same observation could be made: that if you took it over a period of a week, 80 or 85 percent of the stories that one wire service said were main stories would also be main stories on the other wire.

Answer: Yes, I would. I think that that applies to the wire services, it applies to the weekly news magazines, it applies to the large metropolitan dailies that maintain independent wire services and facilities and make their own news judgments.

Question: When you referred to these people reflecting one point of view about one theme, where do you think that uniformity comes from? Do you think it's imposed from the top of their organization, or do you think it's because of the way these men are recruited, or what?

Answer: I think it's the fact that they're members of a fraternity. Like any other businessmen, they talk to each other more than they talk to people in other undertakings. And, institutionally, I think most of them are recruited from schools of journalism where the judgment process follows what's taking place in the then-existing principal media. And I think there's a philosophical compatibility among most people who work for the large news organs that naturally brings them to similar conclusions.

Q. Now, you have put stress always on getting more diversity into that group. How do you think that's possible? Do you have any sort of a strategy?

A. One of the steps that's been taken, of course, is the use of op-ed pages and contributing writers and commentators. Guests on programs. But it isn't entirely effective. And I blame the ineffectiveness not so much on the lack of attempts of the media to do what they can to help, but on the very small number of people with other ideas who are available and willing to make the contributions. That's a problem. I'm sure that The Post, The Times would print whatever was submitted, particularly if it were provocative and well-written, but I don't think they get too much of this kind of material sent to them. Now there must be some reason for that. I don't know what that reason is. I really don't.

But I'm hopeful that it's beginning to change. I see the first evidence of it in my contacts with college youth: not as doctrinaire as formerly, not as willing to accept a simple position and take off with that, but more questioning of every opinion now. And much more ready to hear another opinion than they might have been in the past.

Q. But in your answer to the question, you've moved off of the front page and on to the editorial page.

A. Sorry. Let's talk about the front page. For example, I happen to believe that when a subject becomes very hot, such as Watergate is right now, the problem isn't the fact that it consumes 10 or 11 pages of a news magazine, it isn't the fact that it consumes several pages of the newspaper. It's that much of what is presented on it is repetitious. There isn't the effort to diversify the account.

Let's go to economics. If stats come out, and they show inflation is up, you'll find a tremendous amount of commentary on inflation, but almost a total neglect of the record-setting pace of the GNP growth, of unemployment's decline, of the assimilation into the job market of a great amount of people formerly employed in undertakings related to the Vietnam war. And all of the accompanying things that go with a boom economy that are good seem to be overlooked in the fear about inflation.

Now inflation, of course, is a very real hazard. But the commentary right now about the economy I don't think justifies what you might call a dismal view. Surely we've got inflation that's too high, but so does every industrialized nation in the world. And ours is relatively low compared to theirs.

We are taking steps to dampen the economy and we have made certain projections and inflation's going to subside in the third and fourth quarters of this year. One of the reasons we have this inflation is, of course, the pace of growth in the economy. One of the reasons we have another thing that is generally characterized as bad, which is the growth of corporate profits, is because we've got this tremendous growth in the economy. It isn't that individual companies are pricing their products higher—because they're faced with guidelines—but because they're producing more, and consequently the profits are more.

The comparisons between wages and profits really aren't fairly made. On the one hand, you have the profits coming out of the growth of the business, accelerating at a high rate, and on the other hand you have wages of the individual not changing that quickly because there are more and more individuals to distribute the increased total of wages among.

We're still looking for some way to present this in perspective. But here, when you pick up a newspaper like The Post, the headlines at least and the principally positioned stories would relate to what could be called alarming economic developments—inflation, too much profits, something that carries through the thesis that the little guy is not being taken care of but that the corporate people are being rewarded beyond their legitimate expectation—and nothing to indicate that this

growth of the economy makes it possible for us to project that in fiscal 1976 we may have no budgetary deficit, in spite of increases of maybe almost \$20 billion a year in spending.

Q. I find it ironic that most of your criticisms have been directed at what you call "the opinion-making media." Those are, by and large, media which are in a competitive situation. You haven't said very much about the much more frequent situation around this country where you have literally monopoly ownership.

A. I suppose this is an escape answer in a sense, but I don't read those newspapers every day. And maybe that's why I don't criticize them more. I'm living in a place where what I characterize as the opinion-making media come to me every day in the form of news summary, my own reading of The Post, The Times and The Sun, Time and Newsweek—and some attention to the networks.

Q. You suggested at the University of Virginia that either there should be no unattributed accusations printed against government officials or that they should be substantiated—I think this was your line—by evidence that's admissible in a criminal charge. Do you really think that it would be possible to do investigative reporting of the kind that characterized the Watergate reporting?

A. I have to say that investigative reporting is certainly beneficial as far as informing the public is concerned. I don't think that investigative reporting really ever breaks many things loose. It wasn't the newspaper reports that broke the Watergate matter loose, it was [District Judge John] Sirica's handling of the defendants' sentencing that broke that information loose. Because if the defendants had not changed their attitudes at that time the information wouldn't have been available to be leaked. Looking at investigative reporting at its best, I think it's gathering bits and pieces of information that can lead to a discernible opinion that's intelligible to the public. And I praise that highly. Investigative reporting that provides the incentive for a grand jury to begin an investigation I praise highly. I don't believe that investigative reporters moving out in advance of an acting grand jury or trying to project to the public hearsay of what is essentially a secret proceeding—secret to safeguard the constitutional rights of others—is good investigative reporting. And I find a lot of fault with the fact that inaccuracies do occur and that the public mind can be very much positioned by broad-brush accusations.

Guilt by association: I think one of the news magazines had a whole page of pictures of principals in the Watergate. Now some of these people were implicated to a very great extent, to the point of having been indicted. Others may never be—or may be completely cleared. But they shouldn't all be set up as a rogues gallery, as though they were all in the same status at the moment.

I have a heck of a time trying to figure out how you protect confidentiality of sources—how you protect the newsman's right to go and investigate and report to the public without revealing his sources, and at the same time how you protect people who might be unintentionally destroyed by it. It's entirely possible that people who are later going to be found innocent will have their reputations damaged to a tremendous extent by what takes place in the course of an investigation. So I came out with an idea. How would it work if the reporter, in the course of gathering his story, were totally protected with an absolute privilege—even if he were writing matters that criticized the judgment of his subject—so long as he did not accuse him of any immoral or illegal conduct? But at the point the reporter singles out an individual and writes—from not his own knowledge but the knowledge of some other person who has given him the information—a person that he's not willing to identify—that this man

has done something illegal or immoral that would affect the man's personal reputation—at the point somehow there has to be a way that the man accused can protect himself, provided the reporter publishes it, by coming back and saying, "All right, now, someone has accused me of being a crook. Who says so?" If the accused can't do that, how does he protect himself?

I find it's very difficult to formulate what I think is a fair position. Because I do understand that there has to be some sort of privilege that runs to an investigative reporter. But at some point we must stop the character assassination that can occur through carelessness or through design on the part of the reporter. I don't know just how you do that. I think that one of the principal gains that could come out of our free discussions of this matter would be to try to evolve some system to do that. Now, forgetting about immoral or illegal conduct entirely, just think about expertise in a job and the judgments that a man makes in the course of his political career—how he can be second-guessed by spectators. If someone writes a story that an undisclosed source said something, a high White House source, or any of the other characterizations, a longtime state-house observer, a longtime State Department expert of ambassadorial rank, or whatever the case may be—you never do find out who those people are. The public doesn't know what degree of credibility or expertise to assign to them because it's all left in the hands of the reporter to indicate how believable they are by the way he adjectively presents them in his article.

Q. So is it your opinion that there is not sufficient remedy for this problem in two things: one, libel suits and, secondly, the question of the damage to the reputation of a newspaper which makes these charges and is unable to back them up?

A. I don't think there is sufficient recourse in either one of those things. First, with regard to people in the public sphere, libel suits have become laughable. There is no way to collect in a libel suit because of recent court decisions. We don't have the British system, which is very rigid. And I'm not prepared to say which way that ought to go. I'd much rather see more careful reporting than see a rash of libel suits come up. But maybe this is the only way to keep the freedom of investigation and require the care that's necessary. Perhaps it's worth talking about.

The other point you raised I don't believe really is a factor. Because people read a newspaper casually, and today's newspaper is gone, it's discarded. I doubt if anybody except people such as myself ever read newspapers carefully or pull out something or refer back to something. The average person reads it as a casual source of general information. He couldn't separate in his own mind which newspaper he read something in or whether he heard it on television or heard it on his car radio. He only knows that he heard certain things. So I don't think a newspaper's reputation is damaged by stories that it makes errors in.

For example, I don't think that most of the error is ever presented as error to the public. There's a correction printed occasionally, sometimes not. I've had little things that from time to time I wanted to correct. I don't even try anymore, and I think probably they shouldn't be corrected from my standpoint, we shouldn't even try to correct because it just brings it up all over again.

Q. In the Harding College speech you suggested that the "advocacy journalists," as you phrased it, in recent years have tended to be antigovernment. Do you think of this as a problem that is particularly directed against this administration, or are you concerned about a general problem of skepticism of all

government officials in all branches of government at all times?

A: I think it's a general posture against the power of the government. The fear that power is being misused. And the social consciousness that things are not perfect. Not even equitable. And the feeling that the government should be able to correct that. It's the old attitude that most young people have, and I had when I was young, that if I could just get in there I could straighten it all out. The complexities of the competing positions are not discerned by somebody outside of the government—not as well as they are when you actually have to get in and devise the policy. Consequently, I think this causes an orientation sort of hostile to the failures of the government to realize utopian perspectives.

Q: Do you regard this incipient national press council as in any way being helpful in dealing with these issues that you've raised?

A: Well, I think some press councils have been successful. The Minnesota one apparently has been successful. On the other hand, I feel ambivalent about whether a press council is of necessity the answer. There are dangers in a press council. Clearly, a press council takes away a lot of independence of the organ, independence that perhaps they are constitutionally entitled to. It's a question of how much power it exerts. There's a question of who is the press council—I mean, if the paper's biased it's possible for a press council to be biased. There's no way to assure that it is a good press council.

But I do think that the idea of a review for fairness in reporting is a good idea. How to bring it about, whether it's through a press council, whether it's through individual awareness of the dangers inherent in drifting unconsciously into a biased position, whatever. I think that we have come some distance in creating a greater sensitivity on the part of the media to the fact that they can, without even wanting to, drift into opinion patterns that are biased.

Q: When you got into this subject several years ago your main concern seemed to be that television commentary was in effect jamming the President's message to the American people. Do you still see a real problem of the President as one political actor getting his views across to the American people?

A: Not as much. I think there's been a greater restraint in commentary, a much greater effort to report the totality of a message than to reconstruct it. But it still has certain inherent dangers. This business of instant analysis: Certainly there should be analysis, and commentary, and opinion about what takes place. But there's something insidious about having any speaker, a President, for example, give a message to an audience in its totality, and then having someone come on right behind him and tell the people who just heard the message what was said.

First of all, it performs not a purpose of enlightenment, because the listeners already have the whole message. They've just absorbed it. The analysis has a way of emphasizing certain things and certain possible conclusions to be reached from those points that are being reiterated, and it can to some extent affect the viewpoint of the recipients. I don't think it should happen that way. Now, the following day if somebody comes on and says "Now, this is how I feel about what the President said," that's different.

Q: But isn't the same audience that has just heard the President able to apply the same intelligence in evaluating any comments that they hear after the President? I don't see why it's harder for them to see through the commentary, if you will, than for them to analyze the evidence that the President has presented.

A: Well, I'll tell you why. In my opinion, a person who comes into a living room every night with regularity as a news commenta-

tor, a network commentator, becomes a very highly respected and regarded individual, particularly if he's as personable and as decent and nice as most of the people who appear on U.S. television.

There's a credibility that flows to these people on the simple basis that the average listener says, "Well, he has not an axe to grind, why shouldn't he be telling me the truth?" There's an avuncular image, a benign image, that revolves around a commentator. He is apolitical in their eyes, and he has a much firmer basis for being objective than someone who is in a position of political responsibility who is trying to explain why he took certain moves or why he didn't take certain moves.

Consequently, you can't conclude that, to the average viewer, the analysis is regarded with the same degree of suspicion as the subject of the analysis. You look at a President and say, "Well, he has his administration's viewpoint, he's trying to justify what he's done." But these people (the commentators) don't have anything to justify. In the viewer's mind, they have no reason to go one way or another. Consequently, they are in a much more formidable position to react pro or con to what's said.

Q: Would you have a similar objection or would you feel differently if the television networks, say, simply brought on other politicians representing different points of view than the President? So the people would be contrasting the views of one politician, the President, with that of other politicians?

A: I think that would help. And some of the networks have tried to do this, sometimes successfully and sometimes unsuccessfully. But there is a danger in that also because these are flash opinions based on immediate reactions without any chance to stop and think through the speech or look back on it or examine it or check it against available fact. And when you put somebody on television, he has to say something. The last thing he wants to say is, "I don't know anything about it." And consequently he may not be as careful or accurate or intelligent about his commentary as he might if he had time to think about it a little bit.

Q: Are you concerned at all about the question of access to the public for politicians other than the President, representing other points of view?

A: Well, the question of access for well-known people is not a problem. If I want to go on, I can go on. If a senator wants to get on, he can probably get on. But access for people who are not established personalities is a problem. It's difficult. A young person who wants to begin a political career has a very difficult time getting his opinions aired or printed, particularly if he has no office from which to speak.

Q: In view of your stress again on diversity of opinion, what is your view of the actions of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting on public affairs programming?

A: I'm going to be candid and say that I have not looked at enough public broadcasting to have a firm opinion about it. And I really should have inspected it a lot more carefully.

One thing I did see recently distressed me a great deal. I saw it on one of the commercial channels, but it was a rebroadcast of a public affairs program filmed by public broadcasting in New York. And it appeared on a program called "Camera Three," I think, that shows here on Sunday morning in Washington.

[Agnew apparently was referring to a "Camera Three" show produced for the CBS station in New York and shown here on Channel 9 last February. It was an edited film of a conversation between the Scottish psychiatrist R. D. Laing and Joseph Chalkin, founder of an experimental theater group in New York.]

There were two people sitting in a conver-

sation in the yoga position and very unconventional attire which probably did not attract my sympathetic interest at the moment. And for half an hour they were involved in relating their personal experiences. And one of them, just to give you an idea, was saying why his mother had an impact on his life. His father had not been very kind to her and never gave her anything for her birthday, except one time when he carefully packaged a beautifully wrapped gift and presented it to her on her birthday. And then he began through his own facial expressions to try and show what her reactions were when she opened up the box and it turned out to be a three-months' supply of his father's toenail clippings.

And I kept watching it. I said to myself, "There has to be some point to this. This is being shown, it's being rebroadcast. It was filmed on educational television. There's got to be some point to it." I wasn't able to figure out what the point was. It was so distressing to me from the standpoint of a waste of good time that I tried to get a copy of it and I couldn't.

So again you have the question of media judgment about what you use public television for. To me, it is not justifiable that the taxpayers have to pay for the filming of something of this type. And in trying to decide whether it has any redeeming social significance, I couldn't come up with it.

I think also that we tend too much to go to the professional in looking for diversity: If we're looking for a conservative we go hunt up James J. Kilpatrick or William Buckley. Because they're known. They may not be reflective of contemporary conservatism in the sense that perhaps a young intellectual out of the Hudson Institute would be.

Q: So in these terms it doesn't cause you any qualms when the funding is taken away from a program like Buckley's or like "Washington Week in Review" or Bill Moyers or Liz Drew? Does that seem to you to be consonant with the general theory of diversity which you've laid out?

A: Well, the question then becomes whether the public dollar should be spent in the propagation of political viewpoints, and again that's a difficult subject. I don't feel qualified at this point to make the judgments on public television. Of course, I do want diversity, and I'd like to see us use every way to get it.

Q: Let me ask you just one final thing: Do you have in general, as part of your theory about the relationships between government and media, any thought about the desirability or obligation of public officials to have press conferences? Particularly public officials like the President, who have really automatic access to media on occasions that they choose to make full statements of their own views on a particular subject?

A: Well, you run into a problem with press conferences, and I'm not talking about the President particularly. You go into a press conference that lasts an hour, and you cover maybe 20 subjects. And you can pretty well predict that the report on that press conference will be on two, at the most three, of those subjects. And particularly in a continuing encounter with the press, as in a campaign. As you move from city to city, responses to questions in one city are brought up by the traveling press in another city, and a dialogue develops that has nothing to do with the subject matter in your campaign speech at that place, or with the interests of the people in that place. Press conferences often frustrate and infuriate public people when they're trying to get a balanced report of what's on their mind and all they get is the *cause celebre* of the moment with some new angle or some new interpretation to a response or some alleged conflict or nuance between a previous response and that one.

EUROPE'S SPACE HOPES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial in *Aviation Week*, Mr. Robert Hotz, discusses the plans of the European community to participate in the Space Shuttle program by designing and developing a sortie module. This program will be undertaken at the cost of the European community and will be a direct \$250 million contribution to the flexibility and use of the Space Shuttle. This is a most welcome development which is well described by Mr. Hotz in his editorial:

EUROPE'S SPACE HOPES

Europe is finally showing an inclination to become a serious force in international space technology by mustering its considerable but dispersed technological resources into a strong, homogeneous program that transcends its narrow geographical and political boundaries. The basic decisions that translated these long-cherished hopes for a strong European space presence into the possibility of reality were taken by the ministers of the European Space Conference in Brussels late last year (AW&ST Jan. 1, p. 14).

Most important of these decisions was to junk the diverse and relatively ineffective organizations of ELDO and ESRO and to create a single European space agency along the lines of the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The other major decision was to proceed along organizational and development lines that would eventually enable European space teams to participate on a significant technical and scientific basis in the U.S. space shuttle program. The space shuttle program is the most important future space program in the world. By moving into position to be able to build and use a significant part of the space shuttle system, Europe will finally get itself into the mainstream of international space technology.

This was a goal that many European scientists, engineers and government officials believed would remain permanently out of reach. And so it would, if basic attitudes of European governments had not changed.

When the United States and the USSR engaged in their massive technological struggle for pre-eminence in the exploration of outer space during the last decade, many influential Europeans believed that the space game was one in which Europe could never, by virtue of its divided entity, play a significant role and that its only recourse was to dabble in scientific experiments attached to the coattails of the U.S. and USSR space giants.

Major exception to this philosophy were the French under the leadership of the late Charles de Gaulle. He believed, and was able to convince his constituents, that space technology was a vital sinew of modern power. He launched France on a vigorous and ambitious program of space technology from boosters to satellites.

Ironically, it is this strong position of technical leadership in European space technology that now makes France reluctant to see its prowess merged into the European NASA. The French are struggling hard to preserve European booster development, partly because of their own IRBM requirements and partly because of a basic distrust of dependence on uncontrollable sources of launch vehicles.

It really makes little sense for Europe, aside from the French military missile requirement, to dilute its resources on repeti-

tion of booster technology that is already available from the U.S. However, it also behooves the U.S. to stop playing its cat and mouse game with the availability of its boosters. The U.S. should make it clear that boosters will be available regardless of the temporary whims or shifts of political fashions.

France has also taken the European lead in communications satellite technology and will be reluctant to surrender its ongoing programs such as *Symphonie* to a supranational authority. However thorny these problems of integrating the strong French space program into a truly European program may appear currently, they are bound to fade in the future as new programs become too large and complex for any national resources in Europe.

The first example of this is now at hand in the opportunity for a European team to build the space laboratory module for the U.S. space shuttle—a \$250-300-million job in the mainstream of future development. Two strong consortiums have been formed to compete for this job if the new European NASA gives a green light. They are both headed by German firms, reflecting the strong technical capabilities and philosophical dedication of this country to space technology—a position that its financial resources cannot yet fully support.

ERNO/VFW-Fokker heads a team including Dornier, AEG-Telefunken and Standard Elektrik Lorenz of Germany; Aeritalia of Italy, INTA and Sener of Spain, SABCA and BTM of Belgium; Thomson-CSF and Matra of France, and Hawker Siddeley Dynamics of Britain.

Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm heads the competing consortium with Siemens of Germany; Aerospatiale and SEP of France; British Aircraft Corp., Marconi and Garrett, Ltd., of Britain; Selenia, FIAR and Laben of Italy; CASA of Spain; ECTA of Belgium, and Philips of Holland. ERNO has a technical assistance agreement with McDonnell Douglas and MBB with Martin Marietta.

We hope that both the European and U.S. NASAs give firm approval for one of these consortiums to do the space lab job later this year, because it will represent a giant step forward not only for a truly European space effort but also toward the increasing internationalization of space technology. By its very nature, the exploration and utilization of space must be international. It is ironic that space technology got its tremendous initial impetus from the fierce nationalistic competition between the USSR and the U.S.

But the view of this fragile, tiny planet earth from the Apollo spacecraft has given man a new perspective on his home. It is now clear that all mankind must be concerned with the fate of this planet. The Apollo-Soyuz joint manned space mission is a small but significant step toward internationalization of space. European participation in the U.S. space shuttle program would be another larger step in this direction. We hope Europe can organize its multi-national technical resources effectively to tackle this job and the European governments involved seize the tremendous opportunity it presents.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 77—JOINTLY ADMINISTERED TRUST FUNDS FOR LEGAL SERVICES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD

the text of an amendment I intend to propose to H.R. 77, as reported with amendments:

On page 2, line 3, immediately after "Provided," insert the following: "That no labor organization or employer shall be required to bargain on the establishment of any such trust fund, and refusal to do so shall not constitute an unfair labor practice, however, once bargaining has produced an agreement regarding the establishment of such trust fund, it shall constitute an unfair labor practice to (A) unilaterally modify or terminate that agreement, or (B) fail or refuse to bargain in good faith regarding such trust fund in the next subsequent contract negotiation between the same parties: *Provided further*,"

Mr. Speaker, I recognize and support the growing movement to make legal assistance available on a reasonable cost basis to the median income as well as other segments of the population. H.R. 77, however, ought to be improved to prevent abuses of the trust fund mechanism, so that those employers who do not wish to participate in such programs will not be faced with charges of unfair labor practices.

My amendment would mean that the trust fund is considered to be a "permissive" rather than a "mandatory" subject of bargaining. Precedent is found in the previous exemption to 302(c) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which contains identical language in allowing employer payments for scholarships or child care centers. With my amendment, the bill would remove the present obstacle to legal services plans without mandating that such plans be established.

It is also necessary to protect the employees' interests in such trust funds, if established, from unnecessary disruptions in the delivery of services. The amendment would make it an unfair labor practice once such a trust fund has been set up, to: (1) unilaterally modify or terminate the trust fund during the period covered by the bargaining agreement; and (2) fail or refuse to bargain in good faith regarding the trust fund during the next subsequent contract negotiation.

THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION LAW, THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, AND THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past year I have on numerous occasions called attention to abuses of the Freedom of Information Act by the Internal Revenue Service and their continued refusal to permit the General Accounting Office to conduct management audits into how IRS is spending the \$1 billion plus tax dollars it receives annually to carry out its operations.

In this connection, I commend to our colleagues two informative articles further elaborating on the continuing ef-

forts being made to get the IRS to comply with the law of the land. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, our former House colleague (Mr. MONTROYA) for his leadership in this fight. The Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee has conducted several investigative hearings in this same controversial area and will also continue our efforts to require IRS to comply fully with the letter and spirit of the Freedom of Information Act and to permit GAO to conduct a meaningful audit of IRS activities as the Budget and Accounting Act clearly authorizes.

The articles are written by the nationally syndicated tax columnist, Mr. E. Edward Stephens, who has done so much to make the American public aware of this important subject.

The articles follow:

COUNSEL FOR THE TAXPAYER: IRS HAS ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

(By E. Edward Stephens)

"DEAR COUNSEL: Is there room for improvement in the way the Internal Revenue Service administers our federal tax laws?"

Indeed there is—according to an impressive string of witnesses who testified last week before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Treasury, chaired by Joseph M. Montoya, D-N.M. To buttress their testimony, they placed in the record a stack of documentary evidence, including at least 15 of my columns highlighting IRS abuses of power.

One of the most effective witnesses was Rep. William S. Moorhead, D-Pa., hard hitting chairman of the House Foreign Operations and Government Information subcommittee. He pulled no punches in telling what his committee had learned in extensive hearing last year.

Moorhead said top IRS officials have a "high-handed, unrepentant, bureaucratic attitude" that "tramples on the legal rights" of citizens guaranteed by the 1967 Freedom of Information Act. As an example, Moorhead said row on row of statistical reports had been whisked off the Treasury library shelves last year. This was done immediately after embarrassing figures, gleaned from the reports, had been published in this column.

Moorhead said such "distorted and secrecy-minded policies" subvert the "entire meaning and purpose" of Congress in enacting the Freedom of Information Act. (Moorhead now is putting the finishing touches on a bill to strengthen the F.O.I. Act.)

Fuel was piled on the fire by Thomas F. Field, executive director of Tax Analysts and Advocates, who said the present organizational setup of IRS and its parent Treasury Department is "a fertile source of waste, inefficiency and bureaucratic conflict."

IRS issues about 30,000 private letter rulings a year, but publishes only about 650. The rest are kept for secret use, thus giving IRS agents, tax auditors and conferees an unfair advantage over taxpayers in settlement negotiations. This practice is "outrageous," Field said.

Serious charges were leveled by Philip H. and Susan B. Long, the pluckiest couple IRS officials have met up with in ages. They flew in from their Bellevue, Wash., home, loaded with documentary evidence to prove their points.

One of their charges is that IRS officials set up dollar quotas that agents, tax auditors and conferees must fulfill, or else. The Longs said that, contrary to published IRS policy, these employees are expected to produce a certain minimum amount of deficiencies, and IRS officials don't care whether the taxpayers under examination really owe the money or not.

This was corroborated by Vincent L. Connery, who had been an agent for 17 years, 1950 to 1967. He said: "IRS agents know they are graded on production of dollars, not on fairness." Connery now is president of the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees.

Specific recommendations for improvement were made by various witnesses, including Ralph Nader and former Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue William Smith, as well as former Commissioners Mortimer Caplin, Sheldon Cohen and Randolph Thrower. I'll write about their proposals in columns to come.

Committee chairman Montoya has instructed IRS to respond in writing to all charges and recommendations made at the hearings. He expects the reply before IRS appropriations are approved this spring.

The hearings ended on an encouraging note. Montoya expressed a desire to hold similar hearings every year to maintain regular communication between IRS, Congress and the taxpayers.

COUNSEL FOR THE TAXPAYER: THE HEAT'S ON TO AUDIT IRS

(By E. Edward Stephens)

DEAR COUNSEL: "The Internal Revenue Service's annual report states that in fiscal 1972, IRS collected \$210 billion from U.S. taxpayers, and spent over \$1 billion of tax money. About a year ago, your column reported that IRS wouldn't let the General Accounting Office audit these tremendous operations. Is IRS still holding out on GAO?"

Yes, but the heat's on. IRS soon may have to get out of the kitchen.

The fire was started last May when U.S. Deputy Comptroller General Robert F. Keller spilled the beans during hearings of the House Government Operations subcommittee on information. Keller rocked the members by exposing IRS's refusal to submit to any meaningful management audit.

Chairman William S. Moorhead, D-Pa., gave IRS a chance to refute Keller's charge. But, despite an eloquent performance by Internal Revenue Commissioner Johnnie M. Walters and his team, committee members were convinced that IRS was away off base.

Moorhead isn't about to let IRS off the hook. He showed up Feb. 28 as a witness before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on the Treasury, and called IRS "arrogant" for denying GAO access to its records.

Sen. Lawton Chiles, D-Fla., asked Moorhead if he thought legislation would be required to force IRS into regular audits by GAO. Moorhead replied that Congress might not have to go so far. He said "maybe" Sen. Joseph M. Montoya's committee could swing IRS into line.

The desires of these two powerful committees hardly could be ignored. Before IRS can get a dime from Congress, Montoya's group must approve its appropriations. And Moorhead's panel now is considering legislation that would strengthen the Freedom of Information Act and rein in agencies that withhold information from Congress and its watchdog, the General Accounting Office.

The heat is increasing. Paul G. Dembling, GAO's general counsel, testified April 3 before Moorhead's committee. He updated and reinforced the GAO position as it had been stated last year by Keller.

Dembling said the 1921 Budget and Accounting Act authorizes GAO to examine the books and records of all U.S. departments and agencies. There are a few exceptions, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, but IRS isn't one of them.

IRS says it's implicitly exempted by Internal Revenue Code sections 6406 and 8022. Moorhead assessed this position as "very weak."

Both committees would like to get the views of taxpayers in all parts of the coun-

try. Write to Hon. Joseph M. Montoya, 4107 New Senate Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20510, and Hon. William S. Moorhead, B317-B Rayburn House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515.

NEW OUTLOOK ON FOREIGN AID

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excellent editorial from today's Washington Post which comments on the new proposals for developmental aid submitted by a number of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI):

A PROMISING AID PROPOSAL IN THE HOUSE

The lengthy travails of American foreign aid have made clear to its supporters the need to make aid at once more effective for its recipients and more attractive to its donors. Pessimists have doubted that these twin goals could either be served adequately, or even combined to all. A bipartisan majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, however, has now produced a well-considered and promising proposal meant to do both. Introduced by Rep. Clement Zablocki (D-Wis.), the proposal is intended to strengthen and enlarge the overall economic aid program and to do so in a way calculated to enhance the prospects of the program's passage in Congress. The first without the second is, of course, useless.

So, to satisfy those who have rightfully demanded that aid do more to improve the quality of the lives of the poor, the new proposal would take the same \$1 billion which the administration asks for economic assistance and seek to focus the money more sharply on "human-oriented" needs in population control, agriculture, health and the like. Not every development economist agrees that the poorest of the poor can thus be helped but the approach unquestionably has considerable moral and political merit. Big capital-eating projects such as dams would be left, to an even greater extent than they already are, to the international development agencies.

Then, to satisfy those whose main interest in aid is that it expand American exports, an "export development credit fund" would be established to subsidize another \$1 billion a year in easy-term exports to the lowest-income countries. The interest subsidies, costing \$40 million, would be funded from repayments of earlier aid loans; repayments now run at \$40 million. By training aid on "people not projects" and by hitching to the aid wagon those Americans desiring to help their own economy as well as Americans desiring to help the world's poor, the House sponsors hope to surmount the political obstacles to aid which have grown so high in recent years. To convey the relationship of interdependence which the new proposal reflects and advances, the name of the administering agency would be changed from "Agency for International Development" to "Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency."

It is satisfying to report that, in his department's first formal response, Secretary of State William Rogers Tuesday welcomed the House committee's "thoughtful and positive approach" and noted correctly that AID had itself been moving along similar lines. Mr. Rogers also pronounced himself "espe-

cially pleased at the committee's reaffirmation of the central role of the Department of State in over-all guidance of U.S. development policies." Whether the other elements of the government, particularly the White House, will be equally pleased remains to be seen. On that question of bureaucratic politics, a good part of the fate of the House initiative probably hangs. To imagine that any program so multi-dimensional and so worn and frayed as aid can be considered only on its merits is, alas, fantasy.

Nor can the question of congressional politics be ignored. Not every committee of the Congress will rejoice to see the House Foreign Affairs Committee setting up and overseeing a program in what would be for it the new field of direct export promotion. (Foreign aid has always had a heavy aspect of indirect export promotion.) On these grounds, the sooner that Foreign Affairs chairman Thomas E. Morgan (D.-Pa.) eases from his current posture of benign aloofness, as one observer calls it, to active sponsorship, the better.

The other big question which will shape the fate of the new economic aid proposal is its political relationship to the equally controversial question of military aid. The administration put the two together in a single package. Predictably the Senate split off the military items—these include general security assistance and grant military aid for Cambodia. Indochina reconstruction funds are also in the administration bill. In welcoming the House economic aid proposal, it was plainly one of Mr. Rogers' purposes to cultivate support for the other items in that bill. Some supporters of the House proposal favor the other items, some don't. A difficult and protracted negotiation is no doubt in store. Whenever and however it ends, we would hope that both Congress and the administration would keep high in mind the prospect for responsible engagement in the world, which the House aid initiative holds out.

BALLAD OF THE UNBORN

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert in the RECORD a poem by Fay Clayton which graphically portrays the plight of those who, because of abortion, never had the opportunity to experience life:

BALLAD OF THE UNBORN

(By Fay Clayton)

My shining feet will never run
On early morning lawn;
My feet were crushed before they had
A chance to greet the dawn.

My fingers now will never stretch
To touch the winning tape;
My race was done before I learned
The smallest steps to take.

My growing height will never be
Recorded on the wall;
My growth was stopped when I was still,
Unseen, and very small.

My lips and tongue will never taste
The good fruits of the earth;
For I myself was judged to be
A fruit of little worth.

My eyes will never scan the sky
For my high-flying kite;
For when still blind, destroyed were they
In the black womb of night.

I'll never stand upon a hill
Spring's winds in my hair,
Aborted winds of thought closed in
On motherhood's despair.

I'll never walk the shores of life
Or know the tides of time;
For I was coming but unloved,
And that my only crime.

Nameless am I, a grain of sand
One of the countless dead,
But the deed that made me ashen grey
Floats on seas of red.

PRIME TIME ACCESS RULE—NEW SOURCE OF DIVERSITY FOR TELEVISION

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a rather unwieldy acronym, PTAR, could—if given half a chance—be the key to opening up programming on network-affiliated television stations across the country.

PTAR, which stands for prime time access rule, is under attack from some interests in broadcasting who tend to oppose any change however helpful.

Unfortunately, the promise of PTAR at this point exceeds the performance. The rule was designed to encourage new sources of programming by "freeing" one-half hour of prime time each night from network control; stations were told in effect to find something else to fill the time.

Although the rule did not become fully effective until last October, the number of producers furnishing syndicated programs to network stations in the top 50 TV cities has climbed from 21 in 1970 to more than 40 now. For the 1973-74 broadcast season, more than 50 producers are offering 81 shows specifically for prime access time.

The rule, therefore, has already been partially successful, in making it possible for new producers to enter this highly competitive field.

But the potential for PTAR has barely been tapped. Much of the programming which has appeared on the set-aside half-hours is hardly inspired. There are some shopworn variety and game programs, reborn after full lives on the commercial networks. Some of the fresh fare that is being offered is all too reminiscent of the oldies but baddies we endured 15 years or so ago on the networks.

But there have been some innovative programs and if PTAR is given a firmer hold I am sure we would get more of these.

Particularly, I would like to see a more ambitious effort to cater to the needs of the minorities and special interest groups who receive scant attention from networks necessarily dedicated to finding the broadest common denominator.

Unlike the regular network programs, programming stimulated by the PTAR may be aired on just a handful of stations, perhaps only one or two if it is

truly local in origination. This type of programming can afford to be different, in catering to different groups within a given television market area.

But if we water down the prime time access rule, or throw it out altogether as some of its critics suggest, what will we gain? If the networks resume control of the half-hours they have yielded, most obviously the opportunity for program diversification will be gone; no one seriously imagines that the networks would or even could prepare a steady diet of shows tailored to specific groups in our multifaceted society.

The Federal Communications Commission will hold a special meeting Thursday to discuss future implementation of the prime time access rule.

It has been suggested that the rule should be extended for at least 5 years if it is to have the chance to function properly. This is a suggestion which I heartily endorse, as the most logical means of giving stations and independent producers the leadtime they should have to prepare programming that is both innovative and original, and of benefit to particular segments of the population.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider legislation to extend the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities for 3 more years. This important legislation has received strong support from all over the country. As a cosponsor of the bill, I was delighted to see today's editorial in the New York Times which I insert in the RECORD at this point. I hope my colleagues will read it and give this very worthwhile bill their support. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1973]

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

In the next few days the House of Representatives will vote on renewing funds for the National Endowment for the Arts and its twin-agency for the Humanities. The bill would authorize somewhat less money than the corresponding measure already passed by the Senate—less, for that matter, than the amount President Nixon requested—but it is good enough to warrant the hope that it will be passed intact and by so large a margin that the Appropriations Committee will be discouraged from any attempts to cut it.

Administration and Congress have been growing more generous in recent years in the support the Federal Government gives to the arts and humanities. But unfortunately the costs of maintaining such expressions of civilization as theaters, museums, orchestras and dance companies, and of keeping their personnel alive and active—these, too, are relative. The point has been made that in a country of 230 million people, even the proposed Federal allowance of \$72.5 million for the arts will come to about 32 cents a head, compared with the \$1.40 put up by each Canadian and the \$2.40 by each West German.

Yet even this modest assistance would help

struggling institutions to jump the gap of rising costs without having to price admission tickets out of the market. In view of what this might mean to marginal arts groups, indeed to the cultural life of the nation, the House could only do itself honor by acknowledging, as the Senate has, the needs of the human spirit.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure to join with Italians throughout the world in commemorating the anniversary of the Republic of Italy. Only 27 years ago—on June 2, 1946—the people of Italy voted to abolish the monarchy and establish a democratic republic—a republic that has flourished and become a major nation of the free world.

Italy has shown herself to be a country of great energy and progressiveness. In these last 27 years, Italy has achieved the goal of full partnership in the community of nations. Her participation in the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has enriched the world family through Italy's strong and vigorous support for the ideals they represent. As a member of various European community organizations, she has been a strong force for European solidarity.

Like the phoenix rising from the flames, Italy has risen in the last generation from a war ravaged country to a thriving, prosperous nation. She represents a living example of what a people can achieve when they dare to commit their hearts, minds, and physical energy to the task of building a better life for themselves. The rate of increase in Italy's GNP has been among the highest in the world, and Italy has progressed from a largely agricultural country to one with a modern, diversified economy and an increasingly vigorous foreign trade.

In achieving this transformation of their society, the Italian people have exhibited the same forceful drive, intelligence, and imagination which gave birth to some of the world's greatest thinkers and doers in history. The genius of Michelangelo, Dante, Fermi, and Marconi has left a lasting imprint on the Italian mind and has supported the recent attempts to revitalize Italy.

Over the past generations, our country has also witnessed the energy and drive of Italian-Americans who have contributed their talent and wit to the growth of America. Their diligence, intelligence, strength of character, and love of God and family have been an inspiration. Their achievements in the arts, sciences, politics, and sports are legion.

Therefore, as we honor the anniversary of the Italian Republic, let us remember with pride the important contributions of the Italian people to their own nation and the world. And let us await with eager anticipation the future

contributions of Italy and her people to the future of mankind.

BETTY FURNESS SPEAKS FOR CONSUMERS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, at our recent community conference in New York's 20th District, we were fortunate to have among our speakers, Ms. Betty Furness, New York City Commissioner of Consumer Affairs. Actually she represents millions of consumers across the Nation and it is a real pleasure to insert in the RECORD the remarks she made on that occasion. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY NEW YORK CITY COMMISSIONER
OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BETTY FURNESS

I'm very pleased to be here with you this afternoon. I was tickled to death when Bella asked me if I would come down here and join her. I would add one thing to what Bella said in her introduction: that I went from Hollywood to Westinghouse to Albany to New York. I started that trip from New York City.

I was born in this city and with the exception of having lived in California a couple of times I have always lived here, and I cannot tell you what a thrill it is to have an official job helping to protect the consumers of what I consider my city.

The title on today's program is "Nixon's Budget and Priorities." Well, we can dispense with that very quickly as far as consumers are concerned. Because the Nixon budget for consumers is fiscally almost nothing and emotionally even less.

As you know, I'm sure you're all aware that Nixon's Knauer has no power. I'm afraid we're never going to know what kind of a consumer protector Ms. Knauer might be because her boss has not given her the go-ahead or, even the permission to try to be a good consumer protector. Now he's eased that whole office out of the White House and over into H.E.W. where it may never be seen again. So I think for the next—thank God, we don't have four more years, what we do have is three years two hundred and sixty days... but who counts? I think in that time we can look for little or nothing from the White House as far as consumer protection is concerned.

Let's run down who ought to help consumers. The federal government certainly must help consumers in any areas that concern health or safety. I think when things are going on in health or safety that we didn't know about, they should automatically and immediately be brought to the attention of the federal government. It would make no sense at all for the citizens of one city or state to be healthier than the citizens of another city or state. So the federal government has got to protect us all at once. There are other areas where the federal government can be of enormous help but it isn't always. Certainly under the executive leadership we have today we're not going to get much help.

The state should be of help to consumers because there are some areas where the state, in effect, has the jurisdiction. Matters of banking and insurance, specifically, are all regulated at the state level. But there are other areas where the state could be of enormous help. The state can pass a law and if it doesn't turn out to be such a brilliant

success it can be changed or repealed in a couple of years. But as a result of states trying some ideas experimentally, we've all become better off.

For example, truth in lending. As you well know, all truth in lending does is tell us what it costs to buy credit. That's all it does. It makes it possible for you to compare sources of credit from one place to another. Now this idea had kicked around Congress for seven or eight years and it had been fought by big powers who said we'll never get truth in lending because if the consumers know how much they're paying for credit, they won't use credit and therefore the whole economy will get out of gear.

The state of Massachusetts tried it. It had a truth in lending law and after it had been in effect a year, everybody looked up at Massachusetts and found that nobody had gone out of business. And so the whole argument fell. What was tried out on an experimental basis turned out to be good enough for all of us and the federal government finally got truth in lending for everybody.

There are many other cases where the states can and should lead. The state of New York is not notably progressive in the area and I see no reason why it shouldn't be. New York City and State have been leaders in so many areas: legislative, cultural, whatever you want to call it. I see no reason why New York State should not be very vigorous in protecting the consumer.

I notice happily that the governor signed a couple of consumer protection bills the other day, bills that were introduced way back when I was still working for the state, so the wheels of the gods at Albany grind slowly. But they grind!

Then let's get down to the city, as far as consumer protection is concerned. Well, I'd like to offer you my congratulations, because you are living in the only city that has a consumer protection office such as exists in the Department of Consumer Affairs. There is nothing else like it anywhere in the country. Nothing even to compare to it. It is a remarkable example of what can be done and what I think should be done.

As you know, this department is only four years old and the strides that have been made in that time, under the marvelous leadership of Bess Myerson, have just been extraordinary.

The first, biggest thing that Bess went after was the Consumer Protection Law, and she did a very good job of getting it passed by the City Council. Under that law the department that I now, happily, head has the right to regulate unfair and deceptive trade practices. In the time since that law was passed, about three years, there are now 35 regulations under that law. They range from the size of type in advertisements to the regulation of repair services: 35 different regulations to help you get a fair deal in the market place.

We also handle specific complaints. We call merchants and we call whoever people have trouble with and we try to straighten out complaints. As you probably know, we have five neighborhood offices where people can go in and say, "I don't know what happened to me but somebody did something wrong." And we have real live people there who try to sort out the complaint and talk to the merchant. If they can't handle it directly, they tell the consumer where to go with the problem and what proper recourse they have.

These are the areas where you can expect help, as long as you live in New York. If you live in Pittsburgh it's not so good. The point here is that as in so many other areas of life consumers are going to have to learn to help themselves. We have to learn to be good, efficient consumers, how to play the consumer game. But, in a much larger sense, we have got to organize as consumers

and develop expertise so that we can, with responsibility, be pushing those who should be helping us. Push me, push Albany, and push the federal government. God knows the federal government is being pushed by everybody else now, and that's where the big problem is. In many areas they are listening to the people who holler the loudest. And who's hollering the loudest? Big business. And who is this administration tuned into? Big business.

Now, you may think it's impossible to organize as consumers. You know, if it's such a hot idea, why isn't it being done? Well, it's beginning to be done marvelously. Let me tell you just a couple of instances where people have organized and how well they've succeeded.

In Rochester there is a lady named Judy Brahmin, who belonged to a consumer organization. She decided it was not working too well. So she started her own group which has no formality about it. There are no officers, no meeting places, no secretaries. Everybody does her own work. Judy was upset about any number of things. She organized the upstate people to police the unsafe toys that were still being sold by retailers, that had been theoretically banned. She did a marvelous job on that. She got interested in the leaching of lead from earthenware. Do you remember there was a lot of it coming in from Mexico and other countries and the lead was getting into food and it was very dangerous. So Judy looked into this, all by herself and then found this was true of domestic ware. What she then did was to get Rochester to get the Monroe County Board of Health to examine any earthenware or china that had the kind of decals on it that might leach lead. They examined it all, at a fee of, I think, \$3 an examination, and then they passed a law saying the stuff could not be sold up there in Monroe county.

So one woman has done this. Now you may say, "Oh, I'll bet she is 64 and the children are gone and she has nothing to do." I don't know how old Judy is—she looks to be about 30—but she's got five children, from nine on down, and she's found time to do all of that.

I've got another story that may be my favorite. On the first Earth Day three years ago in Buffalo, a lady named Mrs. Ignatius McCarthy wrote a letter to the *Buffalo Evening News* decrying what was happening to Lake Erie, because it was dying right at the feet of Buffalo. She thought that maybe the phosphates in detergents were helping it to die faster than it had to and she thought housewives ought to cut back on the use of phosphate detergents. She just wrote a letter to the paper.

Another lady named Mrs. Mary Ryan read the letter and she called Mrs. McCarthy and they met. Mrs. McCarthy was about 74 and Mrs. Ryan about 30. They decided they wanted to do something about it and they gathered about two dozen women, none of whom came from an organization. They became an organization called Housewives to End Pollution—HEP.

The HEP ladies went to supermarkets and they said, "We would like you to post the phosphate content of detergents." The supermarkets said, "Uh uh, we can't do that, because it's not up to us to promote the sale of one product over another." So the ladies fell back and realized they honestly didn't know what they were doing. So they tried to figure out what to do and they did it. They studied. They peeled off in various groups of twos and threes and they studied phosphates, eutrophication, sewage disposal, everything that related to this story of eutrophication of the lake.

While they were studying they spoke to any four humans who would gather together and listen to them, so they began to be known around the Buffalo area. They got on

radio and television. Finally, they went back to the supermarkets and asked the supermarkets again. They said that if the supermarkets did not post the phosphate labels this time, they might just have to boycott the supermarkets.

The supermarkets saw the light. They not only put up the signs, they paid for the signs. And the ladies were on their way.

Well, we cut the story from there, their first success, to the end of the story. The two dozen women were responsible for Erie County passing a law banning phosphate detergents from the whole county.

So that's what happened when women, with no training, not a scientist among them, not a lawyer among them, sat down and said, "We've got a problem and we've got to figure out how to solve it."

Right in the middle of all of this I had met a Bonnie Phillips, who is one of this group. I was going down to the Federal Trade Commission to testify to the effect that we wanted an ingredient label on detergents. This was about two years ago. I asked Bonnie Phillips to go with me. As Bella will tell you, any Congressional committee or government board that holds hearings in Washington, tends to hear from the same people again and again and they're inclined to say, "Gee, we wish we could hear from a live consumer. We just keep hearing from Betty and Bess and Ralph and like that."

So I took Bonnie Phillips with me. After I'd finished my testimony for the F.T.C., I said, "You've asked for a live consumer, I happen to have one with me. I'd like you to meet Bonnie Phillips."

Bonnie Phillips was eight months pregnant—which didn't hurt our case a whole lot—and she waddled up to the podium and she read her testimony, which was good. But of course they didn't know that she had written it, anybody could have written it, my office could have written it. When she was through, they asked her some questions. She was marvelous and they found out that she really knew what she was talking about. She had ads and anecdotes and facts and figures and she was really an expert on the subject of detergents.

Let me tell you, Bonnie Phillips was so good that when she was finished the detergent industry asked for more time to state their case! And the name "Bonnie Phillips" has fallen into the language of the detergent industry. She is today the best authority I know on phosphate detergents. But if you go to business to ask them, you don't get the same answers. Even if you go to some university people and people whom you might think are not prejudiced, those people will have been, shall we say, influenced by the industry. If anyone wants to know about phosphate detergents, I recommend Bonnie Phillips in Buffalo.

I'm telling you this story to show what can happen when people care enough to do their homework and take responsible action.

There are other kinds of consumer groups. There's one in Philadelphia called Seefa that handles consumer complaints. If you come in with a complaint, they will call the department store, the gas station, or the automobile dealer. If they think the vendor has been unfair, they do something about it. They simply picket him. They tell the police they're going out to picket; they want to do it legally. You would be surprised at the results they get because certain businesses are not crazy about having people picketing out in front of their place. It's powerful stuff but it has been successful. So these are various ways in which the consumer can organize.

There is no perfect example of a consumer group. You can't say, "These people have done it exactly right, so you should follow them." I think perhaps the best example

would be the Housewives to End Pollution in Buffalo, but they are at the moment concentrating on environmental issues and not directly on consumer problems. I recommend to anybody who wants to organize a group, just try to follow what's been done, because nobody's done it perfectly yet. You be the one to originate the way you want to do it. Set up your own structure or lack of structure, because you may be the people who will be the perfect example that everybody else can follow, the model to follow.

If you organize, when you organize, you've got to remember that you've got to really study. You cannot simply say, "Do something." You've got to really know what you're talking about because you're going to have dealings with both business and government, and they all know if you're only bluffing. They all know if you're simply saying, for example, reduce the price of meat. You can say it, but it isn't going to get done that way. You've got to study, you've got to find out where the pressure points are and push at those points. It does no good to holler at the butcher because the butcher is not the fellow who is establishing the price of beef. You've got to figure out where in that whole structure, from the baby calf to your table, where's the fat? Try to push at that point.

Whatever the issue after you've got the information, get to the media. You've got the local newspapers, the local radio stations, the local television stations. They're after people who are doing responsible work. They're dying to publicize what's going on locally so you can get your message spread around. This way you get more interest and you get more people. And then you push.

You push the city, if the object that you stress is in their jurisdiction, you push the state if it's theirs and you push Congress if it's theirs. And you know who'll help you in Congress... Bella will help you in Congress!

The message that you people may not realize is that the consumer constituency is the biggest constituency there is in the United States. If we organize and educate ourselves, and if we push properly at the right time and at the right place, there is absolutely nothing that we cannot do.

DR. BERRY E. EADS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to point out at this time that Dr. Berry E. Eads, of Somerset, Ky., has recently been elected president of the Kentucky Optometric Association—1973-74. I wish to commend the association upon their choosing Dr. Eads for this important position. I believe that he will serve most ably in this capacity.

His record of service and leadership is clearly an impressive one: Vice president of the Kentucky Optometric Association; member of many KOA committees; district governor of the Lions International; president of the Somerset Civic Orchestra Association; city councilman for Albany; member of the advisory committee for the Somerset Community College co-op program; member of the administration board of the Somerset Methodist Church; institutional representative of the Boy Scouts of America;

member of the Clinton County Hospital Board; third degree Mason.

Combining distinguished service to his profession with dedication to community spirit, Dr. Eads will undertake his new responsibility with the character and integrity that he has exhibited in the past. Under his leadership, the Kentucky Optometric Association will certainly continue its excellent work in striving to improve vision care and informational services for our citizens throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

ARGENTINA'S NEW GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, current political trends in Argentina must be regarded as significant to the American people.

Actions taken by the new Argentina President Hector J. Campora leaves much to be desired by American standards.

President Campora has announced recognition of the Communist government of Fidel Castro in Cuba and plans to establish diplomatic relations with North Korea and East Germany.

I include related newsclippings:

[From the Washington Post, May 29, 1973]

PERONIST ARGENTINA RECOGNIZES CASTRO CUBA AFTER 11-YEAR BREAK

(By Terri Shaw)

The new Peronist government of Argentina yesterday resumed diplomatic relations with Cuba after an 11-year break, a move that is expected to influence many other Latin American countries that have been reexamining the cold war policy of isolating Cuba.

Argentine President Hector Campora announced his government's recognition of the government of Prime Minister Fidel Castro after a meeting with Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos, who had been an honored guest at Campora's inauguration Saturday.

[Later, Campora announced that Argentina and North Korea would establish diplomatic relations and a foreign ministry communique announced agreement with East Germany on the establishment of relations.]

The Argentine recognition of Cuba followed by one day Campora's lifting of the ban against the Communist Party.

Both Dorticos and Chilean President Salvador Allende were lionized at the inauguration ceremonies while the U.S. envoy, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, was several rungs down on the protocol ladder and somewhat overshadowed by the publicity and popular acclaim bestowed on the two leftist presidents.

Rogers and most of the other diplomats attending the ceremonies were reportedly encouraged to stay off the streets jammed with celebrating Peronists. But the two Marxist presidents were permitted to travel about and were greeted with cheers wherever they went.

The eclipse of the U.S. envoy, a situation that would have been highly unlikely a few years ago, illustrates the rapid change in attitude in Latin America toward Communism in general and Cuba in particular.

As the Nixon administration has pursued a policy of detente with the Communist superpowers, many Latin American govern-

ments have tried to free themselves of cold war restrictions on dealing with Communists. Most countries in the region now have diplomatic relations and trade with the Soviet Union, and China has exchanged trade missions with several Latin nations.

But the most important cold war issue in Latin America is the isolation of Cuba, decreed by the Organization of American States, at the insistence of Washington, in the early 1960s.

During the past three years, OAS sanctions against Cuba have eroded. Peru, Chile, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago have reestablished relations with the Castro government in defiance of the sanctions. Mexico never joined the other members of the OAS in breaking relations with Havana. Guyana, which is not an OAS member, has also recognized the Castro government.

While the U.S. government's opposition to Castro remains unchanged, Washington's announcement of the "end of paternalism" in its relations with Latin America and the emergence of stronger nationalist governments in the region has made it easier for many Latin countries to take a more independent position toward Cuba.

Castro, meanwhile, has become more receptive to improved relations with other Latin governments. Cuba has curtailed its support for rebel movements, and Castro has drastically changed the tone of his public remarks about other Latin American governments. In the past, the Cuban prime minister vowed to deal only with socialist governments but recently he has called for Latin American unity and said he wanted friendly relations with nonsocialist Latin countries.

In his May Day speech, for example, Castro said: "We are sure that ways of cooperation can be developed with countries following an independent foreign policy and defending their national interests vis-a-vis Yankee imperialism."

Argentina's action in recognizing Cuba is also expected to affect the deliberations of a special committee that is to meet in Peru to consider a complete reorganization of the OAS.

At its general assembly last month in Washington, the OAS voted to support a "plurality of ideologies." This was interpreted to mean the acceptance of all types of political and economic systems, including Communism.

Castro insists that Cuba has no interest in participating in the OAS, which he calls the "ministry of Yankee colonies." But Cuba has become more active in other regional organizations, such as the Latin American caucus at the United Nations, the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America and the "Group of 77" underdeveloped countries.

When Venezuela organized a meeting of Latin American energy ministers, it polled all countries in the region on whether Cuba should be invited. Only Brazil opposed it, a well-informed Venezuelan source said, and Pedro Miret, the Cuban minister of mines, metallurgy and fuels, did attend the meeting in Quito, Ecuador, early last month.

When the delegates decided to form the Latin American Energy Organization, Cuba automatically became a member.

Another international conference that illustrated the warming of relations between Cuba and other Latin countries was the Security Council meeting in Panama in March. Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa had cordial informal conversations with the representatives of many Latin countries that have formerly opposed Cuba.

Panama, whose stand against Washington on the Panama Canal was staunchly supported by Cuba at the Security Council meeting, has sent many delegations to visit Cuba and announced its intention of recognizing the Castro government.

Ecuador, which has mentioned the pos-

sibility of recognizing Cuba, now appears to be waiting to see what happens in the OAS reorganization committee.

Venezuela, a country that sponsored the original OAS sanctions, has exchanged sports teams and government officials with Cuba recently, and reportedly is allowing Soviet tankers that have called at Cuba to transport Venezuelan oil, in apparent violation of an OAS anti-Castro decree.

A Mexican trade mission recently visited Cuba, and there are reports that Cubans would like to buy oil from both Mexico and Venezuela.

While trade between Cuba and other Latin American countries would not be significant economically, it would have political impact.

The only Latin countries that have expressed no interest in changing their relations with Cuba are Brazil, Washington's closest South American ally; Bolivia, which has not forgotten Castro's support for anti-government guerrillas; and Paraguay and a few Central American small countries with rightist governments.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State Times, May 26, 1973]

NEW ARGENTINE PRESIDENT FREES POLITICAL PRISONERS

BUENOS AIRES.—President Hector J. Campora fulfilled his first campaign pledge hours after taking office Friday as Argentina's first civilian president since 1966—by freeing all political prisoners jailed by military rulers during the past seven years.

Campora ordered the jails opened for political prisoners, some of them leftist guerrillas, only hours after taking office. Official sources said at least 185 persons would go free.

After announcing the decision to free political prisoners, Campora appealed to crowds to go home, but about 10,000 persons marched to Villa Devoto prison in a torch-light parade.

THROGS CHEER

There, they cheered as prisoners came out. Hundreds of thousands of persons loyal to ex-president Juan D. Peron, who personally handpicked Campora to run in his place, jammed Buenos Aires to chant Peron's name—and later to riot.

Fighting that broke out during celebrations marking the return of Peronists to power after 17 years left at least 35 persons wounded or injured and endangered some of the 63 foreign delegations attending the inauguration.

Many foreign diplomats, including Secretary of State William P. Rogers, were advised to stay off the streets. Only the presidents of Cuba and Chile, ruled by a self-styled Marxist, were allowed to move freely.

Campora also introduced a moderate cabinet of Peron loyalists that must cope with a variety of serious problems, including a 500 percent cost of living increase since the last civilian government was overthrown in 1966.

PERON IN MADRID

Peron himself stayed in his villa in Madrid, where he directed his followers most of the time since his ouster by the army 17 years ago.

His private secretary, Jose Lopez Reg, who was named Friday as minister of social welfare, said Peron would return to Argentina next month.

After his inauguration, Campora told a session of congress meeting for the first time in seven years that Argentina "will invariably be on the side of those fighting against imperialism."

Huge crowds prevented his triumphant motorcade from traveling through the city so Campora was flown by helicopter to the official ceremonies where he received his sash of office.

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1973]
ARGENTINE GUERRILLAS

BUENOS AIRES.—The Otis Elevator Co. evacuated about 50 dependents of its top executives from Argentina after the People's Revolutionary Army threatened an attack or kidnapping if the company did not make \$500,000 in charitable contributions and double the wages of all its employees.

The same Trotskyite guerrilla group extorted a pledge of \$1 million in donations to hospitals and the poor from Ford Motor Co. last week.

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1973]
LATINS PREFER JAPANESE OVER AMERICAN INVESTORS

(By James Neilson)

BUENOS AIRES.—The Japanese economic invasion of Latin America, which began in earnest toward the end of the 1960s, has been stepped up dramatically.

In the past year, Japanese investments rose from \$600 million to nearly \$1 billion. While this is still small compared to the \$14 billion that U.S. investors have sunk in the region the increase has been rapid enough to make U.S. businessmen talk sourly about "an economic Pearl Harbor."

Japan's economic offensive coincides with a gradual U.S. disengagement. U.S. business is bearing the brunt of a wave of nationalism sweeping over the region. The North Americans themselves find Latin America less profitable than before, while public opinion in the United States is demanding the return of money invested abroad for use at home.

Latin Americans have given a guarded welcome to the numerous Japanese trade missions scouring the region. For many decades the Latins have been treated patronizingly by Europeans and as a junior partner by the United States and few are willing to exchange one form of economic dependence for another.

Worried businessmen are still digesting the Australian woolmen's experiences with Japanese trade. Japanese bulk purchases sent the price of wool sky high, but as soon as the buying stopped it plummeted back to earth.

Latin Americans are uncomfortably conscious that they rely on the export of farm goods and raw materials for foreign exchange and that these exports are subject to wild price fluctuations that make long-term planning very difficult. Temporary overstocking by industrialized countries causes unwelcome troughs in sales graphs, troughs that translate into hardship and political problems at home. In consequence, Latin American governments are seeking permanent agreements with the Japanese, rather than quick sales.

In their competition with the United States for economic influence, the Japanese have six advantages.

The Japanese have no reputation for economic imperialism in Latin America. Unlike the United States and some European countries, especially Britain, they have not yet tried to alter Latin American government policies to suit their interests.

The large Japanese communities in Latin America serve as economic bridgeheads. About a million Japanese immigrants and their descendants live in the area—more than half of them in Brazil, chiefly in and around the dynamic industrial city of Sao Paulo. They own banks, cinemas, restaurants and newspapers.

Much of the Japanese investment in Latin America is being funneled through these communities, which provide invaluable interpreters and experts on local customs. Since these communities were built up by poor immigrants, they did not play a major role in the host countries, and so did not acquire the reputation for snobbery that besets the

British, or for arrogance and disproportionate wealth that causes the Americans so much trouble.

Latin Americans are still unworried by pollution, which is regarded as a necessary evil if industrial expansion is to take place. Brazil, with huge underpopulated areas at its disposal, has openly invited Japan to ship over its "dirty factories," and the Japanese are hurrying to oblige.

Japanese investors are proving far more flexible than their U.S. rivals. They do not insist on being the sole owners of their subsidiaries, or even on having a majority holding, a demand that is almost a fetish among U.S. firms. Instead they are quite content with 20 per cent or so of the shares, enough for them to steer business toward their trading companies.

These four advantages may all be temporary, but two other factors are likely to be permanent.

First, Latin America is fabulously rich in the raw materials that Japan needs, but, unlike the United States, does not possess at home. The continent is littered with mineral deposits which have hardly been scratched, such as the world's largest iron-ore deposits that straddle the Brazil-Bolivia border.

The Japanese are also contributing to fishing in Peru and farming in Brazil, hoping thus to assure the home islands a supply of cheap food just as Britain did in the 19th century.

Second, Latin America is rapidly approaching the economic take-off point. The region has more scientists, technologists and capable administrators than any other underdeveloped area.

In 1972 Latin America's gross product increased by a healthy 6.7 per cent, while industry grew by 9 per cent. This, if continued, will make Latin America a major customer for the sophisticated manufactured goods that Japan has few rivals in producing.

The stage is set, therefore, for increased economic interpenetration between Japan and Latin America.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HONORABLE JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the giants of American politics, the Honorable James A. Farley.

Although it was never my privilege to become an intimate friend of "Genial Jim" Farley, my life and career in politics have certainly been influenced by him.

His own life story is, of course, well known and one can only admire the way Jim Farley pulled himself up from humble beginnings to the halls of power. From first holding elective office as town clerk of Stony Point, N.Y., until the present day, Jim Farley has been a Democrat's Democrat, with party loyalty being his credo.

One of Jim Farley's greatest contributions to the growth and well-being of this country was helping to engineer the nomination and election as President of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose name continues to have a special sound for those many millions of Americans who

can still remember the dark and troublesome depression years. Compassion for the little man guided both of these great Americans.

In these days when public belief in the corruption of the political process has become so common and widespread, it is comforting to think of someone like the gentleman we honor today, a man long known for his personal honesty and integrity. And as more and more colorless bureaucrats are put into positions of power, there are refreshing thoughts of Jim Farley who managed to handle any difficult task without discarding his fine Irish sense of humor. Perhaps if we had more Jim Farleys around today in the halls of Government, there would be far fewer people voicing skepticism about the "Establishment."

It is an honor to wish James A. Farley well as he celebrates his 85th birthday, one we all hope will be followed by many, many more. He can certainly look back over the years with pride. Now that his years of fierce activity have slowed, he should find more time to enjoy the comfort of his 10 grandchildren.

PUBLIC CAN HELP IMPROVE POSTAL SERVICE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that steps need to be taken to correct our deteriorating mail service. I am sure we all have thick files of complaints from constituents and a number of firsthand bad experiences to relate. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee is well aware of the necessity for remedial action, and we hope to have the Postal Service showing definite improvements soon.

In the meantime, there are ways the public can help facilitate delivery. An article in the Buffalo Evening News for May 30, 1973, offers constructive, specific pointers for mailers to utilize USPS services to the best possible advantages. There are some excellent suggestions in the column, and I would like to share them with my colleagues at this time.

The article follows:

A LITTLE KNOWLEDGE CAN SPEED YOUR POSTAL SERVICE (By Ralph Dibble)

It could be that you're not getting maximum results from the U.S. Postal Service because you don't know enough about how it operates. And a little homework might get you much faster deliveries.

You can start out with the mailbox. If you just drop a letter in any old box, it may not be picked up for 23 hours or more.

However, a mailbox with a one-star decal guarantees the latest pickup will be 5 P.M. If that's not good enough, go to a mailbox with two white stars. It guarantees the latest collection will be 8 P.M.

So, you find a box with one star, but that isn't good enough. How do you find a two-star box?

That's simple. Location of the nearest two-

star box is in a printed notice on the one-star box.

There is a third special mailbox—the white-topped "airmail only" box. It guarantees a collection as late as 4 P.M., although there's a later pickup in many cases.

The Postal Service asks you to have your airmail letter properly zip-coded and suggests that you put an airmail sticker, as well as stamp, on the envelope—or that you write "airmail" in bold letters across a corner of the envelope.

If these requirements are met, the Postal Service guarantees next-day delivery within a 600-mile radius for airmail deposited in the white-topped box before 4.

One reason this promise can be made is that the Postal Service has beefed up the air service with contracted flights.

Regular airlines used to carry nearly all the airmail. But the passenger carriers cut out many of their night flights due to the decrease in passengers.

So the Postal Service now has its own air-taxi network, a system of privately-contracted mail flights by non-scheduled carriers.

Getting back to mailboxes, there's one other way you can guarantee early delivery of your mail. Many substations have curbside boxes with chutes into which motorists can place envelopes.

If you put your mail in these boxes at any time during the night, you get an extra early pickup—usually at 6 A.M.—and you've got a good shot at delivery that day.

For emergency service, you can use the new "mailgram," a joint service of the Postal Service and Western Union.

You give the message by phone to Western Union which sends it by teleprinter to the post office in the city of the addressee. It's delivered in a special envelope by a mailman the next day.

There are some more sophisticated delivery services available. Joseph E. Bohlen, director of installation services for the Buffalo Post Office, noted. They're expensive, but if you're in a very big hurry, they are available.

There is the Express Mail service which is used primarily by businesses, but is available to individuals.

The way it usually works is that a businessman will confer with a representative of the Postal Service on what his requirements are.

He may want delivery of mail at 7:30 A.M. daily in New York. Or he may want 8 A.M. delivery of mail every Wednesday and Friday in Chicago.

One Buffalo company even has an Express Mail contract to its subsidiary in Honolulu.

A postal messenger picks up the mail at the business place at the agreed time, delivers it to the airport and gets it on the right plane. At the city of destination, a messenger picks up the express mail and delivers it to the addressee at the agreed time.

It's expensive, but an individual can use the service on a one-time or a regularly scheduled basis by contacting the Buffalo Post Office.

Right now, you can drive to the airport with your letter and post it at the Air Mail Field Office in the Administration Building of the Greater Buffalo National Airport.

And you can ask the clerk to get it on, for example, the 10 P.M. plane to Milwaukee.

The trip to the airport will save you \$7 in Express Mail costs.

And, if the person you are sending the mail to picks it up at the airport in Milwaukee, or whatever the destination, that will shave \$7 more off the cost.

One caution is needed about Express Mail service. Buffalo is only one of 56 cities in which it's available. You'd better check on the destination. The service probably isn't available in cities like Peoria, Ill.

Mr. Bohlen also notes that the Postal Serv-

ice is moving its airport station to the field's old firehouse, probably next week.

So you'll have to make some enquiries about where to deliver Express Mail letters, if you don't use the messenger service.

Even Mr. Bohlen isn't sure yet how the new arrangement will work.

There's one final bit of homework you can do. You can learn exactly what the Postal Service means by the terms special delivery, certified mail and registered mail.

Mr. Bohlen notes the terms are commonly misunderstood and, thereby, hangs a lot of inconvenience and misunderstanding.

Special delivery does not mean fast delivery. Often, the regular postman will deliver your special delivery letter, on his regular rounds. If it arrives after he leaves on his route, it will be taken to its destination by a special-delivery carrier.

Registered mail costs 95 cents above regular postage. This gives you insurance up to \$10,000. But this mail moves slowly because it must be signed in and signed out at every point of handling. Its advantage is that it is practically impossible to lose a registered item.

Certified mail costs 33 cents plus postage. It gives you a return receipt from the receiver.

If you're really serious about doing your postal homework, you can send for a booklet, "Consumer's Guide to Postal Service" from Consumer Advocate, U.S. Postal Service, Washington, D.C. 20260. It's free.

RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of my colleague and good friend, Bill Mills, is a tragedy not only for the House of Representatives, but for the State of Maryland and the district he represented so well.

Bill was recognized by his colleagues as a devoted and thoughtful legislator, and he was very well liked in his quiet, friendly way. On June 7 the Post Office and Civil Service Committee adopted a resolution honoring Bill and I would like to share the sentiments of this resolution with my colleagues:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND
CIVIL SERVICE,

June 7, 1973.

RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MILLS

Whereas, the Honorable William O. Mills, a Representative from the State of Maryland, served with dedication on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service since his election to the Congress in 1971; and

Whereas, his brief service with the Committee was illuminated by the development of bonds of friendship and esteem between the Members of said Committee and Representative William O. Mills; and

Whereas, the Committee, both individually and collectively will deeply miss the sense of responsibility and dependability that Representative William O. Mills brought to said Committee; it is hereby

Resolved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in regular session, that it has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Representative William O. Mills

and that it extends its deepest sympathy to his family.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been made amply clear there is an energy crisis. There is a shortage of crude; no new refineries have been constructed since the late fifties, a situation I note recently that will be corrected in that at least two of the majors have announced plans to construct or expand. The tourist season is on us. Emission control devices further reduce the efficiency of already inefficient combustion engines.

As I pointed out at a freshmen Member special order session, April 19 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, trucks were immobilized because of a shortage of fuel in the Midwest.

Last week, a farmer in my district said he could not secure fuel to operate his farm vehicles. As I predicted on April 18, we have compassion for the environmentalist but if our energy needs are not met, there may be few people around to enjoy the environment. When the Nation's farm tractors, plows, and harvesters grind to a halt, as they did last week, because of lack of fuel, there will be no food to feed the Nation much less export any to the rest of the world.

I have a friend who operates a 24-hour truckers village in Oklahoma City. The voluntary allocations suggested by the Department of the Interior Office of Oil and Gas are simply not strong enough because under these guidelines he has been allocated enough fuel to operate for about the first 20 days of the month without rationing customers. Jerry Brown on May 25 ran out of fuel. During the next 24-hour period, 48 trucks hauling live cattle stopped but Jerry did not have fuel for them. The ramifications of this—Jerry's business consists in the main part of supplying fuel to trucks hauling live cattle. He tells me 80 percent of his business is of this nature. Live cattle smother to death and shrink on a standing truck; meat costs go up, the consumer foots the bill, and we have another round of inflation.

A survey undertaken in January showed that 66 percent of truck stop operators were being rationed fuel by their oil company supplier. Tulsa truck stop operators were limiting customers to 35 gallons of fuel; those in Oklahoma City were limiting customers to 50 gallons.

These trucks moving the goods of America when they run out of fuel, must stop just as they do on the beltway when commuters run out of gas. Fifty-eight percent of the Nation's trucks are carrying food, livestock, fowl, and other perishable items such as produce, milk and so forth. Twenty-one percent are moving and storage vehicles; 15 percent hauling steel and 6 percent are hauling new cars and trucks.

I will not further burden you with figures, but conclude with my two main concerns: Agriculture must have first priority for fuel so it can produce the food and fiber which feed the Nation. My second concern is that fuel must be provided to the trucking industry which delivers over half of the Nation's food and fiber produced by agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, those concerns are not imagined fears; they are facts. The impact of the fuel shortage has already been felt. It is up to us, the Congress, to immediately seek corrective legislation so that these priorities, vital to the very life of America, are established and enforced. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I will strongly support S. 1570 authorized by Senator JACKSON, which calls for mandatory priorities.

DRIVE FOR DEPARTMENT OF PEACE GETS BOOST FROM NATIONAL CONFERENCE

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who believe that world peace is attainable if we work unceasingly for it, there was a note of encouragement recently when more than 150 delegates met in Skokie, Ill., for the First National Conference on a Department of Peace. One of the distinguished participants at the Conference was my good friend and our colleague from Illinois, the Honorable RALPH METCALFE, who contributed greatly to the conference according to all reports.

It is my pleasure to present for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dr. John Eddy which tells about the conference and which appeared in the May 16, 1973 issue of *The Christian Century*. Dr. Eddy is an associate professor of education at Loyola University of Chicago.

Through our technological advances, we have now reached the point where the realization of world peace is the only means of survival for man. "Hiroshima" by John Hersey offers vivid evidence that if man fails to change his ways, one would not even wish to survive a third world war.

It is imperative that we create an entity within our government charged with the responsibility of creating the peace we have vainly sought for generations. We cannot depend on existing structures, for they are often committed to other goals. As a recent Secretary of State said of his Department—

Not for one minute do I believe the purpose of the State Department is to make friends. The purpose of the State Department is to look out for the interests of the United States. Whether we make friends I do not care . . . (what follows) will be a problem for some other Secretary of State, not me.

It seems to me that we must work to make friends if life is to continue on

earth. By questing for peace we are not being visionaries. We are merely recognizing the horrible alternatives.

I hope there will be more conferences and more articles building the case for a Department of Peace. And I hope they will convince more and more Americans, especially Members of Congress, that we must be deadly earnest in our efforts to find permanent peace if we are to survive at all.

The article follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE CALLED FOR AT NATIONAL CONFERENCE

(By John Eddy)

"I thought the *Wall Street Journal* said the peace movement was dead," remarked one delegate at the First National Conference on a Department of Peace, held recently at the Central United Methodist Church in Skokie, Ill. On hand for the conference were more than 150 delegates—a broad cross section that included nationally known officials from educational, religious, governmental and peace organizations.

"This conference comes at a time when we need seriously to plan for the long-range process of uniting the convictions of the people into a power sufficient to swing the decisions of the governments of the world," said DeWitt Baldwin, first national chairman of the Council for a Department of Peace and founder of the Lisle Fellowship, Inc. (which has over 3,400 members in 91 nations).

Paradoxically, the mass media were unusually zealous in reporting this peace movement event—for of late the movement has been ignored by many. Film crews, photographers, and magazine correspondents were much in evidence, and sessions were tape-recorded for such agencies as the Voice of America for worldwide broadcast.

METCALFE KEYNOTES

Congressman Samuel Young of Illinois's tenth district (of which Skokie is a part) and Congressman Ralph Metcalfe of Illinois's first district (which includes part of Chicago's south side) both addressed the conference on the need for peacemaking in the world.

Said Metcalfe, who was keynote speaker: "America is a nation at odds with itself and its ideal. . . . Is there any reason why America cannot promote peace with the same expertise and intensity with which it promotes its industrial and weapons systems products? . . . Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga's bill (H.R. 1824) represents an ideal formula for the establishment of a National Department of Peace National Peace Academy, and a joint committee of the House and Senate on peace and international cooperation."

HISTORY TRACED

Scores of different groups sent delegates to the conference—among them the International Association of Educators for World Peace, the Council for a Department of Peace, and the American Personnel and Guidance Association Peace Commission. Also present were representatives from many religious faiths. Presiding at the sessions was John Eddy, a professor at Chicago's Loyola University, who stated in his opening remarks:

"The idea of a Department of Peace was first proposed 180 years ago in 1793 by Dr. Benjamin Rush and Benjamin Banneker; yet not one of the 93 bills presented in the Congress since World War II has ever even reached the hearing stage. War—like pollution, prejudice and poverty—is every person's enemy, for it destroys humanity and the earth's ecology. The time has arrived for more than a Band-Aid or "patch" approach

to peace: [what is needed is] a new union of citizens for the passage and implementation of federal legislation, like House Bill 4824, in every nation of the world to help safeguard present and future generations."

VARIED PROPOSALS

Many different ideas and proposals were considered by the delegates in the all-day session. Among the general topics; how to train peace personnel (an Academy of Peace), how to work for peace (from preparing bills to be introduced in Congress to improving world trade for the benefit of all nations), and how to create peacemaking agencies (e.g., an agency for world peace in the State Department, a Joint Committee on Peace in Congress, a cabinet-level Department of Peace, a Mediator Information-Ombudsman system). Some of the delegates also discussed the pros and cons of amnesty, various peace career opportunities, and possible peace education approaches in schools as well as in society.

Declared Gerald Grant, S.J., another Loyola professor and vice-president of the World Federalists:

"The profits must be taken out of war, and peace projects must be made profitable. . . . A Department of Peace should find ways to make peace profitable, for instance, when the terms of world trade can be so adjusted that all countries—new and old—can become mutual partners and customers in order that the standard of living of them all will be raised to an adequate level."

OTHER CONCERNS

Ernest Jaski, national chancellor of the International Association of Educators for World Peace (with over 6,000 members in 64 countries of the world) and professor at Southwest Community College of Chicago, described a new nonviolent conflict resolution model devised by the National YMCA and tested at the 1972 Democratic and Republican conventions.

"Peacemaking shouldn't be an amateur activity," commented Mary Liebman, executive secretary of the Council for a Department of Peace. "I simply can't tolerate any longer the idea of a system where war is financed with unlimited tax dollars and peace is financed by smudgy mimeographed appeals of people of conscience. . . . A Department of Peace should be for peace not only among nations but at every level, including Wounded Knee."

Paul Schilpp, who teaches at Southern Illinois University and is editor of the distinguished "Library of Living Philosophers" series, advocated a new kind of peace bonds—bonds that would give Americans an opportunity to finance programs for peace in this nation and around the world.

SUMMING UP

Some of the results of the conference had ramifications for the weeks and years ahead: (1) important materials were prepared for bills for the 93rd Congress and for future Congresses; (2) students received valuable information for making career decisions; (3) many persons gained new insight into possibilities for governmental and private peace projects; (4) new friendships were formed that will ensure stronger support of joint peace projects; (5) a Peace Academy and other peace programs are in the planning stage; (6) the need for extended study as well as for a united effort by a new national coalition of peace groups was acknowledged.

The memory of America's longest and most frustrating war vivid for the delegates—some of them veterans of Vietnam combat. The movement to strengthen the peace programs of the U.S. government and of private groups is gaining momentum. Peace is everybody's business, and what we need now is to make it somebody's job. That is what a Department of Peace is all about.

A POW REPLIES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, although remnants of Vietnam and Southeast Asia linger, and although there are some who continue to discredit much good that has come out of this Southeast Asian episode of American history, there remains an enduring reservoir of strength in American ideals which will not disappear. Col. Robinson Risner has breathed a breath of fresh air into the ongoing analyses of our Vietnam trials.

In responding to a Shana Alexander column in Newsweek, Colonel Risner movingly tells of some of the birthrights and freedoms for which so many young Americans committed their lives or their freedom. I need not explain more. Colonel Risner speaks with a gracious eloquence. The noble and enduring ideals for which the great majority of Americans continue to be grateful have not vanished—no, not even after Vietnam.

Colonel Risner's article follows:

[From Newsweek]

A POW REPLIES

(By Col. Robinson Risner)

(In her March 5 column, Shana Alexander suggested that the returning American prisoners of war were actually "prisoners of peace with honor"—men who were coached by Pentagon public-relations brass on what to say on repatriation. Air Force Col. Robinson Risner, 48, a leader of the POW's own prison-camp command, gives his side of the story.)

DEAR MS. ALEXANDER: Isn't it great to live in "the land of the free" where people with dissimilar beliefs can express themselves in the same publication? I must confess I had long taken this and other freedoms for granted. But after having been denied them for seven and a half years, I can sincerely say that I am acutely aware of even the simple privileges we as Americans possess.

You began your March 5 column with mention of heroes of past wars and referred to the returned POW's as Vietnam's *only* heroes. You were only partially right. There *were* heroes in the prison camps—men who were tortured and some who died at the hands of the enemy rather than compromise their principles; but there were *other* heroes of this war—men who fought with great valor and many who died on the battlefield fighting so that others might have some of the freedoms we enjoy.

Please don't misunderstand me, Ms. Alexander. I know that the Vietnam war was not perfect, either in its concept or in its conduct, but then few things are. At any rate, South Vietnam still remains free of Communist rule as does most of the rest of Southeast Asia. In addition, the U.S.A. is still a bulwark of freedom all over the world. And, although some would like us to believe otherwise, you can bet that our friends and allies continue to rely upon us.

I was speaking of heroes. Let me talk to you a moment about some of the unsung heroes, or rather heroines—our wives. These are the gals that took it on the chin and hung in there through thick and thin—our "velvet and steel" as some have called them. It would be impossible for me to relate here what these women have had to cope with through the years; just let it suffice to say that if anyone deserves recognition for "service above and beyond the call of duty," they

do. So, Ms. Alexander, if perhaps the ladies seemed a little too radiant to you, all I can offer in their behalf is the thought that if you had been with these girls through these most trying years, perhaps you too would agree that not only did they deserve to put aside their cares and dry their eyes for this once-in-a-lifetime occasion, but also that their radiance was nothing less than genuine.

I must say that I am rather dismayed to find that you believed the grins, salutes, statements of gratitude, etc., were rehearsed. Just for the record, let me say that we received no briefing en route from Hanoi about our conduct or statements upon arrival at Clark Air Base. Do you believe that men who endured so much extra hardship and even death rather than allow themselves to be used as propaganda tools would permit themselves to be orchestrated? Don't you believe it!

During the time we were imprisoned and when it was possible for us to do so, we would discuss our basic beliefs and talk about what we considered to be major issues. Over the months and years we seemed to come to a meeting of the minds on some of these issues. Consequently if our statements sounded similar, all I can say is that our beliefs—the beliefs that sustained us through these years—were similar.

"BASIC METALS"

Let me try and explain it this way. If one were to take ore of varying grades and subject it to sufficient heat and pressure over a period of time, the basic metals would emerge. Men, too, are like that. What I'm trying to say, Ms. Alexander, is that we were not and are not unique. We are typical guys from Anytown, U.S.A., and although we were trained as fighting men, we cannot claim uniqueness even among the military. The qualities or "basic metals" that emerged in us are, I believe, inherent in most Americans and no matter what other differences we might sustain, these qualities are our common denominators.

Regarding the "protective shield" that was provided us upon our return, I can safely say that those of us who returned from Communist prisons, as well as our wives, were deeply grateful for the meticulous planning that went into the preparations for our release and return to normal life. They had every right to expect mental and physical deterioration as well as deep psychological problems. Believe me, I'm glad they planned for the worse and were pleasantly surprised.

"Who won?" When I am asked that question, I think, as I stated earlier, of South Vietnam and most of the rest of Southeast Asia which is still free of Communism, and the credibility of America's word with other nations. Yes, it was a very long war. It was not only long, it was the dirtiest kind of war. It was one in which deeds of valor became routine and taken for granted while a few deeds of which we were not proud were given the widest publicity. It was a war in which there were no clean-cut victories because there were no clean-cut front lines, no industrial complexes, no large cities to take. In short, it was a war to which Americans could not relate because it was unique in the history of American wars. It was a war in which the word of a vociferous few, at times, drowned out the less vocal voices of the majority. I'm glad, though, that the majority was sustained and that a peace consistent with the commitments of three Presidents was concluded.

You said that "a nation cannot long sustain a war its own people don't believe in." I agree, and I would like to point out that despite the inherent American impatience, we fought in Indochina longer than in any other war.

BACK TO FREEDOM

Ms. Alexander, we came out of North Vietnam—back to freedom—grinning because

for the first time in years we had a lot of things to grin about. The wives were radiant because they were happy to have their husbands back where they could touch them, love them and be angry at them if they wanted. The freed POW's made similar statements of gratitude to our Commander in Chief out of sincere admiration. While we were in the Communist prison, the North Vietnamese kept insisting that the Administration's Vietnam policy represented only a small minority and that the American people opposed it. The '72 election was an overwhelming rebuttal to that. Most of us felt that the President was personally responsible for getting us out "with honor." Maybe "with honor" isn't too meaningful to some but we would have stayed a lot longer rather than come home without it.

MEDGAR EVERS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker—

I've been fighting for America just as much as the soldiers in Vietnam.

These are the words of Medgar Evers. Ten years ago, on June 12, this great black man and great American was gunned down and killed outside his home in Jackson, Miss. In the 10 years since his death, the American experience has been one of violence and destruction and sadness—in Dallas, in Memphis, in Vietnam.

But yet, it is important to remember those who died. It is necessary to remember and reaffirm to ourselves the conviction that we will not rest until freedom and dignity are afforded every citizen in this country and abroad.

In his life and in his death, Medgar Evers pursued this goal. We honor him and cry for him, on this, the 10th anniversary of his death.

I submit for the attention of my colleagues and to help us remember, an editorial that appears in the June 1973 edition of *The Progressive*, entitled "Medgar Evers: Lest We Forget":

MEDGAR EVERS: LEST WE FORGET

Those Americans who advocate, or even passively accept, the present slowing of progress in civil rights betray the sacrifices of every man and woman, black or white, who gave their lives in the struggle for equality of opportunity. In the 1950s and 1960s alone, at least fifteen civil rights leaders and workers were killed in the South while struggling to achieve some measure of justice for blacks.

The death of one of these leaders, Medgar Evers, took place just ten years ago, in June 1963. Evers, the NAACP's first field secretary in Mississippi, had been warned that he was on the "death list" of white racist groups. He was shot down at his home in Jackson, Mississippi, at a time when he was leading an effort to desegregate that city's public facilities.

Barely thirty-eight years old, Evers had been active in Mississippi and elsewhere in Dixie along the whole civil rights front, from the desegregation of schools and other public facilities to voting rights and jobs for blacks. His efforts began in 1946 when, at the age of twenty-one, after four years of World War II service in France, he and his brother Charles tried to register to vote in Jackson and were turned back by a crowd of rednecks.

Over the years he engaged in every phase of the black struggle—in person, by letter, and through the media—arousing not only Southern blacks but blacks and whites in the North to the urgent need for "freedom now."

It has been widely reported that the assassination of Evers spurred our lagging President, John F. Kennedy, to present in 1963 the omnibus civil rights bill which, ironically, did not become law until after he, too, was killed in November of that year. Evers' death also touched off a Dixie-wide black voter education drive and helped set the stage for the passage of the Voter Rights Act in 1965.

Thousands turned out to accompany the funeral procession when Evers was buried in Arlington National Cemetery. On this tenth anniversary of Medgar Evers' death, it is fitting to recall that he and Martin Luther King, and so many others, paid the supreme price for their part in the civil rights struggle which too many Americans now seem willing to abandon. We can honor their memory best by resolving to review and revitalize the fight for racial justice with greater determination than ever before—and that goes for a great many liberals who have wearied of the struggle and have allowed boredom and indifference to smother their one-time crusading zeal.

CAB EXPANDS ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board enforcement chief Richard J. O'Melia recently described the intensive enforcement drive his agency is making against such improper practices as illegal booking of charter flights and the misuse of youth fare and military discount privileges.

Improper practices ultimately endanger the traveling public. For this reason I commend to my colleagues the excellent report made by Mr. O'Melia to the 10th Inter-American Aviation Law Conference:

REMARKS BY RICHARD J. O'MELIA

AIR TRANSPORT ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC AND LATIN AMERICAN MARKETS

It is a particular pleasure for me to be with you for this the Tenth Anniversary of the Inter American Aviation Law Conferences. In 1970 I participated in the Seventh Inter American Law Conference in Miami. I am beginning to feel like a regular member. Each year the gatherings become more prestigious and valuable to those attending. The organizers and sponsors of this unique and significant series of conferences can be truly proud that their efforts in these ten convocations have brought into being a most useful institution to serve the academic and intellectual needs of the air transport system in the Americas.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has a high regard for these conferences. I am delighted to represent the Board at this session, and feel that it is useful to bring you again a report on the enforcement program of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and some observations on how enforcement problems may affect inter-American air traffic.

When I visited with you in 1970 at your Seventh Conference I spoke somewhat ex-

tensively of the organization of air transport enforcement in the United States, and of our enforcement objectives and techniques. In 1970 I was still a new Director of the Bureau of Enforcement, having been appointed to that office in April 1969. I was then in the throes of reorganizing the Bureau, establishing new priorities for it, selecting new personnel and adopting new enforcement techniques. What were then hopes and aspirations have now become realities to a gratifying extent.

In the course of my remarks in 1970, I gave special attention to two new massive investigations that we had begun into charter irregularities, one on the West Coast and one on the East Coast of the United States. I can report to you now that those initiatives have been almost completely concluded and have had very substantial success.

Initially seven formal proceedings were instituted on the basis of information developed in those investigations. These seven cases have resulted in cease and desist orders against four carriers, involving \$192,000 collected in civil penalties, and in addition eighteen other cease and desist orders against specific organizations and individuals.

Later in 1970 six additional formal proceedings were instituted against five carriers and nine organizations and individuals. This group of cases has led to additional cease and desist orders against three carriers, involving \$38,000 in civil penalties, and cease and desist orders against two organizations and individuals.

In September 1971, in another broadscale move against unlawful charter operators, the Board filed suit against sixteen individuals and organizations primarily in the New York area. This measure, coupled with tightening of our charter regulations and the issuance of Board orders to certain supplemental air carriers requiring them to submit their proposed charter flights to the Board for prior approval, have resulted in a very substantial improvement in the New York charter market.

The extensive black market charter operations, that were rampant, have now greatly diminished.

I do not want to take too much time to tell you what has happened on the various compliance programs I described to you in 1970. But I do want to tell you that enforcement has been accorded even greater emphasis in the activities of the Board than was given then.

As many of you know, the Civil Aeronautics Board has a new Chairman—the Honorable Robert D. Timm. He has strongly articulated his view to the industry that to have vigorous and efficient airlines the carriers must stop predatory and self-destructive practices. Chairman Timm believes in strong airlines and he believes in enforcement. And I suggest to you that these two concepts go together. You can not have strong airlines if you do not have adequate enforcement.

One of the indications that Chairman Timm has given that he supports enforcement, is that he has requested the Congress of the United States for funds to give the Bureau of Enforcement more attorneys and investigators.

This will be approximately a 25 per cent increase in the size of our staff. Those of you who are bureaucrats will understand that this kind of support—budgetary support—is music to the ears.

Last year we also expanded our activities by establishing enforcement field offices in Miami and Anchorage, Alaska. This year we hope to open field offices in Los Angeles and New York, and next year three more field offices are planned—in Chicago, Seattle and Dallas. These field offices will serve as additional eyes and ears, and, we believe,

will perform valuable services for the public and for the industry.

The reasons for the greater emphasis on enforcement by the Chairman and by the Board are numerous. First of all, there is an increasing interest and concern in the United States to protect the passengers and shippers. They are our consumers and must be defended. Secondly, when air transport regulations are violated, the victims are frequently the air lines themselves. Our carriers must be protected if we are to have a viable air transport system. Another reason is that the Board's plans and programs would be frustrated if the Board's regulations are not observed.

The Board's strengthened enforcement efforts are reflected in part by a 108 per cent increase in cease and desist orders since July 1, 1972 over the previous twelve months and a 59 per cent increase in the collection of civil penalties. The total amount of civil penalties collected in the past 24 months (\$574,750) is greater than was collected in all the previous years since the inception of civil penalties in 1963.

I know that some other countries are beginning to pay more attention and to give more emphasis to their enforcement efforts. In the past year the Board has taken action to seek cooperative enforcement measures with air transport compliance officials of a number of European countries. We have met with enforcement officials of Great Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany, and the groundwork is prepared for mutual and reciprocal assistance.

We began these cooperative efforts with European nations because of the very pressing air transport problems over the North Atlantic. But we are equally interested in our air transport relations with other countries in the Western Hemisphere. I would welcome an opportunity to meet with governmental authorities in the American Republics to exchange enforcement views and information.

In my brief remarks to you today, it is not possible to go into all the enforcement problems we have encountered over the North Atlantic. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of dealing with only one problem, and one that I consider very important—the problem of discounting.

A. Historical background of discounting

I think you are all aware that in May, 1972, Mr. Knut Hammarskjöld, the Director General of IATA, held a meeting in Geneva to discuss ticketing malpractices. He advised the Presidents and Chief Executives of the member carriers that the industry was in grave danger as a result of these malpractices, and was risking the loss of confidence of the public and governmental authorities. He related that it was estimated that losses from discounting practices were costing the carriers from 200 to 500 million dollars a year. His proposal was that remedial measures should be undertaken by IATA, by interested governments, and by the airlines themselves.

To advance his proposals, Mr. Hammarskjöld met in June, 1972, with IATA representatives of the North, Mid-Atlantic and Pacific regions.

The outcome of that meeting was a consensus that IATA should depart from its traditional go-it-alone position and should promote and facilitate the exchange of information with other law enforcement authorities. A program of action was mapped out, including at an early stage on approach to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Accordingly, later in June, 1972, Mr. Hammarskjöld and Mr. Stuart Tipton, the President of the Air Transport Association of America, met in Washington with senior Board officials to tell them of the massive discounting of tickets taking place and to solicit the CAB's attention and action to remedy this widespread problem.

B. Action taken by the Civil Aeronautics Board on discounting

The Board felt that the discounting problem merited priority action, and began its efforts with a letter on June 26 addressed to the Presidents of United States and foreign air carriers operating to the United States. That letter went to 104 airline presidents. The letter from the Chairman identified the problem, expressed the concerns of IATA, of the Air Transport Association and of the Board, and declared that the Board would not condone any violations of the law. The airline Presidents were requested to take immediate voluntary steps to stop discounting abuses and to inform the Board of any recurring violations.

This action was followed nearly one month later, on July 17, by a second letter from my Bureau requesting specific information and comments from the same 104 airline Presidents on the discounting malpractices. To this letter was attached a list of typical and prevalent malpractices which I will go into shortly. Let me say here that these two letters on discounting are attached to the printed copies of my remarks, available for distribution here. The response to the two letters was not gratifying. Although more than 60 carriers replied to the Chairman's original letter expressing their cooperation, very few of them submitted any useful substantive information when requested by my Bureau to supply specific details.

It became clear to us that the only way to attack the discounting problem was through systematic and meticulous investigations and formal and informal compliance proceedings.

C. What are discounting malpractices?

Before describing to you what we have done to uncover and stop illegal discounts in the North Atlantic, it may be desirable for me to outline some of these malpractices. I believe that you and I will agree that the illustrative practices I will mention are illegal, harmful and undesirable. If in your mind you question any of these, we would appreciate hearing of it back in Washington.

First of all, we have divided these illegal discounts into four major categories. These are:

1. Excursion Fare Malpractices, 2. Group Affinity Malpractices, 3. Group Inclusive Tour Fares, and 4. straight Discounting.

Let me describe these to you.

1. *Excursion fare malpractices* are very prevalent and may be the most difficult to uncover. Principally, what you have here are devices used to circumvent the time-limit validity provisions. One device is the failure to enter minimum and maximum validity dates on tickets, coupled with a failure by "check-in" agents to review the coupons for time-limit requirements.

The use of revalidation stickers without proper endorsement or the use of a validation stamp is another typical trick. Open outbound and open return tickets permit each flight coupon to be used independently through revalidation stickers. The destruction of flight reservation records makes the misuse of revalidation stickers hard to detect.

Another device used with excursion fares is to keep passenger lists secret at turnaround points. As a result boarding passes exchanged for invalid coupons are used, or reissued or altered flight coupons are given out.

2. *Now what about group affinity malpractices?* You know many of the techniques. By the way, many of these techniques apply also to non-affinity group fares. Travel-together provisions are ignored. The minimum required number of passengers is not observed. When a charter group does not have at least 40 persons, as required, fraudulent medical and doctor certificates are put in to cover up the deficiency. In cases of oversold charters, passengers are taken on an individually

ticketed basis without being made to pay the larger fare. And of course there is the most common violation—the non-bona fide passenger.

In my remarks in 1970 I spoke at length on the requirements of bona fide passengers and how those requirements are violated. Those comments were recorded in the publications of this conference, and are available to you there for reference.

In this area the Bureau has recently obtained cease and desist orders and \$61,000 in civil penalties from three U.S. carriers for issuing group affinity tickets to ineligible groups for transportation between the United States West Coast and Hawaii.

3. The third major category of malpractices involves *Group Inclusive Tour Fares*. These violations consist of excessive commissions—through "overrides", "throw-aways", and mislabelling commercial travel as inclusive tour. I hope that these expressions are familiar to you. These terms refer to deceptions practiced by agents and carriers on the public. Some passengers on GIT's have been found to be travelling at reduced fares below required minimum land charges. Finally, we have discovered that some airlines are not abiding by the time limitations within which GIT tickets may be sold. Accordingly, the Bureau has during the past 12 months issued formal complaints against three United States carriers alleging a failure to sell GIT tickets within the applicable time limits.

4. Finally, there is *straight, pure, and adulterated discounting*. A specialized fare that is subject to much abuse is the military fare. In addition, youth fares, student fares, and regular fares are given in large blocks to ticket agents to be sold at agreed discounts. We have had the harrowing experience of finding an 81 year old nun travelling on a youth fare. And some of the quote students unquote that move on Student fares are paying for their fares from old age annuity checks. This has to be carefully monitored. We have already collected \$30,000 from an Asiatic airline for discounting excursion fare tickets and have charged a South Asia carrier for selling youth tickets to all comers.

Now that, in summary, is what we consider to be ticket discounting malpractices. That is what we want to stop. I hope you agree. I have no doubt that you know of some other ticketing malpractices. Please let me know what these are. I may have an opportunity to speak on this subject at other gatherings. So if you want to send me some other illustrations, I will be glad to add them to the list.

D. Enforcement investigation and actions

Faced with this problem, and recognizing that carriers could not or would not on their own take corrective action, we sent our investigators out to do battle.

Our first field examination into ticket discounting, conducted jointly by Board investigators and IATA compliance officers, took place at New York's JFK Airport in August 1972. Four investigating teams screened nineteen transatlantic carriers for five days. The investigation was successful and productive.

As we announced publicly in November, out of some 8,900 tickets examined, over 1000, or about one out of every 9, contained suspected violations. About 39 percent involved group affinity fares, 35 percent were excursion fare violations, 12 percent arose from inclusive tour irregularities and 5 percent concerned youth and student fares.

You will be interested to know that air carriers corrected on the spot some 400 of the 1,000 violations uncovered, and these corrections resulted in additional revenues for the carriers of \$9,635.

Some simple arithmetic proves that if we found this amount of loss of revenue for the carriers in a five day examination, Mr. Hammarkjold is correct that the airlines as a group are probably losing close to a

half a billion dollars in revenue annually because of discounting.

Now isn't it worth it to the carriers for us to do this? And doesn't this raise the logical question of why the carriers are not cooperating to stop this self-destruction?

We have now had two additional extended investigations in New York conducted jointly with IATA. One in November and one in March/April. These joint efforts are working well. Twenty-one international airlines operating over the North Atlantic have been checked. In April a large part of our investigative staff was engaged in these airport examinations during most of the month. Now, here is the encouraging item. We have discovered that as a result of these checks discounting is diminishing and fewer violations are occurring.

E. Discounting in other markets

This talk is entitled *Enforcement Problems in the North Atlantic and Latin America Markets*, and you may be interested to hear what I have to say about discounting in the US/Latin America traffic. I will be brief.

We do not have as much factual information on discounting practices in air transportation between the United States and countries in Central and South America as we need to have. However, we have enough to be sure that such practices are very prevalent and, like in the North Atlantic, very harmful to the air carriers. This means, for those of you in the audience whose governments are having to subsidize national airlines, that you are paying to support a discounting habit. It is like a drug habit—if you don't stop it, it will get worse. The withdrawal symptoms may be painful, but that is the only way to save your patient.

When letters to Presidents of the air carriers were sent by the Chairman and my Bureau in August and July of last year, less than ten Latin American airlines responded. We appreciate the comments that were made, but—as was the case with the North Atlantic carriers—almost no substantive information was received. We are going to seek, with your assistance and cooperation, to gather more such information.

In my country they tell the story of the clerk who lived in an apartment below a workman. Every night the workman would come in late, make a lot of noise, and finally drop his heavy shoes on the floor. The clerk in the lower apartment could not go to sleep until the workman had dropped both his shoes on the floor. One night the workman only dropped one shoe. Finally, the clerk screamed, "Please drop your other shoe so I can go to sleep."

We have dropped one of our shoes on the North Atlantic. My message is that we are going to drop the other shoe on the traffic between the United States and Latin America. This may be keeping some air lines awake. If we are delayed in beginning these efforts, and you become impatient, just knock on the ceiling and we will try to hurry up.

Before I leave these thoughts, let me say that these are not the only two markets with discounting problems. We see equally great difficulties across the Pacific.

We have already begun to examine both passenger and cargo discounting problems in the trans-Pacific market, and our enforcement program in that area may prove to be as intensive as over the Atlantic. The time allotted to me today does not permit my discussing the cargo area with you. But let me just mention this. Discount practices in the cargo field are of no less importance and no less harmful than passenger discounting. We are taking a very hard look at cargo practices in Miami and will do the same thing in the Pacific. We hope that you will very soon begin to hear the results of those efforts.

F. Conclusion

In concluding these remarks I want to stress one thing. As Knut Hammarkjold has

declared, the illegal ticket discounting problem poses a grave danger—not only to the traveling and shipping public, but also to the airlines. What association and governmental compliance authorities do to correct this problem will help the entire industry.

These efforts can only succeed with everyone's cooperation. Airlines, governments, travel agents, and the public must all render their sincere assistance. The distinguished and influential participants in this convention can be of cardinal importance in making it possible to eliminate the grave problem of discounting from the world's air transport industry.

I know that I can call upon all of you for your help.

PROSPERING OMBUDSMAN

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, on May 9 11 Members and myself introduced H.R. 7680, a bill to establish an Office of Congressional Ombudsman. At that time, I expressed the need for greater expertise and resources in handling the various constituent problems that we are called on to investigate. An Office of Congressional Ombudsman would provide such expert assistance. I also pointed out that such a centralized operation would allow a thorough evaluation of the practical effects of the laws and regulations on citizens by compiling records of complaints and confusion so that what patterns emerge can hopefully be corrected.

Although the concept of an ombudsman is well-established in many other countries, it has been relatively slow in coming to the United States. By noting the progress of several programs in Utah and anticipating their continued growth, the Salt Lake Tribune has helped further the public acceptance of such an idea.

An editorial yesterday called attention to Governor Rampton's appointments of ombudsmen for Utah's black and Spanish American citizens, and to Salt Lake County Commission Chairman Ralph Y. McClure's naming an ombudsman for senior citizens. The editorial concluded, and I wholeheartedly agree:

(I)ncreasingly, not only minorities complain about insensitive, unresponsive government. The feeling is almost universal. If the trend continues, the U.S. ombudsman could be as familiar and as indispensable as it ever was in Sweden.

I appreciate the Salt Lake Tribune's interest in this important matter, and I insert the full editorial into the RECORD:

PROSPERING OMBUDSMAN

The "ombudsman" theory is obviously catching on. Starting at the state level in Utah, it has now been added to Salt Lake County government. But in a limited sense.

It is usually traced to original development in Sweden, where a government office was created to investigate complaints filed against the bureaucracy. There has always been some question whether in a nation like the United States where checks and balances between the various branches of government work

on a fulcrum of active partisan politics the full ombudsman idea is either necessary or workable.

However, in true Yankee tradition, the concept has been borrowed and modified to meet a certain need. That seems to be special attention on difficulties encountered by minority groups. At the State Capitol, Gov. Rampton appointed separate ombudsmen to follow up complaints about public services affecting Utah's black and Spanish-American residents. More recently, Salt Lake County Commission Chairman Ralph Y. McClure named a woman ombudsman (should that be ombudswoman?) for senior citizens.

Mr. McClure seemed to reflect the general purpose as he explained that older residents are too often a forgotten minority when public programs are adopted, financed and administered. The same is said in setting up ombudsmanship for racial minorities. And the reasoning is entirely valid.

Special problems confronting racial minorities and a growing population of aged have been overlooked as government deals with community-wide needs. The white, working-age majority is more visible, therefore more influential on policy and programs. Limited ombudsmanship can, then, restore a proper alertness to local government.

Still, that may not be the end of it. Increasingly, not only minorities complain about insensitive, unresponsive government. The feeling is almost universal. If the trend continues, the U.S. ombudsman could be as familiar and as indispensable as it ever was in Sweden.

NO GREATER LOVE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday—Flag Day—is a very special day for many of us here in this body. On that day, No Greater Love, an organization for support and assistance to the special young Americans, the children of our servicemen missing in action, will hold a ceremony in the Rayburn Building.

On that occasion, the son of one of our servicemen listed as missing in action will be presented with a flag which has flown over the Nation's Capitol. This will be the first of many U.S. flags to be offered to children in similar circumstances over the coming months. It represents the fact that his fellow Americans cannot and will not forget the sacrifices their fathers have and are making in the name of this great Republic.

As a member of the National Advisory Council to No Greater Love, I invite all my colleagues to take a few moments of their time on that day to join in this ceremony. Among those attending will be Members of both Houses of the Congress, former prisoners of war, and numerous personalities from the world of sports.

Perhaps the following brief history of No Greater Love, which was published in the March 31, 1973, edition of Human Events, sums up the story of the program better than I could express it. I recommend it to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

SPORT STARS LEND HAND TO CHILDREN OF POW-MIA'S

(By Andrew C. Seamans)

The return of U.S. servicemen and civilians from Vietnamese prisons and tiger cages has had tremendous impact on the American public. Patriotism, all but buried in recent years by left-wing activists and their assorted teams of cheerleaders, has been revived with unabashed statements of love for God and homeland by the ex-POWs (see HUMAN EVENTS, Feb. 24, 1973, page 3).

In return, the public has poured out praise for the returnees and their families to such extent that some of the ex-POWs' loved ones have had to beg respite from overzealous, albeit sincere, well-wishers.

The men have been greeted at every stop on the road home with banners, flowers, gifts, cheers and welcoming kisses from young women. The feeling has been mutual. The men have shown profound, unashamed love for the nation and the people, especially the youth of America.

A common strain of concern for young Americans has come through loud and clear in most of the ex-POWs' statements since the repatriations began in mid-February. In fact, three of the men from the first historic freedom flight visited Virgil I. Grissom Elementary School at Clark Air Force Base the day after they reached the Philippines.

Navy Capt. Jeremiah Denton, the first man off the plane from Hanoi, Air Force Capt. John Borling and Army Master Sgt. William A. Robinson went to the school to thank some 600 fourth-graders on behalf of the other ex-prisoners for Valentines, posters, welcome home signs and crayoned place mats the children had sent to greet the men at the hospital.

Denton, whose "God bless America" statement at planeside electrified the patriotism-starved nation and at the same time raised the hackles on liberal news writers, told the students: "We thought it was wonderful the other day [the airfield welcome], but I knew John and Bill are as overwhelmed as I am for being here with little America today."

As the father of seven children, Denton knows what the youngsters mean to a returning serviceman. And for the ex-POWs' children we can but imagine what it must be like finally having their fathers back after all these years.

But what of the thousands of youths whose fathers will not be coming home on the freedom planes? What of the families of the men listed as MIA—missing in action?

Over 1,300 Americans are unaccounted for. Their families still wait in painful vigil with nothing but dim hope of reconciliation. The stark reality is that most of them will never learn the fate of their men.

While this situation will be extremely difficult for wives, parents, brothers and sisters of the MIAs, it will be even worse for the children, those Capt. Denton lovingly calls "Little America."

MIAs' wives will, as have the POWs' spouses, try valiantly to fill the void in these young lives that can only be filled by a father. Women's liberation to the contrary, most mothers are not capable of helping a youngster learn to bat a ball, steal a base, throw a pass or hook a worm.

Although no Big Brother organization exists for the MIAs' children, there is a group that comes close: No Greater Love.

No Greater Love began two years ago as an effort, conceived by a young White House staffer, Carmella LaSpada, to try to do something to ease the plight of the POWs and the MIAs.

Acting on her own, Carmella took a leave of absence without pay in April 1971 to organize America's Sports Stars for the POWs-MIAs.

Miss LaSpada won the support of four prominent athletes to get the idea started:

then-Baltimore Colts quarterback Johnny Unitas, who since the beginning has performed yeoman service for No Greater Love, Baltimore Orioles third-baseman Brooks Robinson, Hall of Famer Ted Williams and Olympic swim champ Don Schollander. One of the athletes' first acts was to sign a letter to North Vietnamese Prime Minister Pham Van Dong asking permission to visit Hanoi as private citizens to discuss the POW's welfare. Naturally, this request and subsequent letters to the North Vietnamese athletes' association were ignored.

Foiled abroad, the sport stars' efforts were soon turned toward the United States as a result of a chance occurrence when some of the missing servicemen's children wrote to Unitas and Robinson to thank the men for what they had done. Miss LaSpada and the athletes saw an opportunity to ease the loneliness of the youngsters.

With the aid of the National League of Families of Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, letters were sent to mothers of the POW-MIAs' children, describing the organization and asking those who wished to participate to list their children's names and their favorite athletic teams or athletes.

By November 1971 over 600 names had been gathered. Without a budget and with only a handful of volunteers, Miss LaSpada began the task of contacting the kids' idols and favorite teams as a special Christmas project.

Within a few weeks the sports world had responded with autographed photos, posters, pennants and a wide assortment of other gifts. Still the volunteers faced the Herculean chore of wrapping and mailing the packages before Christmas, but they made it on time.

Since that initial project, the outpouring from U.S. athletes for these children has been phenomenal. Miss LaSpada said: "Not one athlete has ever turned down a request from No Greater Love."

Some examples of the response: The Houston Oilers and Philadelphia Eagles gave official National League footballs. *Sports Illustrated* magazine sent baseball and football games.

Unitas personally autographed over 100 photos with Brooks Robinson signing almost that many. Other stars sent out letters and photos, including Henry Aaron, Arthur Ashe, Wilt Chamberlain, Joe Frazier, Rod Gilbert, Billy Kidd, Al Kaline, Jerry Lucas, Bobby Mercer, Joe Namath, Arnold Palmer, Bart Starr, Roger Staubach, Ron Swoboda, Jerry West and Ted Williams. Some stars even telephoned youngsters.

Rep. Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.), a former Buffalo Bills quarterback, also joined in the effort.

Even former heavyweight champion Muhammad Ali, who fought against the draft in the courts, chipped in by sending one child a watch.

The program has quite naturally resulted in some humorous and touching sidelights.

One youngster, who couldn't pinpoint a favorite athlete, chose the entire Cincinnati Bengals football team. He and his brother received individual photos from each Bengal player. In a letter to the team, the lad thanked the players, adding the postscript: "P.S. My mother didn't make me write this."

The Chicago Bears received the following poignant message from a young girl: "My daddy used to watch your team on TV and I did, too. I was waiting for my daddy to come home from Vietnam, but I still watch your games."

Last year No Greater Love stepped up its efforts and added entertainers to its ranks. Brant Parker, cartoonist of the "Wizard of Id" comic strip, designed a special birthday card to be sent to each of the children on his or her birthday. With these distinctive cards went autographed photos of Dallas Cowboys

quarterback Roger Staubach, an Annapolis graduate, and such stars as Flip Wilson and Carol Burnett.

Last Christmas the list of participating "Little Americans" had passed the 1,000 mark. Again the teams, the athletes and the show business people came through. Baseball teams sent autographed baseballs. The Philadelphia Phillies, in fact, with pitching star Steve Carlton in the vanguard, sent grab bags filled with baseballs, T-shirts, batting helmets and other gifts. Singer Bobby Sherman joined in with photos and record albums.

Washington area POW-MIA children were the guests of the Washington Redskins with a king-size Santa Claus, played by defensive end Ron McDole. Some of the Baltimore Colts visited with a group of area POW-MIA offspring in the home of one of the mothers.

With the Vietnam cease-fire, many people might assume that No Greater Love is finished with its humanitarian effort. Not so. In fact, the program will have to be stepped up more than ever.

"People say the war is over," said Miss LaSpada. "They fail to realize that 1,300 fathers are still missing. We cannot forget these children. Actually, we want to expand the program to remember all children whose fathers were lost in Vietnam."

Expanding the program, though, is going to cost money. Unitas said: "We can't let these children down. It's going to take at least \$100,000 to expand the program and keep it going."

That the program has been able to continue as it has for the past two years is due largely to the efforts of a nucleus of key athletes and Miss LaSpada, who has used up her life savings to keep going without a pay check. Without an increase in contributions, however, no Greater Love may be forced to fade from existence. But anyone who knows Miss LaSpada doubts she will let this happen.

In fact, progress towards an accelerated fund drive has already been made. The *Boston Globe* has offered its help in publicizing the tax-exempt program, as has Washington's WMAL radio-TV station. Others are also expected to join in.

Mrs. Carolyn Cushman, whose husband Air Force Maj. Clifton Cushman has been missing since September 1966, summed up what No Greater Love has done for their seven-year-old son, Colin.

"Most boys are introduced to football by their fathers," said Mrs. Cushman. "Colin hasn't been able to do this. But through the program he was introduced to football in a unique way. It's really enriched his life."

Colin recently announced that, as a result of getting signed photos from Staubach and Unitas, he intends to become an NFL football star when he grows up.

While not all of the children will grow up to be professional athletes, the program has had a positive psychological effect for the young people. They cannot boast, as their schoolmates do, of the things they do with their fathers on weekends and after school or about plans for Father's Day. By bringing in photos of personalities in the sports or entertainment field with a personalized signature, the MIA children are able to show they too are special in their own way. Many mothers have said this helps to some extent.

No Greater Love has also helped enrich the lives of those on the giving end. Former heavyweight champ Joe Frazier is an outspoken proponent of No Greater Love.

"I got five of my own [children], so I know what it means to have me around. I'm not home that often, but when I am it's like the star on a crown. With these kids, it's a thrill to know somebody cares for them."

One of the major drives among the anti-war activists since the POWs have begun to re-enter the country has been for amnesty for the draft-dodgers and military deserters.

Army Special Forces Maj. James N. Rowe, who escaped from the Vietcong in 1968, said: "Amnesty cannot be considered until all missing in action are accounted for."

In essence, Rowe, who recounted his captivity in his book *Five Years to Freedom*, was saying there can never be an amnesty for the runaways, for the missing in action will never be fully accounted for.

Rather than worrying about amnesty for those who refused to serve the nation, it would be far better to turn our attention towards those who are left behind—the "Little Americans."

No Greater Love cannot rely on only famous sports or entertainment figures for the money to guarantee the program's continued existence. They must turn to the public.

Georgetown University in the Nation's Capital has given a special post office box to No Greater Love (P.O. Box 968, Hoya Station, Washington, D.C. 20007). Georgetown students, led by 19-year-old Charles Fazio, have volunteered to help answer the mail. Here's hoping these young people are kept busy.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATION CONTAINS TWO FATAL FLAWS

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with the greatest reluctance that I voted against H.R. 7645, the Department of State Authorization Act of 1973. The decision was particularly painful because I strongly support the provision of funds to assist in the resettlement of Soviet Jewish refugees in Israel.

The measure as reported and eventually passed, however, has two fatal flaws, which to my mind made it unacceptable.

In this era of rising prices and conflicting demands on the Federal dollar, I believe that Congress should stand in the forefront of fiscal restraint. To raise the per diem 50 percent for Members of Congress traveling overseas only tells the American people that we do not care, that we believe we are exempt from the belt-tightening we demand of the rest of the Government.

Civilian personnel of the executive branch except when traveling to Baffin Island or Oman, or to Martinique and some small Dutch islands during the height of the tourist season, manage to survive on less than \$50 per day. In most countries the per diem rate is much less due to the low cost of accommodations and meals. Most often they wind up in-pocket even with these lower rates. Whereas I recognize that Members have representational duties which often outstrip those officials traveling on routine business, I question the need and propriety of staying in the very best luxury hotels and eating in the finest restaurants at the taxpayer's expense. Surely a more modest standard would be sufficient.

So long as we insist on a worldwide flat rate per diem, not geared to price levels in individual countries nor reflected in actual vouchered expenses, I think we can manage to survive very well on \$50 per day.

Similarly, how can we justify spending \$1,165,000 to establish a liaison office in Peking when we could use those dollars much better for social programs right here at home? I applaud President Nixon's successful attempts to reach a degree of normalization with China, but believe we can proceed at a more modest, less costly pace. I hope that when we come to State Department appropriations for the next fiscal year this amount will be substantially reduced.

STUDENTS TO SEEK TURNABOUT OF UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO'S "OUTCAST" IMAGE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the classical liberal tradition of discussion is one I hold very dear. The competition of ideas, the expansion of thought, the promotion of dialog and debate, are all vital concepts which must remain realities in a free and open society. It is my hope that such goals remain ones to which academia and academicians remain deeply committed.

I am grateful that this classical liberal ideal is very much alive on the University of Buffalo campus. In the words of that great nineteenth century thinker, John Stuart Mill—

In general, opinions contrary to those commonly received can only obtain a hearing by studied moderation of language, and the most cautious avoidance of unnecessary offense, from which they hardly ever deviate even in a slight degree without losing ground; while unmeasured vituperation employed on the side of the prevailing opinion, really does deter people from professing contrary opinions, and from listening to those who profess them. For the interest, therefore, of truth and justice, it is far more important to restrain this employment of vituperative language than any other. . . . (opinion) ought to give merited honor to everyone, whatever opinion he may hold, who has calmness to see and honesty to state what his opponents and their opinions really are, exaggerating nothing to their discredit, keeping nothing back which tells, or can be supposed to tell, in their favor. This is the real morality of public discussion; and if often violated, I am happy to think that there are many controversialists who to a great extent observe it, and a still greater number who conscientiously strive towards it.

Mr. Speaker, I find J. S. Mill most relevant to the University of Buffalo. The recent election of Jonathan A. Dandes as president of the University of Buffalo Student Association is only the most immediate example of the kind of dialectical movement I consider so essential. Jonathan Dandes views the relationship between the university's students and the Buffalo community as a dynamic, two-way process. He hopes to better utilize student and faculty expertise for community related projects. I suspect his thoughts will have a thoroughly positive effect on the University of Buffalo, on the Buffalo community, and on the relationship of the University of Buffalo to the community.

I hope to be able to do what I can to encourage the kind of dialog and co-operative action which will help bring about accelerated Lake Erie clean-up, rapid transit and water-sewage treatment projects. It will be not only of immediate benefit to the Buffalo community, but also in the highest tradition of institutions of higher learning.

The Buffalo Courier Express recently did an article entitled "Students to Seek Turnabout of University of Buffalo's 'Outcasts' Image." I insert it at this point:

STUDENTS SEEK TURNABOUT OF UB'S "OUTCASTS" IMAGE

"We're tired of being treated as outcasts!" The speaker was Jonathan A. Dandes, newly installed president of the University of Buffalo Student Assn. representing 15,000 undergraduates.

Mr. Dandes, in an interview, expressed concern over the image of the students held by the general Buffalo community.

"The 1970 image of the wild, radical, rioting UB student is still strong in Buffalo," Mr. Dandes said. "As a result, students have great difficulty in finding housing and are discriminated against by local shops and businesses. University area stores seem to have higher prices, give bad service to students, and discriminate against them in regards to employment."

The articulate, soft-spoken Student Assn. president from Flushing, L.I., feels that the Buffalo community is, unfortunately, unaware of the many programs and services that UB students offer to the public. He cited as an example the Community Action Core, consisting of more than 50 free programs in tutorial, recreational and cultural realms.

Mr. Dandes also points out that UB students sponsor many speakers and open up these events to the public. Congresswoman Bella Abzug of Brooklyn, Lester Maddox, lieutenant governor of Georgia, are two speakers slated in the near future. Students are negotiating for Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts to speak at the university.

"We also offer the Buffalo community a fine athletic program," says Mr. Dandes. "But local newspapers give twice as much coverage to smaller colleges' athletic events as they do to UB's programs."

Mr. Dandes views the relationship between the university's students and the Buffalo community as a dynamic, two-way process. A mere welcome to students on the part of the Buffalo community is not enough, he says. And for the students to "... move toward a sense of belonging, a sense of greater identity in Buffalo, they (the students) must direct their energies into the goal of a more productive community and university."

Asked if student and faculty expertise could be pooled for such projects as the rapid transit system, Mr. Dandes said that the use of this talent would be productive, but to his knowledge the community has not asked the university for such help.

Mr. Dandes is presently in the process of requesting county and city officials to speak on and aid in his proposed image building process.

Mr. Dandes was asked about alleged anti-Semitism directed UB students. Mr. Dandes, who is Jewish, said that the alleged anti-Semitic barbs have never been aimed directly at him. However, he added, he is aware of its presence on campus and off. Again it's a matter of the university and the community understanding each other and working together. Some Buffalonians believe that UB is entirely composed of Long Island Jews. And, some students believe that Buffalonians generally are anti-Semitic.

"Buffalo has many resources available to the UB student. Working together, the university and the community can produce an

infinite number of positive actions," Mr. Dandes insists. "We're slowly working out of our 1970 image, but we've only been fairly successful. Today our political and community concern is as great as it was in 1970, if not greater, but our mode of expressing this concern has changed."

Mr. Dandes is confident that if the Buffalo community and the university "... move in a positive direction ... students will leave the university with ... a good feeling about Buffalo."

HANDGUNS IN AMERICA

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith another article containing more shocking statistics and information concerning the handgun business in America. Nathan Cobb, the journalist on the staff of the Boston Globe who has written this article, states that in Boston last year, only 1 of 43 handgun murders was alleged to have been committed by a legally registered owner. He also states that every 13 seconds, someone in the United States buys a handgun, and every 58 minutes, a handgun is used to kill a human being in this country.

An earlier article was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 5, 1973, page 18201. I commend that article, and the article which follows, to the attention of my colleagues:

EVERY 13 SECONDS, A SALE—AND EVERY 58 MINUTES, A KILLING

(By Nathan Cobb)

Every 13 seconds—about the time it takes to light a cigarette—someone in the United States buys a handgun.

And every 58 minutes, a handgun is used to kill a human being in this country.

Chances are very good that before you've finished reading this Sunday paper another man, woman or child will be dead or dying, shot by a handgun.

The Great American Handgun Boom, flourishing despite five-year-old Federal laws supposedly designed to curtail the nation's privately owned small arms arsenal, is being matched by startling increases in handgun crime.

An in-depth Globe study, which revealed that 50 percent more handguns are being produced in the US since passage of the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act, has also discovered a corresponding leap in violent handgun use.

In comparing national violent crime statistics compiled three years before and three years after the passage of ostensibly stronger gun laws, these facts stand out:

Handgun murders jumped 87 percent between 1966 and 1971, while murders with other types of weapons rose at less than half that rate. In 1971, the last year for which the FBI makes such figures available, 8991 Americans were murdered with handguns—more than with all other types of weapons combined.

During the same period, 1966-1971, handgun murders of police officers more than doubled. In the decade from 1962 to 1971, records show, 530 of 722 murdered policemen—73 percent—were killed with handguns.

Aggravated assaults with firearms—of which the handgun is the most popular type—also doubled from 1966 to 1971. Meanwhile, aggravated assaults with all other

types of weapons rose at less than half the gun rate.

Robberies by firearm nearly tripled between 1966 and 1971. The FBI estimates that roughly two out of three armed robberies are now committed with guns, and local law enforcement authorities confirm the handgun is the most popular robbery weapon.

The country's private cache of handguns stands at 30 to 40 million, with 2.5 million more being manufactured or imported this year alone. Four of 10 guns now being made in the U.S. are handguns, and there is one handgun for every 1.5 American families.

In Boston, the capital of a state with one of the nation's strictest gun laws, 43 percent of the 377 murders committed since January 1970, have involved handguns. Last year, nine times as many people were murdered with handguns than with rifles and shotguns combined. Further, aggravated assault with a firearm in Boston has risen almost 50 percent since state laws regarding gun purchase were toughened in 1968, while armed robbery has more than tripled.

According to William J. Taylor, superintendent-in-chief of the Boston Police Dept., the handgun is far and away the most prevalent weapon used in all types of armed crime. "One of the major factors driving up the crime rate is the availability of handguns," Taylor said recently. "Outlawing handguns would make our job an awful lot easier."

That Boston's handgun murder rate is slightly lower than the national average may well be attributable to the fact that handguns are more difficult to acquire legally in Massachusetts than in most states. In any case the FBI reports that there is a significant correlation between gun ownership and gun crime—the South, where gun ownership is highest, has the highest gun murder rate and the highest rate for aggravated assaults with firearms of any region in the country; the Northeast, with lowest gun ownership, has the lowest rates for such gun crimes.

Since 1967, at least three presidential crime commissions have linked violent crime to the stockpile of handguns in America, recommending solutions ranging from stiffer laws to an outright ban. The most famous, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, reported in 1969 that "Firearms, particularly handguns, facilitate the commission and increase the danger of most violent crimes—murder, robbery and assault."

"We believe," the commission, chaired by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, continued, "on the basis of all the evidence before us, that reducing the availability of the handgun will reduce firearms violence."

Who kills with a handgun? According to Lt. Det. Jerome P. McCallum, acting head of the Homicide Bureau of the Boston Police Dept., the scenario for murder in the Hub goes like this: "Someone is drinking . . . there's an argument . . . a handgun is somewhere nearby . . . someone reaches for it . . . and a killing occurs."

Indeed, the FBI's 1971 Uniform Crime Report points out that "The significant fact emerges that most murders are committed by relatives of the victim or persons acquainted with the victim."

Adds McCallum, a 15-year veteran of murder investigations: "It's the availability of the blasted handgun, that's all."

At 1010 Commonwealth av., row upon row of handguns line the walls behind the locked steel cage protecting the Firearms Identification Bureau of the Massachusetts Department of Public Safety. More are found inside several large metal drawers, and all have been involved in some type of firearms violation. Last year, the bureau investigated 708 cases, a 43 percent jump over two years ago. Ninety-four of the cases were fatal shootings.

"I'd have to say that roughly three-quarters of the guns we see are handguns," Lt. Carl M. Majesky, head of the bureau, said last week. "We work on any crime involving firearms outside Boston, primarily identifying weapons, and we feel handguns are used so often in crime because they're concealable and convenient."

Across town, deep beneath the John F. Kennedy Federal Building, a similar scene is found in the storage room of the Boston district office of the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau (ATF) of the US Treasury Dept. There, handguns by the dozens normally hang from the walls, most of them seized in undercover operations carried out against people selling guns illegally.

"The majority of guns we see and buy—in other words, most of the guns being dealt illegally—are handguns," admitted Arthur A. Montuori, special agent in charge. "But even though we make arrests, we don't get all the guns. They're still out there some place, on the illegal market." ATF, in fact, seized fewer than three weapons for every criminal case it initiated last year.

Some law enforcement officials claim that black market sales of handguns may equal legal transactions in number. In Boston, as in any American city, it is easy to get a gun if you want one: in bars, on the street, in well-known apartments.

But there is a striking fact about handguns used in crimes. While most are not owned legally, virtually all were at one time legal guns which were legitimately manufactured, probably in New England. Somewhere along the line, however, they were stolen from the manufacturer, the retailer or, most likely, in a housebreak. Many also came from neighboring states such as Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine, where laws regarding purchase are weak.

In Boston last year, only one of 43 handgun murders was alleged to have been committed by a legally registered owner.

"Guns used in crime almost always come through the black market," said McCallum, "and the black market originates in housebreaks and other types of robberies of legal owners. So, in the end, the source for illegal guns is legal owners."

Despite the overwhelming statistics which link handgun ownership to violent crime, the handgun trade seldom meets trouble in the form of genuinely restrictive legislation. The business is locked firmly to the National Rifle Association (NRA), which claims 1 million devout members and warned in the February issue of "The American Rifleman," its monthly magazine, that "Communist leaders and their henchmen or unwitting tools continue to demand that US citizens give up their guns . . ."

"Henchmen" and "tools" notwithstanding, the more than 60 bills that have been filed this year in both branches of Congress to amend the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act or add further restrictions to firearms pose little real threat to the handgun market.

Some are so innocuous they are backed by the gun lobby itself. Those with teeth are given little chance of passage.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's Personal Safety Firearms Act of 1973, which would ban the domestic output of all handheld firearms not designed for "sporting uses," is currently resting quietly in the Senate Judiciary Committee, where a similar bill died during the last Congress. There is little hope within the senator's office that it will be approved in its present form, and he is searching for a more popular bill with which to couple some of his currently proposed measures in amendment form.

An even stronger bill, filed by Sen. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.) and proposing to ban all private ownership of handguns, is currently pending before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. But it is essentially a

carbon copy of a measure defeated 87-7 last year on the Senate floor.

The closest shave the handgun business has had recently came in the form of a bill filed last year by Sen. Birch E. Bayh (D-Ind.) which proposed to ban the sale, importation and manufacture of certain small handguns. Aimed primarily at the new domestic manufacturers of so-called "Saturday Night Specials," those cheap handguns made with foreign parts, it passed the Senate by 68-25 on June 27, 1972, but died in the House without reaching a vote.

In Massachusetts, which passed the first gun control law in North America in 1692, attempts to toughen laws continue to go down to ignominious defeat. A 1973 bill prohibiting the sale and possession of handguns, except for or by members of the armed forces and law enforcement officials, was reported unfavorably this year by a unanimous vote of the Joint Public Safety Committee.

This hardy perennial, sponsored by Sen. Jack H. Backman (D-Brookline) drew a vociferous and protesting group of 1000 gun owners to a public hearing Feb. 15. Another bill, sponsored by Rep. Peter F. Harrington (D-Newton), would have required the registration of handguns with a barrel length of less than six inches or an overall length of less than 18 inches. It was defeated in the House by a 151-70 margin.

What finally did pass were six bills, backed by gun owners, which increased penalties for violating various sections of the state's current gun laws.

"The opponents of strong gun laws are very well-organized," Sen. Backman explained recently. "But the proponents who far outnumber the gun lobbyists, don't ban together. They just don't get excited."

National polls, in fact, have consistently shown the public solidly backs stiffer gun laws. But the number of handguns—and the violent crimes in which they're used—continues to mount.

DR. FRED STAUBER RETIRES

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, this month, Dr. Fred Stauber will retire as superintendent of schools in my hometown of Union, N.J. His departure will punctuate one of the most progressive eras ever enjoyed by the Union Township School System.

I greatly admire Dr. Stauber, both as an educator and as a man. Individuals of his stature and character do not come along every day.

The Union Leader, my local newspaper, last week published the following editorial salute to Dr. Stauber, which I regard as so appropriate that I believe it should be spread on the Record so that my colleagues can recognize the type of man and educator Dr. Stauber has been:

[From the Union (N.J.) Leader, June 7, 1973]

Fred Stauber is about to retire as Union's superintendent of schools and there's much that we can say.

The trouble is that it sounds like a cliché: He has been a hard-working, successful administrator, a patient listener and an intelligent decision-maker. He has kept his mind open and his voice low. He has been a conservative with money and a progressive with ideas.

He helped to give Union a much better school system than the one he inherited. He was the leading force in achieving racial balance in the schools while strident voices were damning his efforts. He helped get the taxpayers to put up the funds that gave Union a truly comprehensive high school—again with opposition that would have sent our children to two separated schools.

Those were big tests and big accomplishments for the superintendent and the school board. We remember those days well, because Dr. Stahuber and the board went to the newspapers and to the people to tell their ideas and their plans. They understood the citizen's right to know the facts and respected his ability to make intelligent decisions. They were educators in the finest sense of the word.

Lesser men—in this town and elsewhere—have been fearful of informing the public. Yes, there can be difficulty dealing with an informed public; the temptation to be silent or to delay or to obfuscate is great. But no public servant worth his salt is able to forget his responsibility to keep the public informed.

Fred Stahuber didn't forget when times were toughest.

That's the finest tribute a newspaperman can pay him.

SECOND THOUGHTS

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other Members of Congress who have expressed their strong opposition to the announced intention of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to implement on June 18, 1973 its so-called pesticide safety regulations.

Orchardmen in my congressional district who are knowledgeable in the use of pesticides from long years of experience are alarmed over the grave economic impact which implementation of the proposed OSHA standards would have on the apple and tobacco industries of western North Carolina.

Experts in the use of pesticides advise me that there is no credible scientific evidence to justify the emergency nature of the OSHA order and that the standards proposed are both unrealistic and unreasonable.

A spokesman for the North Carolina Apple Growers Association warned a few days ago that the OSHA order "is going to result in higher production costs for the growers and is going to put some producers out of business."

I am somewhat encouraged to learn that OSHA is apparently having some second thoughts over the wisdom of its hasty proposal. I base this on information that top Labor Department administrators were on Capitol Hill Friday, June 8, to discuss the matter with appropriate Members of the House and Senate.

Hopefully, their conferences will lead to a stay of the June 18 effective date for implementation of the OSHA order.

Everyone concerned recognizes that agricultural workers must be protected against the hazards of toxic chemicals. Everyone is for realistic standards in this regard.

However, the OSHA standards appear to have been arrived at without the benefit of a careful evaluation of scientific data and certainly without due regard for the adverse impact they would have on the orchard and tobacco industries.

THE USE OF U.S. CREDIT IN WORLD DIPLOMACY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it appears absurd, but the present administration continues to consider extension of U.S. credit to Americans inflationary, while at the same time considering extension of credit to foreigners as good business.

Now we learn that the Russian oil deal is also to be financed in part by the U.S. taxpayers, with money borrowed from the U.S. Export-Import Bank. Efforts to increase U.S. petroleum production are apparently inflationary, while developing Soviet production is supposed to be good business.

We further learn that our country plans to extend military credit to Chile for the purchase of 16 jet aircraft. The rationale seems that we must finance the Chilean sale so that they do not buy from the Russians.

In one field we are financing Soviet technology and production, while in another area we are financing sales to limit Soviet sales.

In the interim, possibly because the Chase Manhattan Bank at No. 1 Karl Marx Square, Moscow, and the Bank of America have transferred their credit to the Soviet Union, they have announced that their prime U.S. lending rate has been raised to 7.5 percent—obviously to help control inflation by discouraging Americans from obtaining the credit that they have helped these two banks amass.

We may not be curbing inflation, but our leaders and multinational financial institutions are certainly following the maxim of sharing America's wealth with the world.

I am inserting the related newspaper clippings in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star-News, June 8, 1973]

U.S. FIRMS TO BUY SOVIET GAS

MOSCOW.—Two American firms signed a letter of intent today to import more than \$10 billion worth of natural gas from the Soviet Union over a 25-year period.

The agreement was between the El Paso Natural Gas Co. and Occidental Petroleum Corp. on the one side and the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade on the other.

Occidental chairman Armand Hammer announced the "agreement of intention" at a news conference.

"Quantities up to 2 billion cubic feet per day are contemplated," he said.

"At current market prices, such gas over the 25-year term of the agreement would exceed \$10 billion to the U.S.S.R. It is expected that this sum will be spent for U.S. goods and services."

Hammer said the project will require a 2,000-mile pipeline from Yakutsk to the Vladivostok area, "the largest liquefaction

plant" ever envisaged and a fleet of 20 cryogenic tankers.

The hard currency financing for the project, excluding the ships, will be about \$2 billion, Hammer said.

Hammer said that Japanese firms which have been negotiating with the Soviets may participate in the project and take a portion of the gas.

The Soviet gas provided for by the agreement is intended for the west coast of the United States, Hammer said.

Asked about probable delivery dates, the Occidental Petroleum chairman said it will take about six years for Russian gas to cook American steaks.

Howard Boyd, the El Paso chairman who took part in signing the protocol, said one of the major problems to be settled before the agreement became firm was that of price. He said the price of the Soviet gas "will have to be competitive with other liquid natural gas sources" in the world.

He said negotiations on an acceptable price "will undoubtedly take time."

Boyd added that the Americans expected to have "a firm understanding on price" before the project is financed.

Asked about funding for the project, Boyd referred to a deal El Paso is carrying out with the Algerian government for Algerian natural gas. He said the Algerians raised part of the money from a consortium of American banks and the rest was borrowed from the U.S. Export-Import Bank. He said he expected the Soviet project to be financed along the same lines.

Boyd said that according to the letter of intent signed with Deputy Foreign Trade Minister Nikolai G. Osipov, the American firms "will counsel the Soviets on financing."

Asked how the Americans would handle customary Soviet secrecy in providing such essential data as proven gas resources, Boyd replied, "We have to be satisfied. . . ."

"This was explained to the Russians, and we have been assured that all the necessary geologic data will be provided to satisfy us." He said he expected there would be on-site examination by the American firms.

Hammer recalled that Occidental had recently signed what he called a "firm contract" with the Russians on an \$8 billion chemical deal and revealed that the Russians had insisted the agreement get the formal backing of the U.S. government.

"Such agreement has been given by our government. Letters have been exchanged," Hammer said, meaning that the fertilizer deal was sealed.

Hammer said he is still discussing with the Soviets a project to build an international trade center in Moscow and to sell to the Russians a system for converting garbage into oil.

Hammer said the Russians would be given a proposed agreement on the trade center today and that he expected some action on it by the time Communist party chief Leonid Brezhnev goes to the United States June 18.

Hammer also said that he was trying to interest the Russians in a prototype plan his firm has in California to convert waste disposal into oil. Hammer said the Soviets would visit the California-plant soon.

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1973]

CHILE SAID TO BUY U.S. JETS

SANTIAGO.—The Chilean Air Force plans to buy 16 F5E International jet interceptors from the Northrop Corp., El Mercurio, the usually reliable opposition newspaper, said yesterday.

Chile will pay for the planes with a \$16 million credit, the report said.

The Nixon administration announced last week that the president had lifted a ban on the sale of sophisticated military hardware to Latin America. The Latins have been buying advanced equipment from France and

other nations, and the United States had been losing out on the market without damping down the regional arms purchases.

A State Department official was reported as saying last week that Chile preferred the F5Es to MIG-21s offered by the Soviet Union. The United States last extended military credit to Chile in 1971, when it loaned the government of President Salvador Allende \$5 million for the purchase of a C-130 transport plane.

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 1973]
BANK OF AMERICA, CHASE MANHATTAN RAISE
PRIME LENDING RATE TO 7.5 PERCENT
(By James L. Rowe Jr.)

The prime lending rate was raised a quarter point, to 7.5 per cent, yesterday by major banks, including the nation's biggest bank, Bank of America in San Francisco, and the largest business lender, Chase Manhattan of New York.

New York's largest bank, First National City Bank, is expected to follow suit today, when it automatically adjusts its prime lending rate on the basis of a "floating" formula. Citibank relates its prime lending rate to other interest rates in the money markets, specifically the rate prevailing on 90-day, dealer-placed commercial paper.

Other banks raising their prime rates yesterday included Manufacturers Hanover, Chemical Bank and Marine Midland, of New York; First Pennsylvania of Philadelphia and Mercantile Trust Co. of St. Louis.

The quarter point increase in the prime lending rate was initiated Wednesday by Girard Trust in Philadelphia, which was quickly followed by two major Chicago banks, Continental and Harris Trust.

It is the fourth increase in the prime rate since April 16, when the government told banks they could allow the prime rate to move up and down with other money market rates, provided that consumer and small business lending rates were restrained.

Before April 16, the government had been pressuring banks to hold down the prime rate—the rate they charge large corporate borrowers for short-term loans. As a result, because other money market rates rose faster than the prime rate, businesses which otherwise would have obtained cash in the commercial paper market, for example, borrowed from banks.

This phenomena dried up funds that banks would otherwise have lent to small businesses and consumers.

Most industry observers expect another increase in the prime rate to 7.75 per cent, and predict that the rate might reach 8 per cent before it begins to fall again.

The current prime is the highest since September 1970 when it touched 7.5 per cent on its way down from the historic high of 8.5 per cent which prevailed in the credit crunch of 1969 and 1970.

STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT AND TITLE I OF ESEA

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in March 1973, I introduced my bill H.R. 5163, the "Educationally Disadvantaged Children's Act of 1973." This bill, which amends title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is designed to distribute funds on the basis of educational disadvantage rather than economic disadvantage.

Under the legislation, a nationwide criterion-referenced test in reading and mathematics would be administered to a sample of children across the country. Based on the results of this assessment, program money would be distributed to the States. Each State in turn would distribute the money to local school districts based on their own statewide assessment programs using either criterion-referenced or norm-referenced tests.

I have found that many States are already using statewide assessment programs or plan to do so within the next few years. A book soon to be published by Joan S. Beer and Paul B. Campbell entitled "A Nationwide Survey of Statewide Assessment" reports the results of a comprehensive survey of each of the States. The results indicate clearly that all 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico either have an operational assessment program, are developing a program, or are in the planning state. More specifically, 28 States and the District of Columbia have existing statewide assessment programs and 22 States, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico have emerging programs.

Among the 28 States and the District of Columbia which have statewide programs, 17 collect information for State-level decisionmaking and 13 collect information for local-level decisionmaking. In eight of these States where the achievement levels are collected primarily for State purposes, the results are used to allocate State and Federal funds to school districts. In 10 other States, the intentions are to use assessment information to distribute funds. This would suggest that for the Federal Government to utilize the results of statewide assessment programs in distributing title I funds would not cause an additional problem for the States but would allow them to use a system they have already developed.

For the information of the Members, I am listing the States which have programs in each of the three categories discussed. You will note that New York is listed under two categories since they have separate programs which serve different purposes.

The 17 programs for which the emphasis is on collecting information for State-level decisionmaking are in these States:

Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, and Michigan.

Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

The 13 programs for which the emphasis is on collecting information for local-level decisionmaking are in these States:

Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, and Kentucky.

Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania.

The 24 emerging programs are in these States:

Alaska, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana,

Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, and Ohio.

Oklahoma, Oregon, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

In the States where the information is used for statewide decisionmaking, verbal, and mathematical achievements are measured. This information is apparently of the most value in assessing the cognitive skills which children have mastered.

Both criterion-referenced tests and norm-referenced tests are found in programs of statewide assessment. But where the results are used for State-level decisionmaking, the trend is toward criterion-referenced tests. The implication is that the results of criterion-referenced tests have the greatest potential to be effective in distributing Federal funds fairly and equitably.

In discussing the major problems related to assessment programs with each of the States, the two eternal problems are not enough money and not enough staff. The States seem committed to the value of statewide assessment but feel that their lack of financial and personnel resources prevent them from developing as fully as they would like such aspects as dissemination, interpretation, acceptance, understandings, awareness, and utilization of assessment results by teachers and administrators.

Yet another encouraging trend is the increasing involvement of citizens in goal setting. For example, in Wyoming a series of discussions were held with the participation of a State Sounding Committee, the State superintendent of public instruction, the State board of education, the State education agency, students, teachers, administrators, the teacher's association, staff from the national assessment of educational progress, and other educational experts. The goals were in turn presented to the State board for endorsement. Other States such as Georgia, Michigan, Kansas, Idaho, Virginia, South Carolina, and Colorado have conducted similar programs. These suggest that many States are grappling with the important issue of the educational goals they hold for their children.

The data in a nationwide survey of statewide assessment show clearly that States are moving in the direction of statewide assessment and in some States this is being accomplished through State legislative mandate. But more importantly the information obtained from the assessment is helpful in establishing State goals for education and assessing the progress made in reaching these goals. Beers and Campbell in their book indicate that—

Statewide testing can help to bring greater stability into the educational process by steering a well-planned educational program toward well-considered educational goals.

This recent report suggests that for the Federal Government to move in the direction of using the results of statewide assessment in distributing title I funds concurs with the direction that the States themselves are taking.

A HELL OF A TOWN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, though I might receive arguments from my colleagues in Congress, there is no doubt in my mind that New York is the greatest city in the world. For sheer excitement and magnitude, nothing beats New York City.

The spirit and imagination of our city, and especially its citizens, was no more in evidence than on West 69th Street this past Sunday. For on that afternoon, the West 69th Street Block Association sponsored the fifth annual "Little Old New York Festival."

I now submit for the interest and collective jealousy of my colleagues, the New York Times article concerning the event, entitled "Old New York Festival Draws 3,000 to West 69th Street Block."

It is indeed my privilege and pleasure to be able to represent the citizens of West 69th Street in Congress.

The article follows:

"OLD NEW YORK" FESTIVAL DRAWS 3,000 TO WEST 69TH STREET BLOCK

About 3,000 people turned out in ideal weather yesterday for the fifth annual "Little Old New York Festival"—an event sponsored by the West 69th Street Block Association to beautify the block and help elderly citizens living in the neighborhood.

There were 79 display booths and carts between Columbus Avenue and Central Park West, offering food and merchandise patterned after the turn-of-the-century New York scene. But despite the straw hats and striped jackets, a good bit of Orchard Street and the more contemporary Lower East Side of the nineteen twenties and thirties filtered through.

"A FORM OF THERAPY"

A large, brightly colored gazebo functioned as an all-purpose reviewstand and bandstand. Costumes ran the gamut from 19th-century New York to hot pants. There were blue T-shirts specially designed for the occasion. Lettering on them said: "I got mine on West 69th Street."

Richard Smith, a public-relations director who lives at 41 West 69th Street, set a wooden board on a barricade horse and invited people to knock nails into the wood. The price was two nails for a nickel or five for a dime.

"It's a form of therapy," he explained. "It's better than three years of psychoanalysis."

There was a "white elephant" booth loaded with things that people living in the neighborhood wished to dispose of. An outdoor beer garden and sidewalk cafe served beer for 50 cents.

The "our own thing" booth featured arts and crafts made for the festival by people on the block. There was a fortune-teller booth, and for 25 cents you could get an old-fashioned haircut from an old-fashioned, outdoor barber.

"The only difference between an old-fashioned haircut and a modern haircut is the price," said Luis Sepulveda, who charges \$2 for the same trim in his shop at 204 Columbus Avenue.

As a free service, the Parks Department provided a sportsmobile, a puppet unit and a show wagon where the "Child in Time" rock group played.

"I love it," said Barbara Good, who originally came from New Jersey and now lives at 113 West 69th Street. "Everyone says New

Yorkers are creeps, but it gives me a warm feeling of pride to know so many wonderful people get themselves together for something like this. I think New Yorkers are marvelous."

Cathleen Jordan, chairman of the event, estimated that \$3,000 would be realized from it.

TRUMAN THE RITUALIST

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman had a great love for his Masonic fraternity. That love was frequently expressed during his years in the White House. It is estimated that he raised more than 30 candidates during the nearly 8 years he was in the White House. He insisted upon the strict injunction that no publicity was to come from his participation. Of course, that was not always possible but it certainly was his firm intention.

In the spring of 1973 issue of the Freemason there are recited several instances of Mr. Truman's participation in lodge ceremonies. One can read with great interest how he journeyed from the White House over to the Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22 to participate in the initiation of Lt. Neville J. McMillan, son of A. T. McMillan, master of the Grandview, Mo., Lodge No. 618 back in 1916.

Then the President later went out to Grandview, Mo., to assist in conferring the second degree in the Blue Lodge on Harry A. Truman, son of his brother Vivian and nephew of the President, at the Grandview, Mo., Masonic Lodge.

In this same article, there appears a story of the incident when Mr. Truman walked from the White House to the Washington Lodge in November 1947 to assist in conferring the lodge's third degree on Capt. Thomas J. Burns, assistant White House physician. It was noted that after a 12-year lapse former Grand Master Truman of the Missouri Grand Lodge recited his lines without missing a syllable.

Finally, one of the most famous Masonic incidents involving President Truman occurred in 1948. It was at Kokomo, Ind., on October 15. While Mr. Truman was talking from the rear platform of his train, he noticed a young man in U.S. Navy uniform. He motioned for the young man to come up and shake hands. Mr. Truman had recognized the young man as one of the crew from the Presidential yacht, *Williamsburg*. The young man was Donald E. Bauermeister. He immediately invited him and his father to board the train to ride on into Indianapolis.

En route he discovered that the young man was to receive his third degree that night at Beech Grove Lodge No. 649, about 8 miles from Indianapolis. The President was invited to attend and at first declined.

But, that was not the way things turned out. Following Mr. Truman's evening speech at the Indiana War Memorial in Indianapolis, the President

ordered his car to proceed to the little town where the President indicated he wished to be present at the initiation of the boy from the Presidential yacht, *Williamsburg*.

Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to read into the RECORD the article from the spring issue of the Freemason entitled "Truman the Ritualist":

TRUMAN THE RITUALIST

President Truman's great love of Masonic fellowship and the ritualistic work in the tiled Lodge room was frequently evidenced during his years in the White House. Some sources indicate that he raised more than 30 candidates during those nearly eight years, always with the strict injunction that no publicity was to come from his participation. That was easier said than done!

LT. NEVILLE J. McMILLAN

A petition presented to Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22, early in 1945 bore the name of Lt. Neville J. McMillan, the son of A. T. McMillan, Master of Grandview Lodge No. 618 in 1916.

The young officer's father and Truman had worked together in Grandview Lodge and Truman had presided as Master at the Raising of the elder McMillan. Truman offered Alexandria-Washington Lodge a highly favorable recommendation of Lt. McMillan and planned to be in attendance on the evening of April 12, 1945, when his petition was voted on. In fact, Truman and Rep. William C. Cole from St. Joseph signed his petition.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt died April 12 and Truman was sworn into office as President within a few short hours. He could not go to Lodge, but he sent three Masonic members of Congress to speak for him, and McMillan was elected to receive the degrees.

Bro. and Rep. Cole wrote Truman on April 16 that McMillan "is scheduled to receive his Entered Apprentice Degree on Wednesday, April 19. I will keep in touch with his progress and inform you of the date that he is to be raised if you so desire."

Cole did keep the President advised of McMillan's progress and again wrote Truman on September 27, 1945, that "I am happy to inform you that he has successfully completed his Entered Apprentice and Fellowcraft degrees and will be raised at the Lodge room of the National Masonic Shrine at Alexandria, Virginia, on Thursday, October 11, or at any other date that suits your convenience."

Truman appended a note to the bottom of the letter addressed to his appointments secretary, Matthew Connelly.

"Matt: I'd like to go. This boy's father is my good friend. In fact I took him through and he served as Master of my little Lodge. The boy's brother was killed in the Pacific. HST."

TRUMAN ATTENDS

Thanks to the *Virginia Masonic Herald* we are able to tell the rest of the story of the Lieutenant's initiation.

Early on the day of the communication, Secret Service men swarmed into the George Washington Masonic National Memorial and carefully scrutinized every square inch of it and set up guards throughout the building.

The Alexandria-Washington Lodge was opened at 7:30 p.m. by W. M. Marvin L. Wilson. Although no notice had been given to the members through the press or otherwise the grapevine apparently had carried the news far and wide that the President was expected. An overflow gathering filled the large Lodge room and there was not even standing room left.

President and Past Grand Master Truman, accompanied by Secret Service men who were members of the Fraternity, was escorted

to the Altar and introduced. He was conducted to the East and accorded the honors due his rank as a Past Grand Master.

After Brother McMillan was Raised, Truman spoke briefly.

When the Lodge was closed, Truman remained in the room to greet the members personally and autographed the dues cards of all who asked. He remained until a late hour before his Secret Service team insisted that he must return to the White House.

President Truman later wrote the Master of the Lodge that "I enjoyed the visit and wish it were possible for me to make more of them."

"Neville McMillan is a good young man—just as his father was before him."

NEPHEW OF THE PRESIDENT

The Kansas City Times of Nov. 2, 1946, took note of another unusual incident in the life and activities of President Truman.

"After leaving his mother's home last night, President Truman paid a visit to the Grandview Masonic Lodge No. 618. While Engle Wray, the Master of the fraternal organization, was supposed to be the only one apprised of the visit, somehow a rumor had spread around among the Masons of Washington Township and a good crowd was on hand.

"The meeting was called for the purpose of conferring the second degree in the Blue Lodge on Harry A. Truman, son of his brother Vivian Truman and a nephew of the President.

"In the ceremony, the President took the role of Worshipful Master and his brother performed the duties of Senior Warden.

Following the ceremony, a social period was held "in which Mr. Truman visited with his fellow Masons" before starting the journey home to Independence.

CAPTAIN BURNS

Newsweek magazine of November 1947 carried this account of President Truman.

"By a companion's count, not one in 20 strollers recognized the blackhatted figure walking briskly up Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington last Thursday evening, November 6. As his Secret Service guard trailed him discreetly, President Truman walked the three blocks from the White House to the Masonic Temple and, once inside, donned the traditional white apron. Reason: Capt. Thomas J. Burns, assistant White House physician, was taking the Lodge's third degree. Though some of the officiating Masons flubbed their lines during the initiation ceremonies, all noticed that Former Grand Master Truman of the Missouri Grand Lodge recited his, after a 12 year lapse (what Newsweek didn't know wouldn't hurt them), without missing a syllable. Later the President chuckled: 'I thought Burns' eyes would pop out. Wish I could get out this way more often.'"

A SAILOR

One of the most famous Masonic incidents involving Truman as President occurred in 1948 during his campaign for re-election to the White House.

It was at Kokomo, Indiana, on October 15, that Truman noticed a young man in a U.S. Navy uniform. After Truman finished his talk from the rear platform of the train, he motioned for the sailor, Donald Earl Bauermeister, to come up and shake hands. Truman had recognized the young man as one of the crew from the Presidential Yacht, Williamsburg.

Young Bauermeister and his father were invited to ride the train into Indianapolis and during the trip, Truman discovered that the sailor was to receive his third degree that night at Beech Grove Lodge No. 649, about eight miles from Indianapolis. The President was invited to attend but expressed doubt that he could because of a tight schedule.

Truman later changed his mind. William J. Bray, special assistant to the President, in an Oral History Interview for the Truman Library, recalled that "when the train arrived in Noblesville, Indiana, for another platform speech, several of the Secret Service men left the train to put into adoption a plan which had been drawn whereby the President could participate in these ceremonies...."

"Following the speech (at the Indiana War Memorial at 8:30 that evening in Indianapolis) the party returned in cars to the train. The car that the President was supposed to ride in at the head of the procession, however, was occupied by two members of his party and his personal secret service bodyguard, Henry Nicholson. The car containing the President and several Secret Service people proceeded to this little town where the President had indicated that he wished to be at the installation of the boy from the Williamsburg. . . . About an hour later the President returned to his railroad car, very much pleased that maybe he had made several people happy. Of course he had made many, many people happy, especially the boy and his father. It was not until two days later that word 'leaked out' about the President's detour and it did not make the press feel very happy that they had missed quite a scoop."

The young sailor's mother, Mrs. John Bauermeister, wrote Truman on Dec. 18, to thank him for "the time you spared, on Oct. 15, 1948, to be present at the raising to a Master Mason of our son, Don." And she said "I also wish to thank your daughter for the beautiful orchid she sent to me. I still have it, and hope to keep it always."

INDIAN FOOD CRISIS A RESULT OF GOVERNMENT AND NATURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the food crisis in India is being exploited in anticipation of more American handouts.

The report of the food shortage in India should serve as an education to those Americans who feel political solutions can solve all problems.

Indian farmers are refusing to sell their crops at prices fixed by the Government—which the farmers consider too low.

The Indian food crisis should be studied as indicative of what American consumers can expect should our Government freeze food prices. The only difference is that our American consumers have no "sugar daddies" in the State Department who would come to our aid and bail us out of such socialistic shortcomings.

A related newsclipping follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 1973]

INDIA PONDS MASSIVE GRAIN IMPORTS

(By Lewis M. Simons)

NEW DELHI, June 7.—The next two weeks will be a period of weather-watching and intense worrying in Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's government. If the impending monsoon fails to develop, India faces its greatest food crisis in modern history.

So far, the signs are promising: rain has been reported in the state of Kerala, at the Subcontinent's southwestern tip, and in Bombay, on the Arabian Sea coast. An of-

ficial of the government meteorological bureau said today that "all signs are there for a largely normal monsoon."

Unfortunately, even if the rains come—and are abundant—the immediate effect will be only psychological. Tempers of city dwellers, exacerbated by high prices and unavailability of food, will be temporarily cooled. Farmers, millions of whom have had to turn to government relief projects for survival, will be able to go back to the land.

But it will be five months before the crops they sow reach food shop counters. Meanwhile, the government has to find ways of filling the gap left by last year's monsoon failure and the resultant widespread drought.

This drought, and the dismal performance to date of the recently nationalized wholesale wheat procurement program, are forcing India to import massive quantities of grain from the United States and other countries.

According to an informed Finance Ministry source, Mrs. Gandhi's Cabinet is considering a proposal to purchase an additional 4.5 million tons of grain, having bought 2 million tons earlier this year.

Although officials refuse to admit it yet, for fear of driving prices up on foreign markets, Indian purchasing agents are already shopping in the United States and Canada, as well as in Argentina and possibly in parts of Europe.

The public, though, does not feel any compunctions about discussing the need for imports, and all its implications that India's much-touted "green revolution" and nationalized domestic procurement are not panning out.

The food shortage is discussed everywhere. "Whenever I meet a foreigner," says one young New Delhi housewife, "I rush up and ask, How is the wheat crop in your country this year?"

Even when admitting that imports will be necessary, image-conscious Agriculture Ministry officials play down the quantity. The latest figure being floated publicly around New Delhi is between 2 and 2.5 million tons.

Foreign specialists note that while the government's desire to wait until American and other prices decline is understandable, much more delay could prove far more costly in human terms than any saving warrants. Even if a major purchase is made in the United States right now, at least three months would elapse before the grain could reach Indian ports.

India finds itself having to buy at a time when wheat is in short supply worldwide. The Soviet Union and China have made major purchases in the United States, Canada and Australia, greatly reducing available stocks and sending prices up. The Indians were bitten badly when they bought 2 million tons last winter, just after the Russians made a killing in the United States grain market.

So, while trying to play the market abroad but at the same time create a scare at home and get farmers to sell their crops, the government seems to unroll different sets of figures at different times and for different audiences.

The habit of downgrading needs and exaggerating goals is a long-standing one in India. This year, for example, the government claimed that the current wheat crop would total 30 million tons and that 8.1 million tons of this would be procured for public distribution.

Now it looks as if the crop will total no more than 26 million tons. The procurement system, nationalized in April, has so far netted 3.2 million tons. Agriculture Minister Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed said yesterday that he was now hoping for a total of 6 million tons.

According to experts, though, the chances of approaching this newly lowered target are nil.

Farmers are refusing to sell their crops at the government's fixed price, which they con-

sider too low, are taking the chance that a poor monsoon will drive their profits up. Actually, the chance the farmers are taking is small. Even if the monsoon is good, food will remain in short supply until the crop comes in. Thus the open market price for their hoarded crops can only improve.

In fact, the government itself may have to raise procurement prices. Already, the Agriculture Ministry is trying to tempt farmers to come across by offering them inducements such as seed, fertilizer and diesel oil to power tractors and irrigation pumps.

These offers, which might have proved tempting had the government not taken over procurement, seem to be going largely unheeded. A large majority of farmers have already committed their crops and themselves to former wheat wholesalers, who were put out of business by nationalization.

Just as the wholesaler predicted when the government took over the trade, the farmers are sticking by their old middlemen. The reason is not that farmers are balking at Mrs. Gandhi's attempt to extend socialism, or even that they are interested in maintaining old friendships. It is far more practical.

The former wholesalers are the only source of loans for millions of peasant farmers.

In theory any farmer, even the smallest peasant landowner, should be able to borrow from nationalized banks to finance his next crop. But the banks have withheld small loans and instead have offered money only to big landlords and, ironically, the former wholesalers.

The farmers are also being pressed not to sell by opposition political parties. Buoyed by dissatisfaction in the countryside over the government's low purchasing price, opposition politicians ranging from the extreme right-wing Swatantra Party to the Marxist Communist Party are gaining niches in former Congress Party strongholds.

Although the government is not prepared to admit that wheat trade nationalization is a failure signs of acknowledgment are growing.

A few days ago, for example, the junior agricultural minister, Annasaheb Shinde conceded that the government was "rethinking" its plan to extend nationalization to the wholesale rice trade. "We are free to examine the situation and make changes in our decisions," he said.

But Shinde's implicit recognition of reality has evidently not filtered through the hierarchy. The Agriculture Ministry has once again set itself an impossible target of 115 million tons of grains for the coming year, surpassing the bumper crop of 1970-71.

Commenting on the new goal, the respected Calcutta Statesman said in an editorial Wednesday: "An ambitious target is often used as a device on the somewhat dubious reasoning that if the aim is high, more is likely to be achieved. But, in practice, this makes a mockery of planning. What is worse, it rarely works."

"JUSTICE" AT WEST POINT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the New York Times has made public an aspect of the system of justice at West Point which is truly frightening and dangerous: the "silencing" of a cadet for an alleged violation of the cadet honor code.

CXIX—1207—Part 15

Cadet James J. Pelosi had been accused of cheating on a test by continuing to write after the instructor had asked the class to stop writing. The cadet honor committee at first found him guilty but the case was later dismissed because of "command influence" and Pelosi was returned to the corps of cadets in good standing. Despite that decision, however, the cadets chose to impose upon Pelosi their severest form of social ostracism—silence. For over a year, the Academy's cadets did not talk to Pelosi except on official business, and they harassed him and threatened him as well.

The "silencing" of a cadet by his fellow cadets is an unofficial punishment; yet it is clearly sanctioned by the West Point administration. It is a form of cruel and unusual punishment that has no place anywhere in American life, and particularly not in an institution of higher learning where a respect for law is supposedly taught.

The "silencing" is indicative of the Academy's entire honor code, which is archaic and which indoctrinates the cadet with the principle of blind obedience to arbitrary military authority. I think the entire code deserves public scrutiny.

I would like now to insert the following article from the New York Times of June 7, 1973:

SILENT AGONY ENDS FOR CADET AT POINT
(By Linda Greenhouse)

WEST POINT, N.Y., June 6.—James J. Pelosi was graduated from the United States Military Academy here today, more than a year and a half after he was officially "silenced" by his fellow cadets.

Beginning in November, 1971, Cadet Pelosi, who received his commission today as a second lieutenant in the Army, had roomed alone and eaten by himself at a 10-man table in the cadet mess hall. Almost none of the 3,800 other cadets talked to him except on official business, in class, or to deliver a message.

A 44-member Honor Committee, senior cadets elected by their companies, had found Cadet Pelosi guilty of completing an answer on a quiz after the examiner had given the order to stop writing. Although he denied the charge and produced witnesses on his behalf and although the conviction was reversed, the Silence was imposed by his fellow cadets.

When his name was called to step up and receive his diploma today, Lieutenant Pelosi, who was 452d in a class of 939, expected that his classmates might boo him as silenced cadets have been booed in the past. But only a brief moment of silence greeted his name, and there were welcoming handshakes when he made his way back to his seat in Michle Stadium.

"It was just as if I were a person after all this time," he said.

In the last few months before graduation, the rigid observance of Silence had all but broken down, at least among cadets who had been Lieutenant Pelosi's friends before the Silence began.

Standing with his family on the field after the ceremony, Lieutenant Pelosi exchanged warm congratulations with members of his class, and there were no visible traces of the ostracism that had marked the last third of his career here. According to some of the other cadets, many of his classmates had come to respect Lieutenant Pelosi for his determination to stay at the Academy and graduate.

In the first few months after the silence began, Lieutenant Pelosi, a 21-year-old native of West Hempstead, L. I. lost 26 pounds, found his mail destroyed and his possessions vandalized, and saw his cadet peer rating drop from among the highest in his 100-man company to 979th, lowest in his entire class.

AN UNWRITTEN PROVISIO

A member of the Cadet Honor Committee himself, Lieutenant Pelosi was accused of violating the honor code at the beginning of his junior year. In his attempt to maintain his innocence, he found himself caught in an aspect of the honor system that is unique to West Point among the nation's service academies, little known to the public at large, yet almost as old as the honor code itself.

The "Silence," a total form of social ostracism, is defined in an official Army memorandum as "a traditional and unwritten proviso of the Honor System designed to deal with a cadet found guilty of an honor violation, but who does not elect to resign and cannot be discharged because of lack of sufficient legal proof."

The Silence is rarely imposed, because most cadets faced with the prospect chose to resign. Perhaps the best known victim of the system was Benjamin O. Davis Jr., who was silenced during all his four years at West Point, 1932 to 1936, because he is black. He went on to become a lieutenant general in the Air Force.

Under the Cadet Honor Code—"A cadet will not lie, cheat or steal or tolerate those who do"—the charge against Cadet Pelosi was construed as cheating by the Honor Committee.

Cadet Pelosi refused to take the usual course of resigning from the Academy and appealed his case to a board of officers. "When you're right, you have to prove yourself," he said the other day in an interview at the Bear Mountain Inn.

It was a decision that changed the young man's life. "I'd do it over again," he said. "I'd hate to have seen some guy silenced who might have given in to it and quit."

"COMMAND INFLUENCE"

An officer board was convened, but halfway through its hearing Cadet Pelosi's military lawyer, Capt. David Hayes, moved to have the case dismissed. He learned that the Honor Committee, before it made its decision, had seen a note from a high-ranking officer urging the members to "expedite" the case because it was a clear-cut honor violation.

Lieut. Gen. William A. Knowlton, the West Point superintendent, ordered the case dismissed for "command influence" and ordered Cadet Pelosi returned to the Corps of Cadets in good standing.

In response, the Honor Committee decided to impose the Silence, a step that was supported by a referendum of the corps.

Lieut. Col. Patrick Dionne, public information officer for the Military Academy asked yesterday to supply details of the case, said that under the pressure of preparing for graduation, no one on the staff would have time to look up the records.

By his own account and the accounts of cadets who know him, Cadet Pelosi enduring the Silence for almost 19 months with an almost stoic calm, turning back catcalls with ironic humor, ignoring occasional rocks and ice cubes thrown his way, confiding his thoughts only to the journal he recorded in a green looseleaf book in the few free minutes before 6:15 breakfast each morning.

A KIND OF GAME

At times, he said he felt compelled to make a kind of game out of his experience. During one vacation this year, he drove some of his high school friends to West Point. Dressed in civilian clothes, he stopped random plebes and asked them if they had ever heard of

"a guy named Pelosi," and then watched his friends' reactions as the first-year cadets described what a "terrible" person he was.

Cadet Pelosi agreed to talk about his experience during the four-hour interview a few days before graduation. But he had mixed feelings about telling his story, not because he feared reprisals, he said, but because "I don't want to wreck this place."

"I put in four years here and it means something to me," he asserted. "I don't want people to look at me like a martyr. I'm happy with myself. There's nothing I regret."

He had finally decided to share his experience, he said, because "if people know, it might help to implement some change."

"Maybe people around here can start examining their own consciences instead of always watching everyone else's" he said. "I have the greatest respect for my classmates who abide by the rules and regulations, but no respect at all for someone like the Honor Committee who can't admit they made a mistake."

"They have placed themselves above the law, and no one has the right to do that. If I'm such a heinous criminal who deserves such suffering, then why has the Academy allowed me to stay here as a thorn in their side for all this time? There is wrongdoing here and it can't all be mine."

"I've told myself I didn't care. I changed, myself to suit the circumstances. That's how I beat them. I read a lot. I went to the gym. I found friends among the civilians here, the waiters in the mess hall, the M.P.'s. No matter what anyone did, I never let it get to me. But if I thought I could make a difference, then maybe I would care."

PAYING A PRICE

But each time Cadet Pelosi repeated that he had "never let it bother me," he sounded less convinced that he had been quite so untouched. There is evidence that he paid a price for his rigid self-control. For one thing, there was the rapid weight loss, down to 132 pounds on an already spare 5-foot-11-inch frame. He has gained back only about 10 of the 26 pounds he lost.

And there was the good friend, the one who cried the night Cadet Pelosi was convicted, but who waited six months after the Silence began to find his friend and ask how he was getting along.

"Yes, I guess that bothered me," Cadet Pelosi said. "That's what bothered me the most—no one has ever asked me what it was like. I never expected anyone's sympathy. But at least I expected some concern for my health and welfare, after they isolate a guy and torment a guy."

"Sometimes now I feel like two people," he added after a moment. "The one that it didn't get to and the one it got to."

A STARK RECORD

His diary entries provide a stark, almost emotionless record of his daily life:

"Friday, 26 November: I returned to my room after class in the afternoon and found a letter from Richard C. ripped up and placed on my desk . . . I believe it is a Federal offense to destroy a person's mail."

"Friday, 10 December: I inspected my gym locker as part of my preparation for the next day's inspection. All my articles of clothing had been thrown in the shower, soaked and then dragged around the floor of the latrine."

"5-7 May: Ring Weekend for the class of 1973. On Saturday, 6 May I received a telephone call in the F-1 orderly room. The unidentified caller said, 'Pelosi, we're going to get your ring if we have to cut off your finger to get it.' On Monday evening, 8 May I received another phone call. The caller said, 'Pelosi, you wear that ring and you're dead.'"

Cadet Pelosi did accept his West Point class ring, but he has never worn it—not out of fear, he said, but because the idea of wearing it no longer appealed to him.

A DRAMATIC IMPROVEMENT

Cadet Pelosi's life improved dramatically when the Commandant of Cadets ordered him transferred back to Company B-4, his original company, after 14 months of nearly total silence in Company F-1.

His civilian lawyer, Edwin Cooperman, a former member of the judge advocate general's office here, had threatened West Point with a lawsuit on the ground that the transfer out of his original company had been an official act furthering the Silence, which Academy officials have always maintained is an unofficial and spontaneous action of social sanction by the cadets.

With his transfer back to B-4, where he had many friends, the Silence became, by common admission here, almost unenforceable. In the last few months, as many as half his classmates have talked with him openly, visited his room, even sat with him.

Last week, Cadet Pelosi received a letter from his class president informing him that "because of the situation in which you find yourself" he would not be allowed to attend last night's graduation banquet and dance, the social highlight of June Week.

Cadet Pelosi protested and, somewhat to his surprise, the class officers reversed themselves and gave him an invitation. But at the last moment he decided to dine with his parents instead.

"I just had it in my mind that I might be stuck off in a corner somewhere and it meant more to me to be with my family," he said.

FEDERAL DOLLARS AND THE "EDUCATIONAL" PROCESS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the "Phi Delta Kappan" contains an article that ought to be read by every taxpayer and particularly every educator in the country.

The article, by Michael Chiappetta, chairman of the Division of Comparative and International Education at Indiana University, is entitled, "If You Lose on Every Sale, Maybe You Can Make Up for It in Volume." The writer demonstrates, with devastating logic and analysis, that Federal aid often does more harm than good.

The article follows:

IF YOU LOSE ON EVERY SALE, MAYBE YOU CAN MAKE UP FOR IT IN VOLUME

(By Michael Chiappetta)

On a dark and dreary day last winter, that recent addition to Washington bureaucracy, the National Institute of Education, announced that it would distribute \$7.5 million dollars in small grants (\$10,000 to \$50,000 per grant) to educators who could propose worthwhile research.

In retrospect it doesn't seem believable, but it was and is true: Applications for those grants were to be submitted in twenty-plicate! Even so, grantsmanship, somewhat dormant in the face of wintry blasts from an economy-minded administration, sprang to life. Across the country teams of researchers began to meet, to talk, to outline, to write,

to concoct budgets, to call colleagues at other institutions, to divine the criteria by which approvals would be gained; in short, to bring into life "The Proposal" which would elicit from fair Washington the final blessing—money. That's grantsmanship.

What happened? On the magic date, February 28, 1973, there were unmistakable signs that a phenomenon worth recording had occurred. The Post Office had dumped 6,000 proposals on NIE's doorstep. Six thousand! At Indiana University we were thunderstruck by this news, but at first it was only an awe born of logistic considerations. For example: If each proposal was 35 pages long (the average of the 27 proposals emanating from Bloomington) and each proposal was sent in twenty-plicate, then no less than 4,200,000 sheets of paper inundated the receiving office in Washington. Four million two hundred thousand pages! That is approximately 25,000 pounds or 12.5 tons of paper. The paper-management problems alone are enough to frighten any office in the country except perhaps the Pentagon.

Our somewhat rural Indiana observation might have stopped there if it had not been for the fact that we began to mull over the economics of the escapade. Just what did it cost to put together the 6,000 proposals? Let us reconstruct some of the details. We know that at least one major professor was involved in the development of each project. He had to invest at least six days in thinking, talking, writing, editing, and seeking administrative approval of his project. In most cases, if there was to be collaboration—a highly desirable characteristic—at least two other professors would have been involved for a minimum period of three days. At least two graduate students must have been involved for five days. Let us add it up: A major professor costs at least \$20,000 per year or \$100 per day. That's \$600. Two other professors at \$75 for three days makes another \$450.* Two graduate students, especially if on assistantship status, cost a minimum of \$10 a day, so we add another \$100. New total: \$1,150. Indiana University rightfully charges 60% overhead when applying for "soft" money, since it provides space, light, heat, office equipment, library and computer services, so we must add 60% of \$1,150, or \$690, to come up with a professional cost of \$1,840.

We all know that the most important part of proposal writing is secretarial. It is obvious that a 35-page document written by at least five people approved by at least three levels of administrators, and requiring budget clearance, would require at least three typings. At five pages an hour—a phenomenal rate for three carbons—that makes at least seven hours per version, but let's be conservative and estimate only half a week's salary for the finished product. That comes to a neat \$50, if your secretary's salary is slightly above the starvation levels usually paid in university towns. Then there's paper, tons of it—as noted before. Getting to the final version must have used the three grounds mentioned plus some waste caused by errors, so let's estimate 500 sheets. A ream of regular typing paper costs not more than \$5, so add that to the bill. In the interest of economy, and not to pad the bill, let's forget the carbon paper. But we cannot forget the paper needed for the 20 copies. At I.U. we Xeroxed our copies—not 20 but 28, since copies were needed in two deans' offices, two vice presidents' offices, and the treasurer's office. Besides, it was thought that we should keep a couple of copies on hand in the originating department. So that's 28 x 35 or 980

* The cynic will suggest that one should consider the time professors spend on proposals that go nowhere a social gain, since it keeps them away from more mischievous activities. I am not such a cynic.

sheets of paper for each proposal. Our Xerox costs are about 3.5 cents per sheet, so let's add \$35, which could include wastage and staples, and not charge any new labor for Xeroxing and collating. We can't overlook the postage, however, since bulk does get noticed in mail pouches; so there must be at least a \$5 charge for getting the proposal to Washington. Adding this subtotal of \$95 to the \$1,840, we get \$1,935.

One final cost item must be added. At I.U. each proposal has to be approved by the department head, division head, associate dean of education, a vice president for research and advanced studies, the graduate dean, and the treasurer's office. In our School of Education we had the full cooperation of an assistant dean for purposes of organizing the proposal in accordance with presumed understanding of the National Institute of Education's criteria for judging the proposals. Let us estimate that a minimum of eight hours of administrative time was invested in all of the advisement and approval processes. That's one day's work, so let's add another \$100. Grand total: \$2,035.

There were 6,000 proposals seeking the money offered by the National Institute of Education. At \$2,035 per proposal it means that the educational community invested \$12,210,000 in order to obtain \$7,500,000. Say that again! Yes, the educational community invested \$12,210,000 in the development of proposals to spend \$7,500,000.

So this is the new economics of grantsmanship. For some time now there has been a vague and general suspicion that getting grants may not be as profitable as in the past. Putting aside matters of principle, this analysis may illustrate the fact that there is a point below which it is not feasible for the research community to seek funds, and a given institution faced by 1 in 40 odds might decide wisely that it can't afford the costs of preparing proposals. It may even be that the educational research community should conclude that grantsmanship is a losing game and concentrate on its primary business, research.

In this instance Indiana University invested 27 x \$2,035 or \$54,945 in the hope that it would get more than its arithmetic share of the funds, 27/6000 of \$7,500,000, or \$33,750. It remains to be seen what sort of payoff I.U. does get, but if I.U. does well on its investment, it simply means that other institutions will do worse.

I didn't start this note with a broad policy issue in mind. Before it is overtaken by such considerations, let us leave well enough alone. Certainly there is much to think about here. Let's do that; think, that is.

POW'S IMPRESSION OF COMMUNISM

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, some of the most patriotic and loyal persons I have met were the wives and families of our POW's and MIA's. It was a special thrill for me to meet and talk with some of their returning servicemen. One wife we know and one husband we were pleased to talk with after his return was Comdr. and Mrs. Ted Kopfman of Lemoore Naval Air Station, Calif.

Commander Kopfman spoke to the Hanford, Calif., Kiwanis Club and shar-

ed some of his views concerning the danger of communism. I think the account of his speech in the Hanford Sentinel is worth reading by every American.

I include the report of Commander Kopfman's speech in the April 26, 1973, issue of the Hanford Sentinel at this point in the RECORD:

DANGERS OF COMMUNISM EXPRESSED BY KOPFMAN

(By Joan Pegues)

Comdr. Ted Kopfman, who was a prisoner of war for "seven years and four months," as he put it, reiterated his statements about the dangers of communism when he appeared before the Hanford Kiwanis Club Wednesday.

Appearing more relaxed than in an earlier, formal press conference at Lemoore Naval Air Station, the commander commented that his wife, Marge, had told him about her speech to the same club.

Mrs. Kopfman, who accompanied her husband, was one of the wives who participated in speaking engagements throughout the valley on behalf of the prisoners and missing in action.

Saying that he wasn't knowledgeable enough to form a thorough opinion about the war, the flyer did say he believed that if critics of the war really did understand the objectives of the communists, they would change their opinions.

"We are forced to read magazines, newspapers, and materials which made the North Vietnamese government look good," he explained, "in hopes of making us become sympathetic to their causes." "But we knew enough about our country and what it stood for, so their efforts had a reverse effect on us."

"They tried to take what we cherished and distort it," he noted and went on to give examples of typical communistic methods of propaganda.

"Catholics are free to practice their religion as long as it conforms to the policy of the state," he pointed out. "Freedom of the press is allowed to the extent that all members of the press are state trained and print no dissent. Songs can be written as long as they are patriotic ones," the speaker remarked.

Showing the degree to which the state controls the country, Kopfman said he recalled a line from a song the prisoners heard repeatedly and was taught to little children: "Love Ho Chi Minh better than mommie and daddy."

"I have just one request to make," Kopfman said. "We must make ourselves listen to what these people are really saying. Understanding is the key to dealing with their distortions."

Knocking some of the thunder out from under the anti-war critics, Kopfman pointed out that every man, woman, and child in North Vietnam is considered a member of the "fighting force." Women are equal to men, he noted, and man guns just as the men do.

"Women are equal to men when it comes to being killed too," the commander remarked and they brag about their roles as fighters. "Yet, let one of the women or children be killed, and suddenly they become 'an innocent victim,'" he said.

The people of North Vietnam are told that every abode in every hamlet is considered a fortress. The aviator said he has seen anti-aircraft guns standing between houses and missile sites located in school yards. "If we kill school children," he observed, "then we are criminals."

During a question and answer period, the speaker answered a query about anti-war activist Jane Fonda by saying that he felt she did not have an open mind. She had already made up her mind about conditions in North Vietnam, talked to very few prisoners of war,

and knew before hand just what she would say when she returned home.

"The communists have their objectives," Kopfman said in response to a question "I was told 'we will bury you.'" Explaining the scope of their objectives, the former prisoner said he was told "first South Vietnam, then Laos, then Thailand, the Philippines, then Japan and someday the United States."

"They used medical attention as a lever," the commander remarked. The situation went from non-existent medical attention during the early years to physicals and dental attention beginning last October. When asked if the lack of medical care could be attributed to a lack of doctors and nurses, Kopfman said he really didn't know. "According to their propaganda, they had a lot of medical personnel," he noted.

When asked how he kept going, Kopfman said he took one day at a time, and sometimes even one hour and one minute at a time. "I had faith that I was there for the right reasons, and I tried not to think of the future."

Kopfman began his talk by thanking the club for the cooperation and support they had given to the POWs. "You forced the issue from the dark closet where the communists wanted to keep it," he said.

Kopfman credits the attention focused on the prisoner of war issue through petitions and letter writing as directly attributable to their improved conditions. "Many would never have returned home," he said solemnly.

"Prior to late 1969, we lived in small cages with no ventilation and ate a very poor grade of rice and watery green soup," he recounted. After 1969, the prisoners were given improved food and better lodging.

When asked about the prisoners communication system, Kopfman responded by knocking on the table. "They built the walls higher, but they never stopped us," he said quietly. The commander pointed out that the communists used communications, the ability to talk to someone when you've been alone, as a method of control.

All communication between prisoners was forbidden, but "we'd help and encourage each other whenever we could," he remarked.

Asked if his experience had changed him, Kopfman said he felt he had changed a great deal. "It was the first time I'd ever been alone for such a great time, and I examined my life and every decision I had ever made," he said. "I feel I'm more compassionate and patient now, and I even allow my wife to be late," he said with a smile.

When asked about the changes he has noted, Kopfman replied that one of the biggest changes has been his wife, Marge. "I'm very proud of my wife and the change in her," he remarked. "I had been a rather dominating husband, but now I know it's not necessary, so I just sit back and relax," he said, drawing smiles from the audience.

"Tears," was the word the commander, used to describe his reunion with his wife and children. "Maybe I'm sentimental, but I don't worry about crying anymore," Kopfman said. "I never shed any tears in North Vietnam," he noted. "I didn't know the children, referring to the changes in them in seven years, and I missed a lot," he said.

At the end of the question and answer period, Mrs. Jeff Nicklas told Kopfman that what the prisoners gave to their country had made the country precious.

The ex-prisoner finished his comments to a standing ovation.

During a mini-program before the commander spoke, Jack Schwartz Jr., a senior at Hanford High School and a member of the Kings County WMCA's Youth in Government program, told club members about the youth group's four day trip to Sacramento. "Kings County had the third largest delegation there," he noted. "Not only did we learn the process of state government, we learned to listen to both sides of an issue."

THIS, TOO, IS FOR THE RECORD

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the foregoing title of this entry into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would seem to indicate that it might have been authored by a Member of Congress.

However, such is not the case. Instead, the above title is the heading of an article which appeared in the spring 1973 issue of the Freemason, which was dedicated to Harry S. Truman, past grand master, Grand Lodge of Missouri AF & AM 1940-41. The article, "This, Too, Is for the Record," appeared at page 55. The central theme of the story emphasizes that Harry S. Truman could easily have retired from participation in Masonic affairs at the conclusion of his term as grand master in 1941. The national spotlight was already centering on him as the head of the "Truman Committee." But Mr. Truman was a practicing Freemason. Accordingly, his interest and support remained constant.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that those of us who are Members of Congress are deeply indebted to the author of the article in the Missouri Freemason for his résumé of the activities of Past Grand Master Truman while he served as grand master in 1940 and 1941. Hopefully, some of this material may be included in a memorial volume now being prepared. It is my pleasure to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article as it appears on page 55 of the Freemason, spring issue 1973:

THIS, TOO, IS FOR THE RECORD

Harry S. Truman could easily have retired from active support and participation in Masonic affairs at the conclusion of his term as Grand Master on October 1, 1941. The national spotlight was centering on him more and more as the "Truman Committee" investigating waste and mismanagement in the war program gained for him unstinting praise and admiration by the populace.

But Truman was a practicing Freemason. His interest and support remained constant. The following is a brief list of some of his activities as a Past Grand Master.

December 1, 1941, delivered the dedication address for Masonic Welfare Center, first Masonic Center primarily for Navy personnel, at Newport, Rhode Island.

December 17, 1941, Truman wrote Ray Denslow: "I was supposed to go to a Masonic meeting last night where two gentlemen were made Masons at sight. I got to thinking about the matter and couldn't bring myself to go, because I don't approve of such a matter, however great the recipients. I suppose the high-hats here will be somewhat put out with me because they had consulted me about the qualifications of the two men. Their qualifications were one hundred per cent, but as you and I know, that just isn't the way to do it."

January 8, 1942, Truman responded to a West Coast publisher of a Masonic history and took exception to material on Andrew Jackson. Truman wrote: "I notice where you say that Andrew Jackson received his degrees at Greenville Lodge, Greenville, Tennessee in 1851. Andrew Jackson Grand Master of Tennessee long before that, and it is not known exactly where he received his degrees,

but it is recorded that he received them in North Carolina.

"He was born in 1767. You gave the date of his birth in 1808, and the place Raleigh, North Carolina. He was born in Wax Haws, and it is doubtful whether he was born north or south of the State line. There has always been a controversy between North and South Carolina about the location of the State line at the time of his birth. I don't know where you got those figures, but you certainly ought to make a correction on them.

"For your further information, if my dates are correct, Andrew Jackson died in 1845, so he couldn't possibly have received his degrees in 1851" (Truman Library, Senatorial file).

February 1942, attended Grand Masters Conference and George Washington Masonic Memorial Association meetings.

June 1942, addressed the Annual Convention of the National League of Masonic Clubs in Atlantic City. The Chairman, Arvid V. Swaningson, wrote that "To have had you present at the Gold Card Dinner was a pleasure, indeed, and your attendance at the Inspirational Hour on Friday evening was also a real mark of Masonry, and many of the Brothers there made mention of that fact."

September 28-29, 1942, attended Grand Lodge in St. Louis. Truman served in the traditional role of chairman of the Committee on the Grand Master's address. He also had secured the featured speaker for a Masonic patriotic meeting on Monday night before Grand Lodge, Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Commanding General Services of Supply.

Gov. Forrest C. Donnell, a Republican, was elected and installed as Grand Master at the conclusion of the communication, Donnell appointed Truman as a member of the special Committee on Social Service at the training camps.

October 5, 1942, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, Truman made the following remarks: "Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the (Congressional) Record a very timely address by Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Chief of the Services of Supply of the War Department. The address was delivered in St. Louis on September 28, at a patriotic meeting sponsored by the Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Missouri, and it is well worth reading by every Senator and Member of the House." The address was ordered to be printed.

Somervell's remarks included the following reference to Truman:

"You may not know it but the Senator has twice volunteered to don the uniform he wore with such distinction in the last war and is serving on the Capitol front only at the express request of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff who felt the need of his assistance there."

January 27, 1943, addressed Grand Lodge of Tennessee and made Honorary Past Grand Master.

September 27-28, 1943, attended Grand Lodge and again had secured the speaker for the Masonic Patriotic night on Monday before Grand Lodge. Truman introduced the speaker, Rear Admiral George D. Murray. Truman helped prepare and signed the report of the Committee on Social Service at the Training Camps.

Grand Master Donnell, at one point during the communication, said, "I think it would be very discourteous and not at all proper if I did not at this time call to the microphone a gentleman who has come from Washington, D.C., leaving his official duties, which means simply that he has to take care of them when he returns, as they have piled up, and he has come here to pay us a fraternal visit. I take great pleasure in presenting at this time our distinguished junior United States Senator from Missouri, former Grand Master of Masons of Missouri, Honorable Harry S. Truman."

Truman responded: "Most Worshipful Grand Master, Your Excellency: It certainly is a very, very great courtesy for you to invite me to the microphone. I am just an ordinary member of this Grand Lodge, and it is the greatest place in the world to come, I think. I do want to take this opportunity, Governor, to again thank you for delegating me last night to introduce the principal speaker . . . I appreciate most highly your courtesy, and while we differ politically, our friendship is just as strong as it ever was."

November 24, 1943, Truman attended Harmony Lodge No. 17 in the District of Columbia, which met that night to honor its own member, Grand Master Carl Claudy of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia and executive director of the Masonic Service Association.

April 19, 1944, Truman addressed the Grand Lodge of New Jersey. Sometime later he received a letter from Grand Secretary Isaac Cherry expressing the Grand Lodge's appreciation and enclosing a \$50 honorarium. Truman responded, "I did not expect any such donation, although I do appreciate it most highly. I am endorsing the check and returning it to you with the suggestion that it go into the Masonic Home charity fund."

September 25-26, 1944, attended Grand Lodge in Kansas City. Truman again had made arrangements for two of the speakers. A Masonic patriotic meeting was held Monday night in the Music Hall. The featured speaker, introduced by Truman, was Senator Owen Brewster of Maine. Tuesday evening in Ivanhoe Temple, there was a program of music, the motion picture produced for the Masonic Service Association, "Your Son Is My Brother," and Carl Claudy of the MSA delivered an address. Truman also served on the Committee on Social Service at the Training Camps.

At this time, Truman was the Democratic party's Vice Presidential candidate.

January 20, 1945, took the oath of office as Vice President of the United States.

April 12, 1945, less than four hours after the death of Brother and President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman took the oath of office as President.

On May 8, 1945, Victory in Europe! Within a few weeks, Carl Claudy of the Masonic Service Association visited with the President and called his attention to the need for providing assistance to Masonic brethren and Grand Lodges in Europe that had been overrun by the Axis powers. It was suggested that a Masonic Commission be sent to Europe to make a systematic, detailed study of the needs, Truman agreed to help.

The State Department was opposed to the Masonic Commission making the trip, suggesting to the President that it might unleash a flood of similar requests from other Masonic groups and other organizations.

In a White House memorandum Truman advised his Special Counsel, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman: "Mr. Grew (of the State Department) is very much mistaken about the Masonic program. The situation that I had in mind would take in every section of that fraternity, and would represent all of the Masonic bodies. Under no other condition would the matter be considered.

"I think it can be worked out on that basis, and I am of the opinion that it would be an asset both to the State Department and to me."

The four-man Masonic Commission, headed by Missouri Past Grand Master Ray V. Denslow, departed for Europe August 12, 1945. The other members of the Commission were Past Grand Masters Claude J. McAllister of Montana and Charles H. Johnson of New York, and W. Bro. Justice George E. Bushnell of Michigan.

The commission returned home September 29. The President had sent a cablegram to Denslow, returning aboard the Queen Mary, and asked that he come to the White House

immediately on his return. Denslow did and provided Truman with a concise summary of the commission's findings.

October 19, 1945, Frank Land, founder of the Order of DeMolay, met Truman at the White House and accompanied him to the Scottish Rite House of the Temple for a dinner. Following the banquet, the President received the Honorary 33 degree along with 349 other designates including Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold, Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, Lt. Gen. James P. Doolittle, and Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson.

December 26, 1945, Home for the Christmas holidays at the "little" White House in Independence, Truman walked across the street to the home of Nathaniel D. Jackson, a life-long friend, for breakfast and was installed as a member of Kansas City's Mary Conclave, Red Cross of Constantine. Others present were Harris C. Johnston, George C. Marquis, Milton F. Hill, Sam A. Gilliland, Perry N. Lindgren and George M. Saunders.

OTHERS ACTIVITIES

During his years in the White House, Past Grand Master Truman, with only one exception, returned home to install the officers of his home lodge.

The President also met annually except for 1948 with the Conference of Grand Masters of North America. In 1946, 1947 and 1949, Truman was host to the Grand Masters for a brief visit in the White House. In 1948 he was out of the city but sent a letter of greetings.

Beginning in 1950, Frank Land sponsored a Presidential breakfast for the Grand Masters and in 1950-51 and 1952, the Masonic dignitaries were not only greeted by Truman but he brought along members of his cabinet and Congress.

The Grand Masters were received in the East Room in 1947 at 12:30 p.m. and at 3:35 p.m. Frank Land, Ray V. Denslow and William R. Denslow were received for a private visit with the President.

Truman's remarks to the Grand Masters were broadcast nationwide on Feb. 22, 1952, and won a host of favorable comments. One letter came from a Roman Catholic Priest, Rev. Francis G. McNulty of Sacred Heart Church in Plains, Pa. Father McNulty wrote:

"Heartly congratulations on that homey, off-the-record speech which you made at the gathering of members of the Masonic Lodge at the Hotel Statler in Washington last Friday morning!

"... Your calm, sincere and friendly manner acted like a magnet to hold the attention of your listeners, and I am sure all who heard you could not help being convinced of the truth of your message."

November 6, 1947, President Truman visited Hiram Lodge No. 10 in Washington where he Raised two Fellowcrafts from Missouri lodges who were receiving "courtesy" work.

November 1, 1948, Truman attended a breakfast given by Mary Conclave, Red Cross of Constantine in Kansas City. Truman made a few remarks including the comment: "Boys, I'm not a betting man myself, but if any of you want to make a little easy money just bet on me to win tomorrow!"

Later that day Truman was honored by Ararat Shrine with a ceremonial named in his honor and a dinner that evening.

July 19, 1949, President Truman addressed the Imperial Council session of the Shrine at Soldier Field in Chicago. It was a major address in which Truman discussed past foreign policy decisions and discussed the future and prospects for "creation of a world in which we, and all people, can live and prosper in peace."

February 22, 1950, President Truman spoke at the dedication of the statue of George Washington in the entrance hall at the George Washington National Masonic Memorial in Alexandria. The statue was made possible through contributions from the

Order of DeMolay. It was another major Presidential speech and went through seven drafts before it was completed.

November 7, 1950, President Truman visited the Jackson County Library in Independence and viewed the special Masonic collection for the Missouri Lodge of Research.

STONES

During the restoration work on the White House workmen discovered a great many stones bearing the original Mason's mark. President Truman found there was a sufficient number so that one each could be properly prepared and presented to each Grand Lodge in the United States.

The stones were presented through the cooperation of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia, which Truman noted, "is Masonically supreme in the Capitol of the Nation." He further said in a letter to each Grand Lodge that "These evidences of the number of members of the Craft who built the President's official residence so intimately aligns Freemasonry with the formation and the founding of our government that I believe your Grand Lodge will cherish this link between the Fraternity and the Government of the Nation, of which the White House is a symbol."

NEED FOR A NEW STADIUM IN BALTIMORE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, professional sports franchises—their moves and threats of moves—can and have confronted many American cities with the need to make the difficult decision of whether to bow to franchise owners' demands for new stadiums, which represent major capital investments of public or private funds.

Right in our Nation's Capital, we have the expensive R.F.K. Stadium—now used for only 7 or 8 professional football games per year and infrequent special events. In Baltimore, the city and State have been evaluating the need for a new stadium and have proposed to locate it in the former Camden railroad yards. There is a great deal of controversy about the proposed new stadium and the suggested location.

I would like to share with you the thoughtful remarks of Mr. Theo Lippman, Jr., in the June 3 Sunday Sun. His comments are relevant to the situations in which many cities may find themselves:

WHY THE CAMDEN STADIUM WON'T BE BUILT, DESPITE ALL THE HOOPLA
(By Theo Lippman, Jr.)

Tuesday—on the eve of the announcement of the Maryland Sports Complex Authority's proposal that a stadium-garage-convention center be built downtown, William Boucher 3d, an authority member, told some businessmen that opponents who argued to keep Memorial Stadium weren't Memorial Stadium fans. They were racially motivated, he said. They were afraid that if the old stadium is replaced, it might be by black housing. There no doubt may be something to that insofar as white residents of stadium-area neighborhoods are concerned, but as Mr. Boucher and other authority members know, nobody's motives can stand too close examination in this stadium story.

Mr. Boucher's own motives seem to be: He wants to see increased commerce downtown. He believes that putting a stadium at Camden Yards will attract people not only to the games but to the restaurants, stores, etc., surrounding it.

Another authority member, Walter Sondheim, apparently is motivated by the desire for 4,500 parking spaces downtown—and the belief that the quickest way to get them is as part of a stadium-convention center project.

Another member, Ed Rovner and the governor he represents, may be more interested in seeing a multimillion-dollar construction project built than in anything else. Several politicians and journalists have suggested that this project is Governor Mandell's way of keeping the building trades and bond underwriters happy.

There is no suggestion here or elsewhere that these are unworthy motives. I think these motives are nobler ones than the legally sanctioned stated motive, which is to keep the Colts and Orioles in the city at all cost. But I also think that in part because of these mixed motives, in part because of opposition by groups like the neighbors of Memorial Stadium, in part because of the nature of the professional sports business, this planned downtown stadium will never be built. I also believe that in a sense that doesn't make any difference, since even if a stadium were built, that alone wouldn't keep the Colts and Orioles in town. Finally, I believe that there is a cheaper, wiser thing the state and city could do to keep Baltimore a major league sports city.

There was strong opposition to building the stadium complex when the idea first came before the General Assembly last year. At that time most of the proposal's boosters insisted that no public funds would have to be spent. The Governor said that if that were false, he wouldn't support the idea. Now the authority's report concedes that the only way the complex can be built is if the state guarantees the bonds. That means that if in any year the revenue from the complex (ticket sales, parking, etc.) is less than the cost of the debt service and management, taxpayers must make up the difference.

Some authority members say that it is unlikely the complex would fail to pay its own way in any year, but that has not been the experience in any city that I know of. So opponents of the complex are going to be able to argue in the General Assembly next year, when authorization to proceed with the complex must be secured, that taxpayers are being asked to subsidize two profitable private enterprises to keep them in Baltimore. Some Baltimore area legislators are opposed to that. It was Baltimore county's Jervis Finney who almost killed the project at the last session of the legislature. Frank Robey of Baltimore city has already announced he plans to make opposition to the complex a priority fight next year.

You can imagine how cool state representatives and senators from far outside Baltimore's orbit will react to the prospect of spending their constituents' money for this project. Suppose you were a Montgomery county resident, a Redskins fan, would you think it in your best interest to subsidize the Colts? The complex will also have a basketball arena. Suppose you were a resident of Largo, where the Bullets have moved, would you think it was in your best interest to subsidize a new basketball team for Baltimore? Even if financing the complex would never cost the taxpayers a penny, but only posed the potentiality, this is the kind of issue that can be set fire to.

The Governor has apparently told opponents that if they will support it, he will see that they get other projects as a payoff, a road here, a building there, an appointment the other place. That's routine in a democratic society. Still, I would guess there

is no better than a 50-50 chance that the General Assembly will approve issuing state-backed bonds. If the complex does receive the Assembly's blessing, however, that won't be the end of the fight. Mr. Robey has already announced he will try to take the issue to referendum. That means Redskins fans in Montgomery county, Bullet fans in Prince Georges, apprehensive home owners around Memorial Stadium, nonsports fans in Baltimore's suburbs, etc., will decide the issue. The Governor can log roll with delegates and senators, but not with voters.

If the proposal to use the state's credit and, perhaps, tax dollar to pay for the complex survives the General Assembly and the referendum, it still won't be home free. There are the courts. Some issues involving the new stadium complex pose interesting opportunities for environmental groups, especially. For instance, Baltimore's air is already so bad that plans for greatly increased parking facilities would probably be challenged under existing air quality laws. Laws pending in Congress could make it even more difficult for the city to do anything to increase automotive traffic downtown. Even more promising to the environmentalists who oppose the stadium is the question of doming it. If that is done, and the Orioles keep insisting that it be done, then the power requirements for air conditioning such as expanse would be enormous.

Environmental issues aren't the only ones that invite court action. James B. Kraft, one of the Memorial Stadium area opponents of a new complex, said last week that he foresaw a protracted conflict in the courts. He compared it to the east-west expressway fight. That has taken 20 years. If the city waits a fourth that long to begin building a stadium, and if the Colts and Orioles are really serious about moving, then both teams will probably have been long gone by then.

I believe that even if the new stadium could be built as quickly as authority members think, which is by 1976, and even if the Colts and Orioles stay here that long, they might very well be moving out of the new stadium within a few years. If that should happen, then taxpayers would be left holding an expensive bag, perhaps to the tune of \$3 or \$6 million a year. Perhaps more. (One way of reckoning suggests that the stadium cost would be that high even if the teams stay. This is based on the assumption that parking revenue not directly related to stadium events can not properly be counted as revenue generated by the sports complex.)

The reason I believe the new stadium won't necessarily keep the two teams in town is that the experience in other cities that have built new stadiums shows that after only a few years, attendance for games in new stadiums is back where it was in the old stadium. The novelty of a new stadium brings in new fans at first, but only at first. The feasibility study of a Camden Yards stadium comes to the same conclusion about a new stadium here. If the stadium were built by 1975, the economists who prepared the study said, by the 1980's attendance would be back at—or below—the level the two teams have enjoyed in the recent past. This is significant, because the reason the Colt and Oriole management give for demanding a new stadium is that they must have greater attendance to make the profits to which they have become accustomed.

AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS

Are pro sports franchises important? Are they worth keeping? Almost every study of those questions has resulted in affirmative answers. Some answers are based on economics. Having a team attracts people with money to spend. Some answers are based on more exotic reasoning: Atlanta's major league teams have softened rural political opposition to urban voters, according to Governor Jimmy Carter. So far as I know no one has ever argued that having a team or teams

had a negative impact. My own view is that keeping major league franchises is important for many reasons, the most important being that rooting for the home team is the one single experience that can be shared democratically. The Colts and Orioles bring us together.

That being the case, it is important not to lose them. That is a problem in this age of floating franchises. There is a limited number of teams available and a slightly larger market for teams. As in any such situation, the competition for the franchises drives the price out of sight. As an added inducement, tax laws make "owning" players an attractive gimmick for corporations. You can depreciate them, in effect. Team owners can blackmail cities to give them anything, and even having won concessions, still get more from some have-not city. It is probably true that nothing Maryland can do will keep, say, New Orleans from offering the Orioles a better deal.

Nothing conventional, that is. I believe the time has come for the unconventional. Last year Senator Sam Ervin (D., N.C.) was considering proposing that the federal government establish a commission to oversee pro sports. The commission would have the same power over teams as existing commissions have over airplanes, trains and so forth. A team couldn't move from one city to the other without federal approval, just as a common carrier can't cease service without showing good reasons and winning approval. That seems fair. Team owners are always telling us they are public-spirited citizens. They're always telling us that a team isn't really a business.

BIGGER FISH

The problem is, Senator Ervin now has bigger fish to fry, the Watergate investigation, and has lost interest. He may never get back to it. Instead of waiting for the federal government, it might be possible for the state to act on its own to protect the public interest (and investment, to the tune of millions in subsidies over the past two decades) in the Colts and Orioles. I would like to see the state take over the two teams, the way it took over the Baltimore Transit Company, and operate them in the public interest, the way the city operates the Baltimore Museum of Art or the Pratt Library. The legislation establishing the authority authorizes it to "acquire and/or construct athletic facilities and other revenue-producing facilities." "Facilities" is defined to mean "commercial or business establishments," which include, I would have thought, sports teams. Robert Embry of the authority, who is a lawyer, says no, but in that case, it would seem to me that what should be done is for the General Assembly to rework that language to allow condemnation (a power the authority definitely has) and purchase of the Colts and Orioles. That would keep them here forever. It would cost a lot less than building a new stadium, too, about \$30 million compared to a stadium complex cost of \$114 million.

GENERAL MINH ASKS FREEDOM FOR SOUTH VIETNAMESE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out against the police state imposed by South Vietnam's President Thieu many times. His continued incarceration of over 200,000 men, women, and children for political reasons is

a glaring mockery of the oft repeated goals of our involvement in Vietnam, namely to insure the people of Vietnam political freedom.

Yet our Government makes no effort to demand a change from Mr. Thieu. Instead our President mumbles platitudes about South Vietnam's great leader, and turns his head from the oppressive truth.

Unfortunately, the truth remains. I call to our colleagues' attention an article in the June 5 edition of the Washington Post. I would like to read the relevant portion:

MINH CALLS FOR END TO RESTRAINTS

SAIGON, June 4.—Former chief of state Duong Van (Big) Minh urged the Thieu government today to repeal laws aimed at "intimidating and restraining" the non-Communist opposition. He also called for the immediate release by both Saigon and the Vietcong of all political prisoners.

Minh, one of the leaders of the junta that took power after the killing of President Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963, said that the people of South Vietnam are setting their hopes on secret talks between U.S. presidential adviser Henry A. Kissinger and Hanoi's Le Duc Tho which began Wednesday in Paris.

But Minh said that even if these talks are successful, "the correct implementation of the Paris agreement, in practice, depends nevertheless on the goodwill of the two opposing sides of South Vietnam."

Minh, who reportedly is hoping to make a political comeback, said: "If the two sides of South Vietnam wish to see the people begin to acknowledge their goodwill, they must take the following steps immediately:

"Abolish all laws and measures infringing the basic freedoms of man . . .

"Set free immediately the political prisoners, especially university and high school students and those who have struggled for democracy, for peace, so that they may return early to their families without being forced to go where they do not wish to go."

Minh's statement on political prisoners drew a denial from a Saigon government official that there are any political prisoners, but at the same time the official acknowledged that individual liberties have been restricted.

In defending this, the Saigon official said that despite the four-month old cease-fire, "the country of Vietnam is now in a war status."

"Therefore, fundamental liberties must be limited. As soon as the Communists stop violating the agreement, as soon as there are no longer any threats to the nation resulting from the other side's violations . . . the government will immediately delete laws and regulations that are now limiting the people's fundamental liberties."

Mr. Nixon has told us we have peace with honor, yet South Vietnam's Government says it is in a war status. Who is lying to whom?

As I did on June 1, I would like to read the names of another 25 prisoners, imprisoned in Chi Hoa Prison for political reasons, Nguyen Van Be, Le Van Minh, Tran Kim An, Thach Soul, Le Van Thanh, Nguyen Huu Duc, Ngo Quang, Duong Van Sau, Nguyen Van Son, Nguyen Van An, Tang Van Thien, Le Bui, Tran Van Hang, Ngo Du, Truong Hoac, Le Tro, Truong Xin, Trinh Van Toan, Dang Van Ty, Huynh Van Thanh, Huynh Tan Duong, Trang Van To, Ho Ngoc Chi, Nguyen Van Minh, Duong Van Sat.

It is our money that is keeping these people in prison. We must not run away

from the responsibility that this puts upon us. We must demand the end of this repression.

BUT IT'S ONLY 1973, MR. ORWELL!

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the main techniques upon which President Nixon has depended during his administration has been the about-face. Rather than maintaining a coordinated, progressive, and logical method of operation, Mr. Nixon has relied on the element of surprise to help him carry out his programs, both foreign and domestic. His trips to Peking and Moscow, in the context of his political career as a red baiter, demonstrated what has become his standard operating procedure in foreign policy. And in domestic affairs, one need only remember his creation of the wage-price freeze only 5 months after he had requested the Congress not to renew the law which empowered the President to institute such a freeze. In virtually every policy area, from the war in Southeast Asia to Supreme Court appointments, surprise has been the key to presidential actions under this administration.

As the Watergate scandal has unfolded, we have seen Mr. Nixon continuing to rely on the element of surprise. His March 17 announcement of—and I quote —“new evidence” in the Watergate case was a reversal of his previously adamant denials of White House involvement, while the April 30 resignations of four key members of his staff completely changed the direction which the Watergate case took.

In the future we can expect more surprise announcements from the President. In this expectation, Philip Roth has written an article which appeared in the New York Review of Books dated June 14 which speculates on the nature of one such possible upcoming surprise. Mr. Roth's article is written in the form of an imaginary presidential announcement which we might expect in the future. The text follows:

THE PRESIDENT ADDRESSES THE NATION

(By Philip Roth)

My fellow Americans:

I have an announcement to make to you tonight of the greatest national importance. As you know, the Senate has voted this afternoon to remove me from the Office of the Presidency. That, of course, is their right under the Constitution of the United States of America, and as you know, I have not interfered in any way with their deliberations on this matter, as I did not interfere some weeks ago when the House of Representatives arrived at their decision after their own deliberations. They have a right to express their opinion, as does any American, without Presidential interference or pressure of any kind from the Executive branch. That is what is known as the separation of powers. You probably know by now that there were even members of my own political party among those in the Legislative branch who voted to remove me from the Presidency. I

consider that to be a vigorous and reassuring sign of their independence of mind, and of their personal integrity. I applaud them for their actions, which can only strengthen the democratic processes here at home, and enhance the image of American democracy abroad.

However, according to the doctrine of the separation of powers, the Executive branch has an equal voice in the management of government, along with the Legislative and the Judicial branches. That, after all, is only fair. It is what is meant by “The American Way.” Moreover, the President, which I am, has the sole responsibility for safeguarding the security of the nation. That responsibility is spelled out in the oath of office, which, as you all know, every President takes on Inauguration Day. President Washington, whose picture you see here, took that oath. So did President Lincoln, pictured here. And so did our great President Dwight David Eisenhower, whose grandson has just completed serving his country in the United States Navy and is married to my daughter Julie, whom you see pictured here. My other daughter, Tricia, is pictured here in her wedding dress. And of course standing beside Tricia is my wife Pat. My fellow Americans, I owe it not only to these great American Presidents who preceded me in this high office, but to my family, and to you and your families, to respect and honor that oath to which I swore on the Holy Bible on my Inauguration Day. To speak personally, I just couldn't live with myself if I went ahead and shirked my duty to safeguard the security of the nation.

And that is why I have decided tonight to remain in this Office. My fellow Americans, though I respect the sincerity and the integrity of those Senators who voted earlier in the day for my removal, I find, after careful study and grave reflection, that to accept their decision would be to betray the trust placed in me by the American people, and to endanger the security and the well-being of this nation.

As you all know, there has never been an American President yet who has stepped down in the middle of his term of office because of Congressional pressure of any kind. That is something for which there is just no precedent in American history—and, let me tell you, straight from the shoulder. I don't intend to break the record my predecessors have established of standing up under fire.

You know, no one, I don't care which party he belongs to, expects this Office to be a bed of roses. If he does he shouldn't run for the Presidency to begin with. As the late President Truman put it—and you remember, Harry Truman didn't always see eye to eye on everything with us Republicans—“If you can't take the heat, you shouldn't be in the kitchen.” Well, I happen to pride myself on the amount of heat I've taken over the years—some of it, as you older folks may remember, in a kitchen in the Soviet Union with Premier Khrushchev. But in the name of the American people, I stood up to Premier Khrushchev in that kitchen; and in the name of the American people, I am standing up to the Congress tonight.

Richard Nixon is not going to be the first President in American history to be removed from office by the Legislative branch. I am sure that is not the kind of President that the American people elected me to be. Frankly, if I were to give in to this Congressional pressure to remove me from Office, if I were to come on television tonight to tell you, yes, President Nixon is quitting because he can't take the heat, well, that to my mind would constitute a direct violation of my oath of office, and I would in fact voluntarily step down from the Presidency, out of a sense of having profoundly failed you, the American people, whose decision it was to place me in office in the first place.

My fellow Americans, during my years as President, I have as you know devoted myself to one goal above and beyond all others: the goal of world peace. As I talk to you here tonight, negotiations and discussions are being conducted around the globe by Dr. Kissinger, Secretary Rogers, and key members of the Department of State to bring peace with honor to America, and to all of mankind. These negotiations are taking place at the highest diplomatic level and necessarily in secret—but I am pleased to report to you tonight that we are pursuing them with every hope of success.

Now I am sure that no one in Congress would willingly or knowingly want to endanger the chances of world peace, for us, for our children, and for generations to come. And yet, by calling upon the President to pack up and quit just because the going is a little rough, that is precisely what they are doing. And that is precisely why I will not quit. I happen to care more about world peace now and for generations to come than about making myself popular with a few of my critics in the Congress. Oh, I am sure that the easier choice would be to retire to San Clemente and bask there in the honors and tributes that we Americans lavish upon our former Presidents. But I prefer to take the hard road, the high road, if that is the road that leads to the end of warfare and to world peace for our children and our children's children. My fellow Americans, I was raised to be a Quaker, not a quitter.

Now I have to say some things to you that you may not care to hear, especially those of you who try to think the best of our country, as I do myself. But tonight I must speak the truth, unpleasant as it may be; you deserve no less. My fellow Americans, I understand there are going to be those in Congress who will not respect the decision I have announced here tonight, as I respected theirs, arrived at earlier in the day. We have reason to believe that there are those who are going to try to make political capital out of what I have said to you tonight from the bottom of my heart. There are even going to be some who will use my words to attempt to create a national crisis in order to reap political gain for themselves or their party. And, most dangerous of all, there are some elements in the country, given to violence and lawlessness as a way of life, who may attempt to use force to remove me from Office.

Let me quickly reassure you that this administration will not tolerate lawlessness of any kind. This administration will not permit the time-honored constitutional principle of the separation of powers to be subverted by a disgruntled, ambitious, or radical minority. This administration intends to maintain and defend that great American tradition that has come down to us unbroken from the days of the Founding Fathers—the great tradition of a President of the United States, duly elected by the people of the United States, serving out his term in office without violent interference by those who disagree with his policies. Disagreement and dissent are, of course, in the great tradition of a democracy like our own; but the violent overthrow of the elected government is something that is repugnant to me, as it is to every American, and so long as I am President, I promise you that I will deal promptly and efficiently with those who advocate or engage in violence as a means of bringing about political change.

In order to discourage those who would resort to violence of any kind, in order to maintain law and order in the nation and to safeguard the welfare and well-being of law-abiding American citizens, I have tonight, in my constitutional role as Commander-in-Chief, ordered the Joint Chiefs of Staff to place the Armed Forces on a stand-by alert around the nation. The Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau

of Investigation have also been advised to take all necessary steps to ensure domestic tranquility. The National Guard has already been notified and throughout the fifty states units are being mobilized for duty. Furthermore, state and local police have been encouraged to request whatever assistance they may require, in the way of personnel or equipment, in order to maintain law and order in your communities.

My fellow Americans, I swore upon taking this office to safeguard this nation and its citizens, and I intend to stand on my word. No one—and that includes Congressmen and Senators, just as it does the armed revolutionary—is going to tell the American people that they cannot have sitting in the White House the President they have chosen in a free and open election. And I don't care whether that President happens to be myself, President Washington, President Lincoln, or President Eisenhower. I give you every assurance tonight that the President you, the American people, elected for a second four-year term will not permit the votes you cast so overwhelmingly in his favor to have been cast in vain.

God bless each and every one of you.
Good night.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate that Mr. Roth's article is a purely fictional and speculative piece of work. This presidential address has not actually been delivered by Mr. Nixon—yet.

CONGRESSMAN PICKLE CLARIFIES IMPOUNDMENT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Congressman J. J. PICKLE, of Texas, wrote a very informative and helpful article which appeared in the Sunday New York Times, June 10, 1973.

In the article, Congressman PICKLE strips away much of the myth and distortion which is surrounding the impoundment controversy. The article provides the reader with a clear cut and balanced review of the legislative history of impoundment.

I commend this excellent and brief discussion to my colleagues:

MYTH AND DISTORTIONS

(By J. J. PICKLE)

WASHINGTON.—During recent debate over Presidential authority to impound funds, constant repetition has almost made fact of the myth that our third President began the practice long ago. The charge is that President Jefferson refused to build fifteen gunboats to patrol the Mississippi River.

A portion, however, of his fourth annual message to the Congress (Nov. 8, 1804) reads: "The act of Congress of February 28th, 1803, for building and employing a number of gunboats, is now in a course of execution to the extent there provided for."

Similarly, research proves the undoing of nearly all the impoundment precedents paraded about these days.

In his comments (Op-Ed page May 25), Senator Hugh Scott proposed a case for impoundment which he purported to base on historical precedent, including the Jefferson incident, on constitutional and legislative authority, on common sense and on judicial

ruling, or the lack of it, in this field. I believe a closer reading of the history books and the facts of the matter show none of his assertions provide the carte blanche authority for impounding of funds which the present Administration assumes.

When one reads beyond President Jefferson's 1803 message—he said he was deferring funds for building fifteen gunboats—and proceeds to his 1804 message, one finds that *defer* the money—not impound it—was precisely what he did.

A further reading into the history of the period sheds more light on the situation. Building the gunboats was Jefferson's idea in the first place—he preferred them to expensive forts and ships of war to defend our coastal cities. And he originally proposed to build 250 such gunboats. But the first ones built proved unwieldy, and changes in the international situation brought about by the purchase of the Louisiana territory gave the frugal Jefferson time to wait until more usable gunboats could be designed.

What is really important in the Jefferson gunboat incident is that he obviously felt a strong duty to inform the Congress when and why he was deferring the money and to inform the Congress again in 1804 that he had carried out its law.

Between President Jefferson and the twentieth century, only one other so-called impoundment precedent has been found—that of President Grant withholding some river and harbor funds Aug. 14, 1876. This case is most notable for its isolation. Most impoundments were so isolated and so sporadic as to weigh very little in the history of Federal spending.

Senator Scott is correct that the original theory of impoundment was rooted in common sense. If a project or program can be executed for less than the amount Congress appropriated, then no legislator, no citizen, no President would want to spend that extra money.

In 1941, President Roosevelt announced that because of the war emergency he was not going to allocate funds for any water resource project that did not have an important national defense value. In this the only case of massive impoundments until the present times, Congressional outcry was massive and bitter.

Concern by both the executive and legislative branches over the legality of wartime impoundments under President resulted in the Hoover Commission of 1949 and a recommendation that further legislation be enacted to grant the President authority "to reduce expenditures under appropriations, if the purposes intended by the Congress are carried out." Again it was emphasized the President was to have authority to save money if and only if he were still carrying out the mandates of the Congress.

The Hoover Commission report resulted in the 1951 amendments to the Anti-Deficiency Act. The language of the amendments was vague and easily stretched to read as control of the rate or tempo of program implementation. And it is only one step from controlling the rate of program implementation to controlling the achievement of the program at all, which is where we stand today.

The Administration seems to assume when the word "management" was added to the budget office this gave them clear authority to manage Federal funding even if it meant ignoring Congressional directions. A simple reading of the reorganization act and Executive order setting up the new Office of Management and Budget shows there is no such authority included there.

We have today the choice, as we did in 1951, of enacting new legislation. In that legislation we can legalize the new form of policy impoundments we see today or we can put the impoundment authority back into a historical perspective, with the Congress clearly in charge.

The decision which path we take is in the hands of the Congress and the courts.

IN DEFENSE OF THE METRIC SYSTEM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is presently considering legislation that would convert the United States to metric measurements under a nationally coordinated plan. Metric legislation has on many previous occasions been before the Congress, but never under such compelling conditions as presently exist. For the number of nations using the metric system has increased so rapidly in recent years that the United States is the sole remaining industrial nation that is not yet metric.

The following article appearing in the Sunday Star-News, written by staff writer John Holusha, is a very informative rebuttal to certain arguments advanced against metric, and I recommend this interesting article to my colleagues:

IN DEFENSE OF THE METRIC SYSTEM

(By John Holusha)

File on the metric system said J. W. Batchelder in these pages two weeks ago. The United States needs to give up its historic measuring units of pounds, feet, ounces, etc. for the metric one of meters, grams and liters as much as it needs a furlong-sized hole in its collective head.

Batchelder, we learn from the footnote of the piece is the head of an engineering establishment in Chester Depot, Vermont.

One of our natural resources has always been flinty New Englanders who puncture holes in myths, scoff at popular passions, disdain platform shoes and get right down to brass tacks.

Fortunately, we've never taken them too seriously. Otherwise we'd all still be trying to scratch a living out of rocky Vermont hillsides instead of spreading out to the breadbaskets of the Midwest and the fruit bowls of the far west and south.

Batchelder's arguments have a certain quaint charm—like roadside antique shops—but I submit they have little importance in the overall economic and technological order of things.

He feels that we should stick with the results of hundreds of years of evolution in measuring. The importunings of countless learned commissions and the apparent current mood of Congress to join the rest of the world he dismisses as "misconceptions, illusions, biased half-truths and even lies . . ."

So what if we lost some \$600 million in foreign trade last year because our products were the square peg in the worldwide round hole? So what if almost the entire planet has converted to the simple system based on 10?

Batchelder's is an attitude the United States of a generation ago could comfortably indulge itself with. In those days the rest of the world was just recovering from a devastating war or fighting for independence. Our technological and economic strength was overwhelming.

But recent experience has shown the world is catching up. U.S. companies battle to keep even a part of the consumer electronics market. Our steelmakers import technology. We fight for the cheap bottom end of the photography line.

The change shows most dramatically at the supermarket checkout stand. Our food prices have gone up because the rest of the world is now affluent enough to bid for our food supplies. The message is that we must compete in the marketplace with the rest of the world as a strong, but no longer dominant, producer.

And it is hard to sell a machine designed in feet and inches in a country thinking in centimeters and millimeters.

Batchelder tells us our present units of measurement are the essence of convenience because they are honed by centuries of use. The inch, foot, mile, pound and so forth closely correspond to the size of things in everyday use, he says, even if tradition has them conforming to the size of some monarch's thumb or foot. The result, he says, is to reduce the number of digits needed to express a given dimension.

He says the meter (about a yard) is too long to use as conveniently as the foot and the liter (about a quart) too small to be as useful as a gallon.

To the extent we're familiar with the foot and the gallon, perhaps. Change is always a wrench. But what happens when we go either up or down the scale of magnitude? Oilmen found the gallon too small for their use and adopted the obscure barrel (42 gallons). What is the inherent advantage over hecto liters (about 25 gallons)?

Barrels themselves are a good illustration of the confusion inherent in our present system. Every trade which uses them, uses a different size. The beer barrel, for example, is about 31½ gallons.

What about the mile. What is sacred or even logical about the 5,280-foot mile? Even an uninitiated mind can grasp the relationship between the meter and kilometer. One is just 1,000 times longer.

Europeans have been doing just fine with meters and kilometers, grams and kilograms for generations. I doubt Batchelder would be willing to concede that the average European is any smarter than the average American.

Going the other way: The ounce (avdp.) is the smallest commonly used measure of weight in the English system which even the English are abandoning. Anyone working with small quantities is either forced to work with clumsy fractions of the ounce or convert, as all drug manufacturers have done, to expressing their weights in milligrams (one-thousandth of a gram.)

Batchelder mentions the erg, the basic metric unit of energy. He points out that a 100-watt light bulb burning for an hour uses 36,000,000,000,000 ergs of energy. To be sure, a bit unwieldy. But the modern metric system has a handy substitute, the Joule. The same bulb would burn 360,000 joules.

Of if we are determined to stay with ergs, which the modern metric system eliminates, why not 3.6×10 to the 11th power. Since we are working with a system based on 10, everything can be expressed by exponential notation.

To put it in words, one Angstrom unit (used to measure wavelengths of light) equals one-hundred millionth of a meter. Try that with feet, inches and miles.

Totally untouched by Batchelder are the inconsistencies and duplications of the present system that drive engineering students to drink and cooks to distraction. Why, for example, do ounces have to represent both weight and volume. Thirty-two to a quart, 16 to a pound, what do they have in common but the name?

Similarly, pounds. Why must the same name be used for both weight and force except to confuse?

Let us not abandon our heritage, Batchelder says. "Our old system is well adapted to our needs like an old shoe. It grew to fit our requirements like bark fits trees."

Yet anyone reading newspapers knows

imported shoes are driving the domestic industry to extinction and that the Japanese are using transistor radio and small car money to buy up our forests for their housing boom.

We'd better get rid of our buggy whip measuring system before the rest of the world get a 10 kilometer head start on us.

THE MENACE OF SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIALS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the continued manufacture and distribution of handguns, including cheap small-caliber pistols, commonly called "Saturday night specials," constitutes a pressing danger in our country. Especially in large urban areas, the easy availability of these weapons has given a strong impetus to crimes of personal violence, particularly murder, robbery, assault and battery, and rape.

I have introduced legislation which would ban the importation, manufacture, distribution, and possession of all handguns, except those used by the Armed Forces, law enforcement personnel, and members of pistol clubs. All too often, the only use of pistols in American society is in the commission of crime. Their elimination would deprive street criminals and hoodlums of a weapon which has caused innumerable tragedies across the country.

Now, the "Saturday night special" problem has begun to spread from the Nation's streets into the Nation's schools and classrooms, as students begin packing pistols instead of notebooks in increasing numbers. The proliferation and accessibility of cheap pistols is disrupting the learning process and making schools increasingly unsafe for serious students, teachers, and administrators. One essential step to help remedy this appalling situation is to legislate a nationwide ban on handguns.

The growth in the problem of pistols in our schools was underscored by an article which recently appeared in the New York Post, entitled, "Gun-Toting High School Pupils on the Rise." The report gives an indication of the magnitude of the menace nationwide, and I request that the article be reprinted in the Record.

GUN-TOTING HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS ON THE RISE

(By Terry Ryan)

Public school officials in cities across the country report a surge in case of pupils carrying and using guns in classrooms, corridors and school yards during the past year.

Most incidents occur at inner city high schools. The weapons are usually cheap, small caliber hand guns, the so-called "Saturday night specials." Officials relate the increase to the revival of juvenile gangs in some cities and the persistence of racial tension.

An Associated Press survey around the country indicated the scope of the problem:

There have been 60 gun episodes in Los Angeles schools since September. Shots from

a passing car killed a 16-year-old pupil near Locke High School. The car sped into the school parking lot and three pupils were later arrested.

Fifteen handguns were confiscated last year in Atlanta schools. A 12-year-old boy, angered when schoolmates chided him for disobeying a traffic signal, got a pistol from home and opened fire on the school playground. He hit no one.

Four high school pupils, three of them girls, were expelled this month in San Francisco for carrying guns.

School officials in Topeka, Kan., took a gun from a girl who said she needed it for protection.

There were 15 school gun cases in Detroit and four in Seattle during the last year. Since September, 15 incidents were reported in New York and 16 in Kansas City.

"We have a problem and it is increasing," said Everett Copeland, security manager for Kansas City schools. "Kids carry guns for different reasons. Some say they have been threatened. Some involve extortion attempts. Some kids just say it's a status symbol."

NATIONAL STATISTICS

The problem has escalated so rapidly that national statistics are lacking. A few schools now keep records on gun incidents, but comparative figures from past years do not exist. The International Assn. of School Security Directors last year began pushing for uniform reporting procedures that would include such figures.

"There is no question about the increase," said James Kelly, who directs school security seminars for the International Assn. of Chiefs of Police. "There are thousands of cheap guns on the streets. The kids pick them up with ease. These kids have definitely moved out of the zip gun stage."

JAMES R. SCHLESINGER

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, some interesting sidelights on the new Secretary of Defense were noted by Ed Prina, editor emeritus of Sea Power magazine, in the June issue of that publication. Prina's comments on Secretary Designate Schlesinger follow:

THE AMCHITKA BIRDWATCHER

When Pulitzer Prize-winning cartoonist Herblock omitted the Pentagon in his cartoon pointing out the centers of governmental power which had been inundated by Watergate, the inhabitants of that gigantic five-sided structure across the Potomac from Washington were rather self-satisfied about it.

Nevertheless, Watergate has cost them a new and promising Secretary of Defense.

President Nixon has called upon Elliot L. Richardson, one of his most trusted trouble-shooters, to become Attorney General and has nominated James R. Schlesinger to succeed him as boss of the military establishment.

If, as assumed, Schlesinger is approved by the Senate, he will be the third Secretary of Defense in approximately four months. Richardson succeeded Melvin R. Laird January 30.

Who is Schlesinger? Well, he is a 44-year-old Harvard-educated economist and a New York native who brings unusually wide range of pertinent expertise and experience to the position.

As this is being written he is still serving as head of the Central Intelligence Agency,

having taken over that sensitive post in February. Before that he was chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. In each assignment he had close contacts with the U.S. military establishment.

TOUGH AND BRIGHT

But that's just part of the story. He joined the Nixon Administration in 1969 as a top official of the Bureau of the Budget and, when that agency was absorbed into the new Office of Management and Budget, he became an assistant director of OMB. In the latter post, he rode herd on the Pentagon's budget.

For the six years prior to his arrival in Washington, Schlesinger, a slim six-footer who is regarded as "a very bright and very tough" administrator by Washington observers, worked for the Rand Corporation, a California-based think tank that once employed Daniel Ellsberg.

Schlesinger was a senior staff member and director of strategic studies at Rand from 1963 to 1969 and, at one point, served as project leader of a study for the U.S. government on nuclear proliferation.

Rand contributed a number of systems analysis "Whiz Kids" to the Defense Department in the era of Secretary Robert S. McNamara (1961-68). In those days the systems analyst was treated as a member of an elite corps, although a substantial number of their critics charged they exerted a lopsided influence on major decisions to the detriment of the military input.

When Laird became Defense Secretary in 1969, he began to reduce the role of the Whiz Kids, preferring to use systems analysis as a management tool rather than as a policy-making exercise.

A SYSTEMS ANALYST

Not long after Richardson took office, he downgraded systems analysis even further. He abolished the post of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Systems Analysis) and created the lesser office of Defense Program Analysis and Evaluation.

Now comes Schlesinger, something of a systems analyst himself, as top dog at the Pentagon. Will the S/A make a comeback? Perhaps. No one, however, is yet predicting a return to the salad days of the Whiz Kids.

In 1960, when the pipe-smoking Schlesinger was 31, he wrote a book entitled "The Political Economy of National Security." It was mainly a discussion of the role of systems analysis in relation to political decision-making.

Schlesinger, who was a consultant to the Naval War College in Newport, R.I., in 1957, is not one to hide his light under a bushel.

With all the modesty a Phi Beta Kappa, *summa cum laude* Harvard graduate can muster, he personally approved a CIA biography which noted his "special expertise" in energy, politics, and national security.

The Secretary-designate brings another distinction to the Pentagon. He probably has been closer to a major-sized nuclear explosion than 99.9 per cent of the men in Uncle Sam's armed forces.

Showing a gutsy side, he elected to take his wife and two of his eight children to Amchitka Island in November 1971, when he was chairman of the AEC, to be present when the controversial Cannikin nuclear weapon test was conducted.

ALEUTIAN TEST

Environmentalists groups had predicted dire results for the "less than five-megaton" (equivalent of nearly five million tons of TNT) test. Some said there would be tidal waves and earthquakes and the loss of much animal life.

But Schlesinger, asserting that he had been convinced the test could be carried out safely, decided to demonstrate his faith in a direct way.

The blast, the purpose of which was to prove out the warhead for the Spartan anti-ballistic-missile weapon, went off without a

hitch. There were some expected sea otter fatalities, and that was about it.

A 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. worker (much of the time with his shirttail out), Schlesinger doesn't get much time to pursue one of his favorite hobbies—birdwatching—these days. When they get a chance, he and his wife, the former Rachel Mellinger of Springfield, Ohio, grab their binoculars and head for a walk in the woods to spot their feathered friends.

COAST GUARD RESERVISTS CALLED UP TO ASSIST IN DISASTER RELIEF ACTIVITIES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, during the recent disastrous flooding in the Mississippi River Valley, an historic action was taken by Secretary of Transportation Brinegar.

Secretary Brinegar made an involuntary call-up of the Coast Guard Reserve to assist in disaster relief activities. This is the first time that there has been an involuntary call-up of the reserve for a peacetime mission since the Reserve was given its peacetime mission in 1972.

The Coast Guard Reserve members did a very fine job in carrying out their mission during the flooding, and I believe they deserve the very highest commendation. I know that they have certainly earned the gratitude of the victims of the flood that they helped.

I wish to insert the following article from the May 1973 issue of the Coast Guard Reservist which describes the work done by these Reservists during this disaster. I believe that this is only the first example of the fine service the Coast Guard Reserve will give to the citizens of our country with their peacetime mission:

RECALLED UNDER INVOLUNTARY CALL-UP LAW—COAST GUARD RESERVISTS ACTIVATED FOR FIRST TIME TO AID IN CONTAINING FLOOD-SWOLLEN RIVERS IN SECOND DISTRICT

Coast Guard reservists, called to involuntary emergency active duty for the first time, joined with Regular Coast Guard and National Guard forces in battling the swirling flood-waters of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers that covered more than seven million acres from Iowa to Louisiana early in April.

The reservists helped evacuate families from homes along the river systems, ahead of rising water that left more than 5,000 families homeless. At least 19 persons died as a result of the more than \$150 million rampage of the nation's longest river.

Coast Guard Reserve personnel were deployed in West Alton, Arnold, South St. Louis County, Cape Girardeau and St. Genevieve, Missouri, the area hit hardest by the flooding. Relief activities consisted of evacuations, police assistance and support activities and helping control traffic in the area to minimize wake damage.

Reservists also assisted in manning oil control booms and supervising oil clean-up after the flood waters emptied a 10,000 gallon waste oil storage pit.

Reservist-manned small boats provided transportation for National Guard security teams, who were stationed in the evacuated areas to prevent looting.

In addition to the evacuation responsibilities, reservists loaded sandbags onto Coast Guard boats, and delivered them to points along the flood-swollen rivers to shore

up dikes and contain the surging waters. Reservists also manned levees, operated flood relief boats and took part in rescue operations.

Transportation Secretary Claude S. Brinegar authorized the call-up after receiving approval from President Nixon to activate three Second District Organized Reserve Training Units. The action was taken under a law approved last October permitting Coast Guard reservists to be involuntarily recalled to assist in operations made necessary by natural disasters or emergencies such as that created by the floods.

"A request for the action was transmitted to me by Admiral Chester R. Bender, Commandant of the Coast Guard, after it became apparent that Regular Coast Guard personnel working in the flooded area were being overtaxed," Secretary Brinegar said in announcing the call-up.

Regular Coast Guard personnel had been working in the Missouri-Illinois flood areas since the last week in March with only short periods of relief prior to the activations of the Reserve forces.

"Today's action will provide relief for those Regular units and increase the capability of the Coast Guard in the flooded area," the Secretary said at the time of his announcement. "The need for additional action will depend on the progress of the floods."

The reservists were called to emergency active duty on 4 April to serve in the flood-torn areas, where Regular forces already were overtaxed by the severity of the situation.

This marked the first time the emergency call-up legislation, which is unique to the Coast Guard Reserve, had been used.

Approval was received to mobilize a unit in Peoria, Illinois, and two units in St. Louis. In all, authorization was approved to activate up to 143 reservists. However, the Second District recalled only 53 men from the two St. Louis units for duty in the St. Louis area.

Vice Admiral Thomas R. Sargent III, Vice Commandant, arrived on-scene from Washington Headquarters during the height of the crisis to survey the flood-stricken areas and to assess emergency operations.

In addition to those called to emergency active duty, many reservists volunteered to assist in the flood relief operations. Those who were mobilized were screened first to eliminate any reservists already working on flood control, such as policemen and firemen.

Under the call-up legislation, which the President signed on 9 October, reservists are limited to 14 days of emergency active duty in any four-month period, or a total of 30 days in any one-year period. The emergency duty is substituted for active-duty-for-training on a day-for-day basis and those serving on emergency active duty are entitled to all benefits normally accrued by reservists on other types of duty.

In his report on the flood relief activities, RADM SILER, Commander, Second Coast Guard District, commended the reservists for their professionally outstanding and invaluable service.

"Their efforts were without exception outstanding," the admiral said of the reservists. "All reports indicate a high degree of enthusiasm and excellent esprit. Working with Regular members or as individual members, these Coast Guardsmen exhibited an unflagging zeal for the job at hand."

Not all of the Reserve activities were confined to the St. Louis area.

In Yazoo City, Mississippi, volunteer reservists joined with Regular Coast Guardsmen, National Guardsmen and civilian volunteers in flood relief operations after a dike gave way on the Yazoo River causing flooding in several areas.

At Louisville, reservists helped to man a traffic control system for towboats operating on the Ohio River. As in other parts of Western Rivers, maneuvering a towboat and a number of large barges is exceptionally difficult during flood conditions.