

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ON SELLING MORE SAVINGS BONDS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the administration is taking steps to help the small investor, and give Uncle Sam some "Walking around Money" at the same time, by seeking to liberalize interest rates on U.S. savings bonds.

I have long pushed for action to bring earnings on these "Shares of America" up to parity with commercial rates. I introduced legislation to do so, and have made frequent appearances here on the House Floor to urge action on bond rates. About a year and one-half ago the administration liberalized the interest rates on new and outstanding bonds and as a result, the course of redemptions over purchases was reversed and has stayed up ever since.

But, conditions change, and today we have a genuine need to again adjust interest rates on these bonds to a realistic level. I would suggest that the rate be made equal to that being paid on certificates of deposit by the major banks. For years, those with large sums to invest have been able to obtain premium rates through CID's.

Now, I feel, is an opportune time for action to enable the small investor to obtain a better return on money invested in our Nation's future. Higher bond sales ease the problems of debt management, help fight inflation by diverting funds from consumer buying to savings, and provide security for the future of millions of American families. The fact that \$58 billion has been salted away by thrifty Americans who have bought these bonds indicates that they are "bullish on America" and also wisely cognizant of the tax advantages of buying and holding these bonds as a retirement nest egg.

The Chicago Tribune has commented favorably on the bond interest increase in a recent editorial pointing out the desirable aspects of encouraging bond sales. I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

ON SELLING MORE SAVINGS BONDS

The Nixon administration is asking Congress to remove the interest rate ceiling on United States savings bonds. At the same time, it is seeking the removal of the rate ceiling on long term government bonds.

Both of these actions are long overdue. If Congress expects Americans to buy savings bonds in any meaningful amount, then it must make these instruments fully competitive with other forms of savings and investments.

With passbook savings rates at neighborhood savings and loan associations at 5 per cent a year and savings certificate rates even higher, there is little incentive to buy savings bonds and wait until they mature in order to collect 5.5 per cent interest. By eliminating the interest ceiling, savings bonds could be used by the U.S. treasury as a valuable instrument in debt management. A more

realistic rate of return would attract small savers who cannot buy regular treasury securities because the minimum amount is \$10,000.

Asking a new specific ceiling is pointless. By the time Congress acts on a new ceiling request, other money market rates often have risen to a point where the new ceiling is outdated before it's even effective.

Much the same reasoning can apply to the request for removal of the 4.25 per cent ceiling on long term treasury bonds. Congress did allow the treasury two years ago to issue \$10 billion in long-term bonds at interest rates exceeding the ceiling. The move was a success. As a result, the average maturity of privately held public debt has been lengthened.

If the ceiling is removed, the government will be able to attract long term investment by offering bonds during periods of relatively low interest rates. This will alleviate the need to refinance securities with shorter maturities. This would provide a better management tool for the government and cause less havoc in the money markets when the government needs cash.

A third proposal in the package offered by Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz would apply to taxpayers who are entitled to income tax refunds. Under this plan, a refund check would be issued in the normal manner. If the taxpayer decided not to cash the check, it would automatically begin to bear interest after a specified period of time.

Mr. Shultz said this plan would encourage savings and contribute to more orderly cash and debt management. He probably knows what he is talking about. But to the average family breadwinner, whose bookkeeping goes awry if a creditor does not promptly cash a check, it seems appalling to have to cope with millions of outstanding checks—and then have to compute interest on them as well. If the treasury is that efficient, you'd think it could live within its income.

JAMES A. FARLEY BECOMES 85 YEARS OF AGE—NEW DEAL LEADER CONTINUES ACTIVE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, "A Workhorse Turns 85" is the headline on a photo story on May 30, 1973, in the Washington Star-News.

Woody West, staff writer, said:

"Genial Jim" Farley despite a heart attack in 1972, continues active.

He also wrote that the strident personality of the New Deal days, is at his office almost daily.

Many Members of the Senate—not as many now as a few years ago—recall the Democrat who helped Franklin Roosevelt become President.

I remember those years, first the 1932 campaign when I was on the ticket in West Virginia with the vigorous fighter in the exciting battle of that year. Through West Virginia came Franklin D. and with him was big Jim. Yes, I can see him now on the rear passenger car of the Baltimore & Ohio train as it rode

the rails of a twisty track through the mountains. The people were alongside and at the stations reacting to Jim's smiles and waving arms—and often his brief talks.

And many of us are appreciative of our continuing correspondence with this man who remembers to send congratulatory letters or telegrams when our constituents elect or reelect us to public office.

I am hopeful Jim will be active in political, civic, and industry affairs for many years to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, the article to which I have made reference.

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

A WARHORSE TURNS 85

(By Woody West)

The powerful no longer lapse into respectful silence when he speaks. The hopeful and the ambitious no longer seek his patronage. More than half of the nation's population was not on the scene when the name of James Aloysius Farley was a pre-eminent one in American politics.

The old Democratic war horse celebrates his 85th birthday today, his name still evoking memories of the New Deal, the bleak days of the Depression and the ascendancy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

"Genial Jim" Farley, despite a heart attack in 1972, still is active, still appears almost daily at his New York office of Coca Cola Export Corp., and remains, to many, a symbol of political acumen.

He was among the earliest and most adamant supporters of Franklin Roosevelt, and floor manager for FDR at the Chicago convention at which Roosevelt first was nominated for the presidency. He played a key part in swinging the Texas and California delegations, pledged to John Nance Garner, to FDR to put him over the two-thirds required for nomination.

Farley became postmaster general and chairman of the Democratic National Committee and a man to be reckoned with in the heady early years of the New Deal.

Party loyalty was a credo to the big Irishman from Grassy Point, N.Y., and his memory for names and faces became a legend.

But Jim Farley and FDR came to a tense parting in 1940 over Roosevelt's decision to seek a third term—the "third termites," Farley caustically labeled those who urged the President to seek the unprecedented extension of his term.

Farley, it was said, had ambitions himself in those years and his name was put in nomination for the presidency in the 1940 convention.

Although without a political job after 1944 when he quit as Democratic chairman of New York State, Farley was never far from the fulcrum of action in succeeding years and his words still found an audience.

At the 1960 Democratic convention at which he backed then-Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson in the early scrambling, Farley was outspoken against Adlai E. Stevenson. Sending Stevenson to negotiate with Nikita Khrushchev, said Farley, would be like sending "the cabbage patch to the goat."

And though Farley also warned at Los Angeles against a stampede to John F. Kennedy, when Kennedy was elected Farley stoutly defended the young President-elect,

saying that anyone questioning his mandate because of the narrow margin of victory over Richard M. Nixon was "perilously close to irresponsible mischief-making."

Farley has spoken out infrequently in recent years. But a 1967 speech, in which he was highly critical of Sens. Robert F. Kennedy and J. W. Fulbright over their views on Vietnam, sparked a brief furor. He blasted Kennedy for "soaring ambition" and said of Fulbright: "No other senator in American history except Sen. Fulbright has had the arrogance to tell the commander-in-chief that he should withhold air support from Americans fighting for their lives on a battlefield."

There were mutterings that Farley had spoken out at the suggestion of the hard-pressed Johnson administration. Farley quietly denied the charges.

His career symbolized the American belief in the ability of a man to rise from adversity. His first political victory was election as town clerk of Stony Point, N.Y., after years of helping his widowed mother support the family.

From town clerk, he was elected a county supervisor, county Democratic chairman, and was elected to the state Assembly in 1923. In 1928, he became secretary of the state party committee and its chairman in 1930. He was a strong backer of Alfred E. Smith in 1928 and began working for FDR in 1930, while Roosevelt was governor of New York.

But all that is behind him. Today he will be 85, and probably will show up at his office on Madison Avenue. His wife, Elizabeth, died in 1955, but he has the comfort of 10 grandchildren belonging to his three children, Betty, Ann, and James Jr.

THE HIGH COST OF AMBASSADORSHIPS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for appropriate reference a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that no person should be considered for appointment as ambassador or minister if he or members of his immediate family have contributed more than \$5,000 to a Presidential candidate in the last election.

The disclosure that a recent ambassadorial appointment had contributed \$300,000 to the President's campaign coffers after the election is an unfortunate coincidence at best. It would appear that inflation has driven ambassadorial posts out of reach of even the average millionaire, let alone qualified foreign service professionals. I think the time has come to prune ambassadorships from the political plum tree.

This longstanding practice of rewarding big campaign contributors with the top diplomatic post in other countries has a demoralizing impact on career Foreign Service officers, has discouraged other highly talented people from even entering the Foreign Service, and has diminished the respect which other countries have for our diplomatic corps. And I speak as a former Foreign Service officer myself.

While I am not suggesting that we can or should confine these appointments to career Foreign Service officers, I do think the recommended limitations contained

in my resolution would force us to give greater consideration to highly qualified and experienced persons both within and without the Foreign Service—regardless of the size of their political purses.

Last week this body passed the State Department authorization bill which contained a provision requiring that those nominated as Ambassador or minister submit to the Congress a full report of political contributions made by them and members of their immediate families over the previous 4 years. This is an important step in the right direction. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is currently considering ground rules under which anyone who has contributed more than \$5,000 to a political candidate in any calendar year would automatically be rejected by the committee for an ambassadorial appointment unless they possessed exceptional qualifications. I think this is another salutary development.

In drawing up my own bill, I considered the possibility of establishing the contribution limitation eligibility requirement by statute, but my studies revealed that there is some constitutional question that Congress can set such prior conditions on appointments by law, though there has never been a court test of this. On the other hand, there is no question that the Congress can recommend such conditions to the President and that the Senate can fail to confirm a nomination for any reason whatsoever. Therefore, if the Congress, even by concurrent resolution, suggests certain guidelines for ambassadorial appointments, adequate notice will have been served on any President to ignore these at his own peril in submitting nominations for ambassadorships.

I am encouraged by a report in the June 8 Washington Post in which Secretary of State Rogers is quoted as telling the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 30 that the President "agrees" that the subject is of concern. I hope that spirit will guide the administration in accepting the recommended conditions set forth in my resolution, and that the Congress will adopt this policy. At this point in the RECORD I include the text of my resolution:

H. CON RES. —

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that, from and after January 1, 1977, no person should be considered for appointment as ambassador or minister, except in connection with special missions for the President of a temporary and limited nature, if such person or any member of his immediate family made contributions aggregating more than \$5,000 to any candidate for the office of President in the last presidential election preceding his nomination for appointment as ambassador or minister.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, an individual should be deemed to be a candidate for the office of President, if, with respect to that office, he was a candidate within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, and a contribution to any political committee registered under section 303(a) of such Act should be deemed to be a contribution to the candidate for the office of President included in its statement of organization under section 303(b)(6) of such Act at the time of such contribution. As used in this resolution the

term "contribution" has the same meaning given such term by section 301(e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, and the term "immediate family" means a person's spouse, and any child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of such person and the spouses of any of them.

FORT WILLIAM AND MARY FROM COLONIAL TIMES TO THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the early history of New Hampshire's Fort William and Mary—which is now known as Fort Constitution and which will be designated as a national historic site if a bill I introduced in behalf of myself and my colleague, Senator THOMAS MCINTYRE, is approved—has been described in a most interesting and well-researched account by the eminent Dr. J. Duane Squires. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his narration, which was originally presented as an address, for the attention of all who are taking such an increased interest in our Nation's past as the country's bicentennial anniversary year continues to draw closer.

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

FORT WILLIAM AND MARY FROM COLONIAL TIMES TO THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

(An address given at the Adjourned Annual Court and Field Day of the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of New Hampshire by J. Duane Squires, Ph. D.)

The period of time covered by this paper is slightly more than a century and a half. New Hampshire's colonial history began on April 16, 1623, when David Thomson anchored his ship, "Jonathan," off our coast. The Revolutionary War ended with the Treaty of Paris in 1783, one hundred and sixty-three years later. We are dealing, therefore, with a period as long as that which separates us in 1972 from the War of 1812, and that to many contemporaries seems like a very long time ago!

Until after the Revolutionary War the most commonly-used entrance to what is now the State of New Hampshire was by sea to Portsmouth Harbor, at the mouth of the Piscataqua River. At this river's junction with the Atlantic Ocean there was, and is, an island, known for hundreds of years as Great Island. The island is somewhat less than a square mile in area, and is roughly rectangular in shape. At each of its four corners from time to time during the colonial era fortifications were erected; but by far the most important of these earthen redoubts was at the northeast angle where by the middle of the 17th century the fort was called "The Castle."

During the century and a half from 1623 to 1775, colonial New Hampshire had three basic problems confronting it, and in all of these "The Castle," or as it was later termed, Fort William and Mary, played an important part. These three problems were, in chronological order: (1) the complex and often acrimonious relationships with Massachusetts, the powerful colony immediately to the south of New Hampshire; (2) the ever-present matter of frontier expansion to the north and west stretching toward the White Moun-

tains and the Connecticut River, inevitably involving conflicts with the Indians; and (3) participation in the imperial wars of the mother country, Great Britain, running from 1689 to 1763, and then drifting into the War for Independence in the 1770's. Let us now examine the relationship of the famous fort on Great Island to these three problems, especially to the world wars of the British Empire in the ninety years from the "Glorious Revolution of 1689" to the American Revolution almost a century later.

We know that as early as 1632 there was a rudimentary kind of fort on the northeast corner of Great Island. We know that it contained several small pieces of artillery, and was partly intended to protect the settlements against marauding pirates. We know that during the years when Massachusetts assumed control over the four New Hampshire towns of Portsmouth, Dover, Exeter, and Hampton—i.e. from 1641 to 1680—there were frequent mentions of this fort and of the necessity for keeping it in good condition. In 1680 an observer wrote: "There is at Great Island, at the harbor's mouth, a fort, well enough situated, but for the present too weak." It was a lamentation which would be heard scores of times in the ensuing years.

In the early 1690's the people on Great Island, tired of being controlled by their neighbors on mainland Portsmouth, petitioned the Governor and Council for the right to establish a town government of their own. After prolonged and touchy negotiations this request was granted and on May 30, 1693, Governor John Usher issued the charter for New Hampshire's fifth town. Taking its name from the old fort, the residents asked that the community be called New Castle, and by that name it has been known ever since. Its principal point of interest was the old fort, which in the spring of 1694 was renamed Fort William and Mary. This was obviously a tribute to the then ruling British king and queen, who had ascended to the throne after the expulsion of King James II in 1688, and who had recently presented some artillery pieces to "The Castle."

The exigencies of King William's War demanded the further strengthening of the venerable fort. It is hard to realize today that in 1689-1690 and for several years thereafter there were savage Indian assaults on the towns around Portsmouth Harbor, Dover, Salmon Falls, Durham, Lamprey River, and other places. When "The Castle" received its new name in 1694, it had nineteen cannon and a permanent garrison of five men. The ravages of the Indians and the ever-present threat of an attack by the French navy made it imperative that measures to strengthen the fort be undertaken. French commando forces twice destroyed a colonial fort in Pemaquid, Maine, first in 1689 and again in 1696, throwing great alarm into New Hampshire. The Provincial Council in 1694 voted the considerable sum of £702 to improve Fort William and Mary. Twenty men were retained to repair the fort and a garrison of eighteen men was authorized. When the British and French signed the peace treaty of Ryswick in 1697, however, the garrison at the fort was reduced to eight men.

Of course this treaty proved to be but a breathing spell, prior to a renewal of the imperial conflict under the name of Queen Anne's War; this lasted for eleven years from 1702 to 1713. In 1699 the king had sent over a Dutch military engineer—you will recall that King William was also the ruler of Holland—named Wolfgang William Romer. Romer carried the rank of colonel in the British army. In 1705 Queen Anne sent over another military engineer, likewise of Dutch origin, Col. J. Redknap, to make still further studies and recommendations for repairs. It was on the recommendations of these expert advisers that the massive stone foundations visible even today were erected, a well dug,

and barracks and storehouses built. A shipload of supplies for strengthening the fort arrived from Great Britain in 1709. Nevertheless, by 1715, two years after the Treaty of Utrecht, the fort was again reported by the colonial authorities to be in need of extensive repairs. It must have been discouraging alike to the British and to New Hampshire officialdom.

Following the death of Queen Anne in 1714, the American colonies settled down to a period of uneasy truce with the French and Indians. Of course, since New Hampshire was on the most dangerous stretch of frontier, there was no real peace. There were outbreaks of fighting with the Indians in 1718, in 1720, in 1724, and the large-scale affair known as "Lovewell's War" in 1725. In 1740-1741 about a hundred men were mustered at Fort William and Mary to engage in that strange Anglo-Spanish conflict in the West Indies known as the "War of Jenkins' Ear."

In 1744 a formal large scale war again broke out between Britain and France. It was known to the colonists as "King George's War." Lasting for four years, it was highlighted by the capture of colonial forces of the mighty French fortress of Louisbourg in 1745. Unhappily for New Englanders, the peace settlement in 1748 was a status quo ante bellum treaty, and the French fortress had to be returned.

In 1740, prior to the beginning of King George's War, a careful examination of Fort William and Mary had been made, with the usual discouraging findings. Let the official report tell its own story.

Capt. of the said Fort is hereby ordered to receive you into the same & to shew you the said Fort and Stores in order to your Effectual executing this Warrant.

Given under my hand at Portsmouth the 13th day of Feb. 1739-40, and in the 13th year of his Majesties Reign.

J. BELCHER.

In obedience & pursuant to the within Order, We the Subscribers did repair to his Majesties Fort Wm & Mary on the Great Island which with the Stores therein was shown to us by the Honble Shadrack Walton, Esq. the State and account of which is underneath, viz.

The walls on the South part of the Fort very much broken & decayed, the Platform rotten, nine guns on that line mounted & five of the carriages very much decayed, 4 guns mounted next the flagstaff pointing to the South and one of the Carriages Rotten, 4 guns mounted at the East end of the Fort in good Order, (p. 560.) on the north side of the Fort 13 guns mounted pointing up the River, the Platform on which they Stand & the Carriages very good, at the Fort on each side of the Gate a gun mounted but one of the Carriages rotten, without the Fort 9 field pieces mounted in good order, the Powder House in good order to receive Powder, with one half bbl. of Powder only therein with a bundle of match & abt a Reame of Cart-ridge paper. Nigh the Powder House in the Fort 4 pile of shot about 1000 in number and in the old Guard House abt 200 shot for the Field pieces. The old Guard House very much decayed, the Gunners House very much out of Repaire, 17 small arms one of which only fit for present use, 21 Cartridge boxes, 8 formers, 12 ladders, 4 worms, 7 sponge heads 6 Ramer heads, 2 boxes of partridge shot, 20 aprons for guns, 7 iron Crows 7 Crab handspikes, the Century Boxes all gone.

Fort Wm & Mary, Feb. 14, 1739-40

JOSEPH SHEERBURN,
J. RINDGE.

With the renewal of international war between the Great Britain of King George II and the France of Louis XV, it was obvious that the financing of improvements and repairs at Fort William and Mary would be of major proportions. In the years before

1693 the annual upkeep of the fort had been paid for largely by the local towns in the Piscataqua area, principally Portsmouth. Following 1680, when New Hampshire began its independent existence apart from Massachusetts, the fort received certain appropriations from the Provincial treasury. And after William and Mary ascended the throne the royal government itself assumed an increasing share of the burden. In February, 1740, for example, the Provincial Assembly voted £700 for gunpowder and repairs at the fort. Two years later, on January 19, 1742, the King's Council in London ordered that an engineering expert be sent over to Fort William and Mary again to survey the defenses of that place and to make recommendations for its improvement.

By this time Governor Benning Wentworth was in charge of the colony of New Hampshire. Taking his post in 1741, he held it until 1766, twenty-five years in all. It is interesting for us in New Hampshire to note that Governor Wentworth held his office longer than any governor in the history of any other of the thirteen colonies. Benning Wentworth was always keenly aware of the importance of Fort William and Mary, and addressed numerous messages to the Provincial legislature regarding its support and improvement. In 1743 the Provincial Assembly voted the immense sum of £25,000 to put New Hampshire into a state of adequate defense, and of this amount £2500 was allocated to the repairs at Fort William and Mary.

In 1745 occurred the famous assault on Louisbourg, already mentioned, for which New Hampshire expended £10,000. During the months in which interest was concentrated on that affair, Governor Wentworth was also preoccupied with the conditions at Fort William and Mary, with the fate of Fort No. 4 at modern Charlestown, and with Fort Dummer at modern Hinsdale. In the face of these military demands, plus all the familiar costs of ordinary government, the executive and legislative authorities often found themselves in fiscal difficulties strongly reminiscent of more recent situations!

Following the treaty of 1748 there was again a short period of peace before the culminating struggle known to Europeans as the Seven Years War, and to Americans as the French and Indian War, broke out in 1755. Once again Governor Wentworth bemoaned the condition of Fort William and Mary, his remarks being reported in the Council records for August 9, 1757, as follows:

"His Excelency then acquainted the Council that he tho't it necessary to pull down the South West bastion of Fort William & Mary at New Castle it being much shaken and is falling down and that he proposed in rebuilding it to make the bastion something larger and also some parts of the wall between the s^d bastion & gateway and asked the Council whether they would advise to the laying the stone work in lime mortar to which they did advise."

In 1757 also the Governor recommended that the permanent garrison at Fort William and Mary be increased by fifty men, and that extensive repairs be authorized. In 1758 it was reported that the pay for military personnel at the fort for the previous twelve months had been £925. In 1759 Governor Wentworth recommended that the "summer garrison" at the fort be forty "good and effective men." In each of the following years the Governor urged more improvements at the fort. The situation might be indicated in my parody of a well-known jingle: "The fort is forgot and the soldier slighted." "The fort and the soldier we alike adore In times of danger . . . not before. The danger past, both are required; The fort is forgot and the soldier slighted."

During the years from the close of the French and Indian War in 1763 to the outbreak of hostilities between the mother country and the colonies in 1775, beyond the activities normal to a military post in time of peace, Fort William and Mary led a placid existence. The garrison was gradually reduced to six men on standing duty. To the very end of his tenure as Governor, however, Benning Wentworth was urging that Fort William and Mary "be adequately" maintained.

Benning Wentworth's successor in the governorship was his nephew, John Wentworth, who acceded to the post in 1767. His arrival in New Hampshire in his official capacity was signaled by a salute from "... the Castle William and Mary." Governor John Wentworth, like his predecessor, took an active interest in the maintenance of Fort William and Mary. During his governorship expenses at the fort averaged between £200 and £300 annually. In his message to the Council and the Assembly on December 13, 1770, Governor John Wentworth urged that "... some provisions be made for Repairs of the Castle William and Mary and to enlarge the garrison." On June 11, 1772, he secured an appropriation for a new powder magazine at the fort.

During all of Governor John Wentworth's administration the tensions between the colonies and Great Britain were rising steadily. There is no need here to go into the recurrent crises year after year from the Stamp Act Congress in 1765 to the First Continental Congress in 1774. New Hampshire's population was officially reported as 52,700 in the first Provincial census of 1767; and by the beginning of the Revolution it was estimated to be 82,000. But the garrison at Fort William and Mary remained constant at six men, and their billeting costs, plus "firewood and candles" did not noticeably rise as the years passed. In the last appropriation prior to the outbreak of the War for Independence, Captain John Cochran at Fort William and Mary was to be paid at the rate of £3 a month, and each of his five men were to receive 25 shillings per month in pay and 5 shillings for expenses. Thirty cords of firewood were allowed the six men for the fiscal year.

The actual events in the famous seizure of Fort William and Mary on December 14-15, 1774, have frequently and lucidly been narrated. On Tuesday, December 13, 1774, the subsequently well-known Paul Revere arrived in Portsmouth with a message to the anti-British committee in that town. The message indicated imminent British punitive actions in and around Fort William and Mary. Two hundred men from Portsmouth, shortly to be joined by approximately the same number from the combined populations of Rye and of New Castle, about noon on December 14 assaulted the fort and easily captured it and the military stores within its walls. Although the garrison fired at the attackers, there was no bloodshed. The seizures included one hundred barrels of gunpowder, 3200 flints, five kegs of bullets; and other military supplies. So ended the first assault. The next night, i.e., late on December 15, John Sullivan with about seventy men from Durham and vicinity again took over the fort. Using boats they removed miscellaneous small arms, fifteen four-pounder cannon, one nine-pounder cannon, and a quantity of twelve-pound and twenty-four-pound shot. These were then taken by water to Durham.

On December 17, in compliance with Governor Wentworth's appeal for help, HMS "Canceaux" arrived in Portsmouth with reinforcements from Boston; and on the 19th HMS "Scarborough" likewise dropped anchor offshore from Fort William and Mary. There were between eighty and a hundred British troops aboard these two ships. With

their arrival royal authority was promptly restored at the fort. HMS "Scarborough" stayed in or near Portsmouth harbor and the fort until the autumn of 1775. Governor John Wentworth had taken refuge in the fort in the month of June. On the 15th of July, from his temporary domicile there, Wentworth addressed his last message to the provincial legislature, and on the 21st of September he issued his final proclamation.

In that same month the "Scarborough," with New Hampshire's last royal governor aboard, sailed for Boston. Never again would Wentworth return to his native state. He remained in Boston until the British evacuation of that city in March, 1776; from there he sailed to Halifax, Nova Scotia; from that place he went to New York, where he resided from November, 1776, to February, 1778; and thence he journeyed to London, there to live until King George III could find a new appointment for him.

Meantime, in the autumn of 1775, there was a threat of a British attack on Portsmouth, and Brigadier General John Sullivan was named by General Washington to ward off the incipient danger. Artillery was emplaced along the Piscataqua; a harbor-boom was built; and numbers of minutemen assembled. But the British did not press their attack and the threat evaporated. For the rest of the war there was no action in or around the old fort.

In 1791 the General Court of the State of New Hampshire ceded to the New Federal government 1.75 acres of land, which comprised the fort area in the town of New Castle. In June, 1807, an additional 1.5 acres was ceded by the state to the national government. From then until August 23, 1960, the fort and its surrounding area were government property. On the last-named date the federal government retroceded to the State of New Hampshire the 1.75 acres originally turned over to the nation in 1791. Thus the ancient fortress site now is the property of the State of New Hampshire. Included are the ruins of the colonial and Revolutionary fort, various additions made to it between 1791 and 1960, and some auxiliary buildings. It is to be noted, of course, that under national administration the venerable fortress in 1808 became Fort Constitution, by which name it is often known now.

This, then, is a summary of the history of Fort William and Mary from its earliest beginnings to the forlorn ruins we see today. Under various names for more than three centuries it was a key defense point on the coastline of New England. It was in active use as a U.S. military establishment in all our wars up to and including the Korean conflicts in the 1950's. Efforts are now under way to have Congress declare the ancient remains a National Historic Site. It is an objective to which all persons interested in New Hampshire's colonial and Revolutionary history should heartily subscribe. Never captured in wartime by any opponent, it nevertheless marked a key event in the struggle for American independence. As the Rev. Dr. Alonzo H. Quint once wrote with reference to the seizure of Fort William and Mary on December 14-15, 1774:

"The daring character of this assault cannot be overestimated. It was an organized investment of a royal fortress, where the king's flag was flying, and where the king's garrison met them with muskets and artillery. It was four months before Lexington, and Lexington was resistance to attack, while this was deliberate assault. When the king heard of this capture, it so embittered him that all hope of concessions was at an end. It made war inevitable."

That is a just verdict on the most famous episode in the annals of Fort William and Mary during the colonial and Revolutionary War years. And with it I close this essay.

TOWN CRIERS KEEP WATCH ON EDGERTON VILLAGE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, it was a bit of a surprise to me when my constituents indicated in their questionnaire returns that crime prevention and control was the most pressing problem of the day.

However, a news story in the Lyon County Independent, a weekly newspaper in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, reported that crime indeed is a top priority and that many small villages have reverted to "public safety" groups to combat unlawful activities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a most serious situation. It moves our country backward into the early days when every man was a law unto himself.

We have our Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which funnels funds to our States to help them with their law enforcement problems but those funds generally do not trickle down to our smaller communities.

With your permission, and for the information of the other Members of Congress, I would like to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"TOWN CRIERS" KEEP WATCH ON EDGERTON VILLAGE

(Edgerton)—Break-in artists find the small villages of southwestern Minnesota and northwestern Iowa fertile grounds for their late night business activities.

The villages generally are unable to afford around the clock police protection. It is common practice to have a village marshal who also doubles as street repairman, water meter reader, dog catcher and village clerk. Most work a full daytime schedule with little time or energy left for night patrolling.

So between midnight and dawn, criminals have virtually a free reign to do what they wish without fear of disturbance other than perhaps an occasional sheriff's patrol.

But this is not the case everywhere. Crooks in the know steer clear of Edgerton because chances of escaping detection there are remote. It's not that Edgerton has any greater financial resources to finance police activities. It hires only a single man who works a full daytime shift.

The difference is in the people who live here. They believe in citizens working together. One key effort is the civilian night patrol.

Every night at least two Edgerton citizens are on public safety patrol. They never make an arrest or involve themselves directly in control of any nefarious activity. That they leave to the professionals.

They do patrol the village streets, check doors to business places, look inside store windows, watch for fires and observe all that goes on. If trouble develops, a telephone call brings professional law officers on the run to handle it while the civilians go on about their quiet business.

One man has described their activities as something like a burglar alarm. It all started three years ago when a wave of burglaries was in progress in the small towns of the region. At a civil meeting, someone suggested the idea of some "do it yourself" police work. The suggestion caught hold and a patrol was formed.

It has grown to number 150 men. Two are

assigned duty each night and the rotation means each man is required to serve only four or five times a year. They drive their own cars and receive no pay. None are deputized. All carry exactly the same authority as do private citizens and no more.

Each has strict instructions "not to be a hero." "If trouble develops, call for help," is the firm instruction. No "vigilante" attitudes are allowed and the age of the men ranges from 19 to 70.

All do their jobs quietly and effectively. Just ask the five young men from Hills who apparently didn't know of the civilian patrol and who chose Edgerton as the place to burglarize a couple of places this spring.

They were observed by the patrol, a car description obtained and a license number written down. Sheriff Gene Spier was called. The burglars had left town by the time he arrived but it was a simple matter to trace the car. Within an hour and a half the five were in custody and the merchandise recovered. It's a sure bet that if these young men ever decide to burglarize again they won't do it in Edgerton.

For that matter it's fairly certain that other burglars who know of the patrol will find reasons why it is better to "do business" someplace else.

THE 33D ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET INVASION OF LITHUANIA

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, June 15, marks the 33d anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Lithuania. An important consequence of this illegal takeover of Lithuania has been limitation of the religious and political freedom of the Lithuanian people.

Lithuania achieved its independence on February 18, 1918, following more than 100 years of Russian domination. Thereafter, the independent Lithuanian nation achieved remarkable economic, industrial, and political progress. However, their independence was short-lived. Hitler's troops invaded. A short time later, in June 1940, the Soviets occupied Lithuania. They ruthlessly entrenched themselves in Lithuania, imposing the Soviet system on the Lithuanian people. Always a strong and gallant people, the Lithuanians waged a valiant fight for their freedom. Faced with resettlement and deportation, many Lithuanians have died resisting their oppressors.

Other Baltic peoples, notably the Latvians and Estonians, have also been systematically deprived of basic human rights by their Soviet occupiers. As in the case of Lithuania, these forceful and illegal Soviet occupations have spurred Latvian and Estonian patriots to resistance. Recent demonstrations against Soviets in the city of Kaunas and in other cities dramatize the will of these peoples to be free to determine their own destinies.

The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights insures to all of the world's peoples the right to assemble, to free elections, freedom of worship, and freedom of movement. Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

represents a violation of the charter as well as the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, to which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

One million people of Lithuanian ancestry, as well as many Latvians and Estonians, now live in the United States. They treasure the religious and political freedom they have found in their adopted land. And their presence here serves to remind us of our obligation to speak for their oppressed countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, let this anniversary of the occupation of the Lithuanian and Baltic peoples' homelands serve to reaffirm our conviction to do what is possible to support the basic human rights of people everywhere.

AFTERMATH OF A CRASH: A BLACK IN WHITE HANDS

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, over this past weekend I read a refreshing column by Roger Wilkins in the Washington Post.

The account by Roger Wilkins of his experience in Washington after an auto accident is a warm and refreshing glimpse at compassion, decency, and human relations at their best.

The article follows:

AFTERMATH OF A CRASH: A BLACK IN WHITE HANDS

(By Roger Wilkins)

One night recently on a common street in the District of Columbia, control over my body passed from me into the hands of the public authorities of this community—an event traditionally contemplated by most blacks with about as much enthusiasm as a bite from a rabid dog.

In fact, my first experience with the Metropolitan Police came during my first week in this city more than a decade ago when, as a confused stranger driving behind a bus, I inadvertently ran a red light at the corner of 3d and Constitution. A police officer seeing my New York tags and driver's license told this "boy" how many tickets he was going to give me and how many fines I'd have to pay. When he finally learned that I worked at the State Department, he backed off and went away. Several years later, in sweat shirt and old pants, I was jogging near my home at night. Two officers in a cruiser ordered the same "boy" to stop, frisked him roughly, hands on top of the cruiser and found Justice Department credentials. The "boy" again became "sir" and they left with dispatch.

The lessons of a lifetime, then, are to stay out of trouble, and if trouble comes, to find help in the black community and to avoid at all costs white strangers with guns and power.

Suddenly, on this recent May night, there was an unavoidable reality—a curve, headlights in my path, a swerve, a crash, a fight to control the car. As quickly as it began, it was over and there was the terrible realization that I was hurt—badly. A young white woman rushed up and asked excitedly if I were injured. I nodded. She began to rush off saying, "I'll call 411." "No," I said, "It's 911." Then I closed my eyes, held the left crushed elbow and awaited the arrival of the white strangers in authority.

I lit a cigarette and remembered Watts where two helmeted policemen, one with a sawed-off shotgun and the other with a drawn pistol, frisked two of us—members of a presidential mission to the burning city—for no apparent reason other than race. Then again in Detroit in 1967 at the corner of Grand River and Joy Rd. on another presidential mission, there were more helmets, more guns—at least 20 this time all pointed at my two black colleagues and me.

The officers were white, tired, frightened and angry. Death seemed a reasonable possibility. But finally the words "Department of Justice" got through. Grudgingly, the guns were put away and we were released.

Memories receded and I stubbed out the first cigarette and lit another just as the first policeman arrived. Under the helmet a hard white face appeared at my window.

"Are you hurt, sir?"

"Yes, I think my left elbow is broken."

"Wait here, sir I'll call an ambulance." He left. Shortly, a siren heralded the arrival of a red and white D.C. Fire Department ambulance. "Swell," I thought, "both cops and firemen."

The door on the driver's side wouldn't open, so I crawled over the gearbox, clutching the elbow and got out. The faces of the curious and the hard faces under the helmets surrounded me. I felt pain and fear and a child-like desire to be tended. Suddenly, a big red-haired fireman in blue appeared at my side. Gently, but authoritatively, he took the cigarette and tossed it away. "You don't need that now, sir." "No," I thought, "not now or ever," and ached for another drag.

Another fireman, this one black, produced a rolling stretcher. I wanted to lie on it, light another cigarette, close my eyes and hold my arm. But Red wasn't for that—"We'll have to cut your jacket, sir, and put on a temporary splint. It won't hurt and you'll be more comfortable." Now I felt real impatience. But the fireman seemed gentle and competent; his actions could be endured. All background sights and sounds faded except for the swarm of helmets and uniforms; mainly there were Red's gentle hands rapidly constructing the splint.

The stretcher was wheeled behind me and for a moment my mind resisted. To lie on it would be the ultimate submission. "They" would have had me completely. Suddenly scenes from emergency rooms and hospitals in Washington and New York reeled through my mind. Poor people—mainly black—some bearing fierce ugly wounds moaning and waiting endlessly, to be processed ultimately by robots oblivious to pain, misery and humanity. Oblivious, in other words, to everything but their endless questions, eternal forms and ubiquitous typewriters. I wanted to scream, "No, no—take me to some warm black place where a gentle black doctor and an old black grandma will respect my humanity and heal my pain."

But the big red man was respecting both my humanity and my pain and when he told me to lie down there was no contest between the old memories and fears and the need for somebody to do something and very soon.

When I lay on the stretcher I had yielded all control.

On my back the world was entirely different—black sky interrupted by concerned, disembodied faces looking down on me doing things for me that I could not control. The red-haired fireman and the black one lifted the stretcher gently, expertly and almost imperceptively into the ambulance.

Then came the hospital—lights overhead and more questions from white strangers bending over my prone and helpless form. "Where do you hurt, sir?" "My elbow." "Where are you?" "GW emergency room." "Are you hurt anywhere else?" "No." "Can we call someone for you?" It seemed they

asked every question in the world except what I did for a living. To this day, I don't think they knew whether I was an employee of the Washington Post or a pimp from lower 14th St. They didn't seem to care and I didn't tell them.

The rest happened fast. The stripping of clothing, an EKG, X-rays, the faces of the white strangers becoming more grave and concerned—and a form to authorize an emergency operation. Then the stretcher is wheeled rapidly down a long hall, under an endless string of ceiling lights, and suddenly, everybody is dressed in operating room green.

Just before entering the operating room a nurse noticed that under the sheet I was still wearing my underpants. "You'll have to take them off, sir," so I raised my rump and a couple of fellows pulled off the shorts while others held my arm gently in place. Somebody patted me on the shoulder and said, "that away pal—it's ok."

As they wheeled me into the operating room, I thought about the evening's score: smashed elbow—and a black man treated with courtesy, professionalism and dispatch by dozens of white strangers in authority. You couldn't call it a winner, but it wasn't altogether a loss, either.

MR. NIXON AIDS THE POOR BY REDIRECTING THE POVERTY DOLLAR

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, since OEO was established, the Federal Government has spent billions of dollars in an effort to eliminate poverty. When one attempts to determine if such a large expenditure has had any positive effect on the disadvantaged, one is confronted with a very difficult task, indeed. The only logical conclusion is that the war on poverty has been a colossal failure and that a dramatic new approach is needed.

I include the following editorial from the Fresno Guide in Fresno, Calif., in the RECORD:

NEW VIGOR TO POVERTY WAR

In the eight years that have passed since the late President Johnson declared "war on poverty," thousands of administrators have spent almost \$15 billion, benefiting supposedly millions of people.

But poverty has not been eliminated.

Now President Nixon has branded the effort a failure and has begun dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity, where poverty war strategy was mapped.

And despite the crescendo of outraged protest from congressional supporters of social programs, from welfare organizations and from workers in imperiled projects, there is little rebuttal to charges that the antipov-erty campaign has been a disappointment.

Mr. Nixon believes the laudable objectives have become bogged down hopelessly in a morass of bureaucracy.

"Too much money has been going to those who were supposed to help the needy," he said, "and too little to the needy themselves."

Mr. Nixon, however, has been reticent in previewing his own plans for aiding the poor in such areas as health, education, welfare and other human concerns.

Presumably some projects conducted under the administration of cities, but utilizing federal funds will be continued under local

option through an expanded program of revenue sharing.

Other worthwhile programs may be revived in the President's version of reform, which will be revealed to Congress in a message on human resources.

Spokesmen for the administration have indicated that the changes may not mean abandonment of such promising programs as the Job Corps, Head Start, Legal Services for the Poor and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Disenchantment with present policies has centered on the fact that too many projects "kept a lot of people comfortable in their poverty" and that the "seemingly inexhaustible flood" of money was reduced to "a mere trickle" by the time it reached those whom it was supposed to help.

The President has conceded that poverty remains a tragic national problem.

Abandonment of questionable tactics in the poverty war is not necessarily a prelude to surrender.

SENATOR HOWARD BAKER CONTINUES TO RECEIVE PLAUDITS FOR HIS ROLE IN SENATE HEARINGS ON WATERGATE

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, because of the televised hearings on the Watergate incident, the whole country is learning what we in Tennessee have known for a long time about the ability and character of our senior Senator, HOWARD BAKER.

The response to his incisive questioning and his fairness in handling witnesses has been nothing but favorable. One of the best stories I have seen was written by Jack Waugh in the Christian Science Monitor. He sees Senator BAKER emerging as the "Lancelot" of the Watergate hearings.

I am not sure that Senator BAKER seeks such a designation, but his impact upon this aspect of the political scene can not be ignored.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I direct the attention of my colleagues to this article on "Watergate's Lancelot":

WATERGATE'S LANCELOT

(By Jack Waugh)

WASHINGTON.—When Howard Baker was a lawyer back in the Cumberland Mountains, he used to try a case and the whole town of Huntsville (pop. 300) would turn out to hear him argue it.

Things haven't changed much. Howard Baker is now a Republican senator from Tennessee. And he's involved in another case and a lot of the country is turning out every day to hear it.

Senator Baker is the vice-chairman and the ranking Republican on the Senate select committee investigating the Watergate. And with his deep-throated Tennessee accent and his probing questions and photogenic face, he is emerging as a star of the televised hearings. And he also may be rising as the newest political comet in the Republican firmament.

WHAT HE DOES BEST

"That's just Howard," says one of his best friends, Lamar Alexander, a Nashville lawyer, "doing the two things he does best—engaging in a heads-on exchange and being on television."

One of Senator Baker's aides once said that if the Senator had a fault it was that "he doesn't do a good job of letting his light shine before men."

The aide is now eating his words, and 300 letters are piling into the Senator's office every day.

Some of them are accusing him of picking on the President, but most of them are admiring him personally. A young lady from Ohio expressed regret he is not single.

For Senator Baker, going to the Senate, which he first did six years ago, was like coming home to the family reunion.

His father once was a congressman. His mother was a congresswoman. His father-in-law was Everett McKinley Dirksen, the late Republican Senator from Illinois. His brother-in-law, William Wampler, is a congressman from Virginia. And then there is cousin John Sherman Cooper (Senator from Kentucky).

When Mr. Baker first ran for the Senate in Tennessee—in 1964—the state had so infrequently seen a Republican doing that with any conviction, that it almost elected him just because it was so novel.

Next time around, in 1966, Mr. Baker, a moderate Republican, was elected by sheer dint of his appeal and talent. He had to beat a well-known incumbent Governor, Frank Clement, to do it.

TENNESSEE FIRST

He was the first Republican ever popularly elected to the Senate from Tennessee. The only other Tennessee Republicans before him had been appointed in reconstruction times and there hadn't been any since.

The Senator turned out to be, then only 41, the father of the two-party system in Tennessee. After him since has come William Brock, another photogenic Republican, who is now the junior Senator from Tennessee. Together they sport the two most boyish faces in the cloakroom.

Mr. Baker early established himself as a master of the committee hearing. And it is in the give-and-take of the committee room that he has earned nearly everybody's respect. As it was hard to find anybody in Hollywood who didn't like Gary Cooper, it is hard to find anybody in Washington who doesn't respect Senator Baker. Or if they don't, they aren't saying so.

INSTANT GRASP

One of his aides says, "He can go into a hearing cold, with maybe 10 or 15 minutes briefing, listen for half an hour, finally speak up, and show a devastating command of the situation. It is humbling, because it makes me think he doesn't really need me."

The Senator is the ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee and sits on both the Commerce Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He is a recognized expert on environmental legislation.

Even those who often find themselves on the other side of the issue from the Senator circle him warily.

A Democratic staffer on one of his committees, who often finds himself across the issue from the Senator, says, "He is the kind of man, if he takes a position opposite of yours he is so persuasive you find yourself reconsidering your own. If you are still convinced then that you are right, then you can't believe he is against you and that if he just thinks it through long enough he soon won't be because anybody that intelligent can't be."

LOOKING FOR TROUBLE

Besides being the Lancelot of the committee room, Senator Baker, as one of his aides has it, "likes to be on the Senate floor seeing what trouble he can get into."

He got into plenty of it the day the Senate decided to establish the select committee to inspect the about-to-burst Watergate sit-

uation. No sooner had the deed been done than the Republican leadership pointed to him and said, "You."

Senator Baker at first figuratively said, "Who, me?" And they said, "Yes, you." And he said, "No, not me." But the leadership, principally minority leader Hugh Scott, put it in terms of duty to the party. Senator Baker, full of misgivings, finally agreed. The day he did there was no bigger albatross to be found in Washington.

A STAR IS BORN

But now the Watergate affair has exploded with such force on the American ken that it is capable of blowing old faces completely out of the political spotlight and new ones in. And one of the new ones may well be Senator Baker's.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, approximately a year and a half ago a group of scientists at Montana State University, in Bozeman, Mont., offered to counsel with me on science-related problems facing our State and Nation. I have met with this group on a number of occasions and every session has been productive and informative. Some 6 months ago I requested the group to address itself to those energy problems that are becoming more and more apparent each day. Two segments of their response are set forth below. As to some of the particular aspects set forth in the statements, there may, of course, be lack of full agreement, but the significance of these scientists' comments is that they provide valuable insight into the energy crisis and are without doubt a significant prelude for further and more particular inquiry:

MAY 29, 1973.

To Hon. RICHARD SHOUP, Member of Congress.
From Shoup Group.
Re Energy Crisis Outline.

The following is an edited version of the energy crisis outline which we discussed at our meeting of 26 April 1973.

Some aspects of the so-called "energy crisis" are, as we see them, the following. First, there is a growing national and worldwide shortage of conventional resources, especially fossil fuels, used to produce energy at presently acceptable economic rates. At the current usage and growth rates of energy consumption, known world reserves of oil and natural gas are down to perhaps 20 to 30 years supply, while coal reserves may last for only a few hundred years, depending on the specific uses to which they are put. The shortages in U.S. domestic reserves are worse yet. This raises the serious question of possible over-dependence of the U.S. energy economy on fuel reserves under the political and economic control of foreign countries not necessarily friendly to us. For example, can we maintain the delicate balance of power in the Middle East so as to ensure continued access to this region's rich oil reserves? And even if we can do this, can we deal successfully with the economic problems related to our balance of payments which necessarily accompanies purchase of energy resources abroad?

It would be comforting to assume that we can turn to alternative sources of energy pro-

duction in the near future in order to deal with these problems. Unfortunately, however, there are no *guaranteed* alternative sources of energy yet developed which are economically and/or environmentally desirable over a long period of time. Nuclear fission, often mentioned as a panacea for our energy ills, is largely in an experimental and developmental stage, with many as yet unanswered technological problems related to reactor safety and disposal of highly radioactive waste products. Controlled nuclear fusion, which together with solar energy may provide an acceptable long term solution to our energy needs, is almost in its infancy—with a great many problems of a fundamental scientific nature still to be solved. The development of other sources such as solar and geothermal energy is and has been regrettably slow for a variety of reasons.

So it is that within several generations at most, the entire quality of life and of modern civilization, which depends heavily on a somewhat prodigal use of conventionally produced energy, may be drastically changed. We may be forced by circumstances to return to a much more primitive way of life, which at least some people have thought rather desirable. If, however, this happens before we can reasonably well develop alternative energy technologies, we may never again be able to recover the degree of scientific and technological sophistication required to build and maintain a progressive industrial economy, even for those who want it. For the simple fact is that it takes energy to produce and control additional energy. In any case, the societal and economic upheavals connected with the oncoming energy crisis may well be catastrophic in nature.

Possible short term solutions to this situation in the U.S. are to accelerate development of remaining fossil fuel reserves (e.g., develop the Alaskan oil fields, increase offshore drilling for oil and natural gas, more fully exploit our rather substantial domestic coal reserves, etc.) and to convert as quickly as possible to the use of nuclear fission energy. These solutions have been advocated in President Nixon's recent energy message to Congress. It must be emphasized, however, that these are decidedly short range solutions which cannot be maintained in the long run—fossil fuel usage will necessarily decrease as our resources vanish, and the accumulation of radioactive wastes from fission reactors may well become a problem impossibly difficult to deal with. More sensibly, in the long run, we must institute stringent energy conservation methods. This will not only alleviate the demands of growth and usage of our present dwindling resources, but it will buy time valuable for the technological development of alternative energy sources. We must at the same time greatly increase research and development funding of geothermal, magnetohydrodynamic, fusion and solar energy production. Solar energy should probably be considered the ultimate energy source in terms of its long range availability, its minimal effects of local and global heat balances and its relatively pollution-free production. We should seriously consider learning to live within the energy budget imposed by the limitations of solar energy.

Legislation, on both local and national levels, should be developed to implement these solutions. We must carefully and stringently control our present fossil fuel development, with a view toward preserving the environment, and toward maintaining adequate reserves for other uses—such as in the petrochemical industry, which provides seemingly essential items like medicines and plastics. We must learn to distinguish, perhaps as a matter of law, between the present cost of a resource and its potential future value—which may be many times the present cost. We must institute legally based conservation measures such as energy rationing, taxation

on usage, and building codes based on optimum usage of available energy. It may even be desirable to encourage such "gimmicks" as a National Save Energy Month, or six-day bicycle races (designed to de-emphasize our reliance on the automobile as a primary transportation source in the U.S.). At the very least, we should re-allocate federal funding to promote research and development of the desirable long term energy sources such as solar energy. At present, the overall budget need not be increased.

The second area where the energy crisis makes itself felt nowadays concerns those problems related to reconciling "necessary" new energy resource development with various environmental issues. Perhaps we are learning to define what is "necessary" in terms of our real needs, both basic and aesthetic, rather than our imagined wants, which depend on our almost unlimited appetites. In any case, we must realize that *all* energy production pollutes our environment to some extent, thermally at the very least. Fossil fuel production suffers from its relatively well-known air pollution problems and nuclear fission from its radioactive waste disposal difficulties. Anticipated future sources such as nuclear fusion and solar energy will still have to deal with the thermal pollution problem. All such pollution affects the environment, usually in harmful and sometimes unpredictable ways. What we are willing to endure as far as environmental degradation is concerned is clearly related to what standards we have in mind regarding our "quality of life."

There exist strong indications that we cannot afford much more pollution before some irreversible ecological disasters may occur. We mention the approximately desert-like quality of some of the strip-mined areas of Appalachia and the near-death of Lake Erie as examples. Various sub-systems in the ecosystem are already in trouble due to pollution—for example, raptor reproduction through North America, and the plankton balance necessary to maintain life in the world's oceans. Ultimately, and perhaps very shortly, such developments will affect the survival of man himself, or—at the very least—his expected "quality of life."

We must ask ourselves how much energy resource development, with its inevitable accompanying pollution, is *really* necessary. Can we learn to distinguish between our basic needs and our ever-increasing wants? We should increase and focus research and development of methods assessing the effects of energy production of various ecosystems. Ultimately, solutions in this area of energy needs versus environmental quality will probably be in the nature of trade-offs. What is reasonable here, and what is necessary regarding the viability of our environment? Again, perhaps, the question of present cost versus potential value of our resources becomes important.

As far as legislation in this area is concerned, we should continue in the direction of passing stringent and strictly enforced anti-pollution laws, including standards of high quality for both air and water. Land development should be carefully regulated, including strong laws requiring the reclamation of strip-mined areas, and defining acceptable conditions for power-plant siting. Such measures will ensure the requisite lead-time necessary to develop effective long term controls on new energy resource development, as defined by our as yet unspecified goals regarding long term environmental quality. Even very strict laws at present will cause relatively minor inconveniences compared to the major ecological disasters which could befall us in the absence of such laws.

A third aspect of the energy crisis on which we feel we must comment is the somewhat misplaced faith on the part of many people in believing that a variety of "scientific mir-

acles" and/or technological breakthroughs will occur in the near future to save us. Clearly we need substantial new and clean energy sources within 10 to 20 years. Can science and technology come up with the necessary solutions? We are mainly developing nuclear fission as a new source—here the technology is reasonably good, but by no means foolproof regarding reactor safety (we have relatively little experience regarding safe reactor operation, some 150 reactor-years total, compared to a projected accumulation of something like 1,000 reactor-years per year by the turn of the century). In this area, the questions of radioactive waste transportation and disposal have not been adequately answered, much less the question of possible proliferation of nuclear weapons availability accompanying increased production of fissionable materials.

To a lesser extent than fission, we are trying to develop controlled nuclear fusion. This is a quite reasonable area to encourage, but basic and fundamentally difficult scientific and technological problems face us here, and we will be lucky to develop controlled nuclear fusion by the year 2,000, if at all. To some extent, we are making reasonable progress on coal liquefaction and gasification—but these methods, which depend on our finite and dwindling coal reserves, can provide at best relatively short term solutions. We are all but neglecting the development of geothermal and solar energy (only 2 per cent of President Nixon's proposed 1974 energy research and development budget is devoted to these sources, versus 73 per cent for nuclear energy). All in all, none of these research areas (including fission) is really mature and there is no clear-cut solution to the energy crisis among them, in terms of an energy delivery system which can be expected to take over from fossil fuels within the next 20 to 30 years. About 30 to 50 years is a better bet. This points out that we should be conserving present energy resources rather than expecting scientific miracles.

We need new energy sources, but we cannot expect miracles from the science of relatively immature research areas. Good and effective science needs considerable time, perhaps 20 to 30 years, to progress in new research areas to the point where substantial breakthroughs can be expected. We simply cannot expect that a crash program like the Manhattan Project will solve the energy crisis in the near future—for, contrary to the development of the fission bomb, many of the fundamental scientific principles underlying the successful and efficient development of new energy sources remain undiscovered at the present time. Science definitely has its limitations, in time as well as talent, and the layman must be educated to realize this.

The most plausible new energy source appears to be nuclear fission, so we must presumably learn to live with it—but this must be for only a short time, say 20 to 30 years. Fission, with all its built-in environmental dangers related to the production of radioactive byproducts, must be considered at best a very temporary solution to our energy crisis. We should probably also push the development of our remaining fossil fuels as another part of the temporary solution—but we must ensure that we leave ourselves with adequate reserves for other and possibly unanticipated future uses. In both cases, we must prevent vested interests from imposing these short term "solutions" as permanent facts of life. We should immediately begin sensible long term research and development programs on the apparently acceptable and desirable long term solutions such as solar energy.

Clearly we cannot legislate scientific miracles or great technological breakthroughs. As mentioned above, however, we can and

should strictly regulate the development of fission and of our remaining fossil fuels—this to ensure that these developments are indeed considered as only temporary, stop-gap measures. Finally, we should re-allocate and perhaps increase federal funding of research and development on the alternative energy sources such as fusion, geothermal and solar energy.

In the terms which we have used here to define the energy crisis, namely the growing shortages of conventional energy resources, the conflict between new resource development and environmental values, and the inadvisability of expecting scientific miracles to solve our problems, we will be called upon in the near future to exercise all our wisdom and foresight to prevent the crisis from becoming a catastrophe. We sincerely hope that the American people and the government, faced with this great problem, can reasonably and adequately meet the challenge. Our future as a nation depends on it.

G. R. JULIAN,
Chairman.
C. C. BRADLEY,
D. G. CAMERON,
R. T. ROBISCOE,
S. N. ROGERS,
V. H. SCHMIDT.

SHOUP GROUP: ENERGY CRISIS OUTLINE, APRIL 26, 1973

Some aspects of the so-called "energy crisis" are the following:

A. There is a growing national and worldwide shortage of conventional resources (especially fossil fuels) to produce "cheap" energy.

1. Problem. At present usage and growth rates, known world reserves of petroleum and natural gas are down to ~ 20 years supply, coal, ~ 110 years (depending on specific uses). Shortages in U.S. domestic reserves are worse (world politics?). There are no guaranteed alternative sources of energy yet developed which are economically and environmentally desirable.

2. Significance. Within several generations at most, the entire quality of life and modern civilization (which depends heavily on a somewhat profligate use of energy) may change drastically. We may have to return to a more primitive way of life (desirable?). Societal upheaval may be catastrophic.

3. Solution. Possibly accelerate development of new fossil fuel reserves (Alaskan fields, offshore drilling, etc.)—but consider this a decidedly short-term solution (impossible in long run). More sensibly, institute energy conservation measures (this buys some lead time). Try to avoid fission power as any kind of solution (except perhaps very short term). Increase research and development of alternative sources such as fusion, geothermal (both ~ long-term, say 100 years) and solar energy (probably the ultimate source from consideration of global heat balance).

4. Legislation. Carefully and stringently control present fossil fuel resource development (cost vs. value). Institute conservation programs (legally based; such as energy rationing, taxation on usage, improved building codes, etc.). Push gimmicks such as National Save Energy Week, six-day bicycle races, etc. Re-allocate federal funding of energy R&D (e.g., push solar energy development). The overall budget need not be increased.

B. There are difficulties in reconciling necessary (?) new energy resource development with various environmental issues.

1. Problem. All energy production "pollutes," at least thermally (solar energy least of all): Fossil fuels—well-known air pollution problems; nuclear fission—radioactive

waste disposal problems; nuclear fusion—radioactive waste disposal problems; nuclear fusion—mainly thermal; geothermal—thermal (should we tamper with geologic structures?); solar—thermal and visual (sic). All such pollution affects the environment, usually in harmful and sometimes unpredictable ways. This is related to the "quality of life" question.

2. Significance. We cannot afford much more pollution before some irreversible ecological disasters may occur (Appalachia, Lake Erie, greenhouse effect, etc.). Various subsystems in the ecosystem are already in trouble (raptor reproduction, sea otters, plankton balance, etc.). Ultimately, and perhaps very shortly, this will affect survival of man himself or, at the very least, his expected "quality of life."

3. Solution. How much new energy resource development is really necessary? In U.S.? World-wide? We should increase R&D on effects of energy production on ecosystems (e.g., invent the perfect cooling tower). Ultimately, solutions in this area will be in the nature of trade-offs. What is reasonable? We must decide on cost vs. value of our resources.

4. Legislation. Perhaps we should "experiment" with fairly strict and strictly enforced anti-pollution laws (air, water, land development—including strip-mining and power plant siting, etc.). This will buy some much needed lead-time to develop "reasonable" controls on new energy resource developments. Even strict laws will cause relatively minor inconveniences compared to the ecological disasters which could befall us in the absence of such laws.

C. Many people have misplaced faith in believing in scientific "miracles," i.e., technological breakthroughs which will save us.

1. Problem. Clearly we need new and clean energy sources in the near future (10-20 years). Can Science deliver? We are mainly developing nuclear fission (technology—good but not fool-proof [China syndrome]; what about radioactive waste transportation and disposal?), nuclear fusion (control of fusion is probably ~30 years away, if at all), and to a lesser extent coal gasification and liquefaction. We are all but neglecting solar and geothermal energy development. None of these research areas is really mature, and there is no clear-cut solution to the energy crisis among them which can reasonably be expected to take over in the next 10-20 years. About 50 years is a better bet.

2. Significance. We need new energy sources, but we cannot and must not expect miracles from Science in relatively immature research areas. Good and effective science needs considerable time (~10-30 years) to mature in a new area (e.g., plasma physics). We are not running a Manhattan Project type program related to solving the energy crisis at present—many of the fundamental scientific principles remain undiscovered as yet. Science definitely has its limitations (elephants laying eggs), and the layman must be educated to realize this.

3. Solution. The most plausible present alternative energy source is nuclear fission, so we may have to learn to live with it—but this must be for only a short time (~20 years). Fission at best must be considered as only a very temporary "solution" (actually a disease rather than a cure). Also push coal gasification as a very temporary "solution" (cost vs. value, again). In both cases, we must prevent vested interests from imposing these short-range "solutions" as permanent facts of life. We should begin sensible long-term R&D programs on fusion (not too bad at present), geothermal (worse), and solar (awful) energy sources.

4. Legislation. We cannot legislate scientific miracles or great technological breakthroughs. We can, however, rigidly control fission and remaining fossil fuel develop-

*Figures from Table 4 of "Limits to Growth" (Meadows, et al, 1972) p. 56.

ment—this should be done to ensure that they are, indeed, considered as only temporary, stopgap measures. Then we should reallocate and perhaps increase federal funding on the alternative energy sources (fusion, geothermal, solar).

Miscellaneous topics for consideration:

1. The energy "crisis" could become a "catastrophe" (Bradley).

2. Economic arguments: supply and demand, cost and value (Cameron).

3. Possible funding for MSU Environmental Forum (Robiscoe).

4. What are points of contact between the above and Nixon's recent energy policy speech?

5. Further meetings and contacts.

GORDON JULIAN,
Chairman.

RICK APPELGATE,
C. C. BRADLEY,
DAVE CAMERON,
DICK ROBISCOE,
SAM ROGERS,
V. HUGO SCHMIDT.

SUGGESTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS, APRIL 26, 1973

The establishment of a National Energy Conservation Commission:

Established as an arm of the legislature, such a Commission would evaluate the potential for and make recommendations concerning significant energy conservation possibilities in the private and public sectors. Where possible, profligate use of energy—e.g., flashing lights and signs, unnecessary use of privately owned automobiles, etc.—would be identified and alternative regulation, taxation or subsidy schemes designed to phase such usage out. Full public participation would be encouraged via public regional hearings and the dissemination of discussion drafts. To be most effective, the Commission should issue some preliminary conclusions within six months of its establishment with subsequent reports following at six-month intervals.

Reorientation of Federal Research Budget:

The Budget should be oriented away from its present, nearly total, commitment of funds to the investigation of fossil fuels and fission, toward such alternative sources of energy as geothermal, fusion, and solar energy. This would mean primarily a reallocation of funds rather than any sizable increase.

Enactment and implementation of a Utility Facilities Siting Act:

Such an Act would state clearly the federal policy that no energy extraction, conversion or transmission facilities are exempt from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. Key provisions would include, as well: no pre-emption of state activities or regulatory powers in those cases where existing state laws are more restrictive than federal minimum standards; the assurance of sufficient lead time for agency decision making by requiring full disclosure of a utility's future plans; and certification establishing public necessity and environmental compatibility of all facilities and energy development-related rail lines, transmission lines, aqueducts, etc.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND
NATURAL RESOURCES

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, as everyone is well aware, this country is

suffering a serious energy crisis. This problem is now being recognized in its entirety and efforts are being made by the administration and legislation is being introduced in the Congress to rectify this situation. I, myself, have introduced bills to ban oil import quotas, to create an international organization of oil-importing nations, and to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Energy. All these steps are aimed at getting a handle on the energy problem and at taking prompt action to alleviate it.

Over the weekend, we have received word that the President will shortly be announcing plans to create a Department of Energy and Natural Resources. I applaud this effort to consolidate and coordinate programs in the energy and natural resources fields.

There has, however, also been considerable talk of late about the possibility of increasing the Federal gasoline tax as one of the methods of solving our energy crisis and increasing gasoline supplies. I am wholeheartedly opposed to this proposal. It will place an onerous burden on consumers who are already being forced to pay excessive prices for gasoline and it makes no effort to get at the root of the problem and find solutions to the gasoline shortage.

There is an urgent and definite need to solve our energy problem and to solve it at the earliest possible time. To do this, we need sound, inventive, and workable proposals and programs. I do not believe that increasing the gasoline tax meets any of these criteria.

INFLATION—A VIRUS THAT SHOULD
HAVE BEEN DEALT WITH YESTER-
DAY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, just 8 weeks ago when this body considered the Economic Stabilization Act of 1973, I joined with those convinced that an immediate and total freeze on prices and wages was essential. I carried this conviction one step further in opposing the act itself, because it gave the President more authority of the type that he had not used.

Since that time, these concerns raised by those of us who felt an immediate freeze was the only course of action have been borne out. Just a few days ago each of us received a copy of the Economic Indicators for last month. This document, prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisors, by chart and figure clearly shows just what has happened.

During May wholesale prices in all commodities increased 2 percent. If you think 2 percent sounds like a small figure, project that on an annual basis. This is a 24-percent increase in the wholesale price index. This means that which cost \$4 today would cost \$5 next year. Stop and think for a minute what this means

to an elderly couple trying to struggle along on social security or for that matter to anyone on a fixed income.

In recent days we have heard a great deal of talk about food prices. It is true that food prices have increased at a faster rate during the past 6 months than any other commodities. But the charts show that food prices just now are reaching the levels already achieved by the cost of personal services in a steady but less spectacular growth pattern over the past 5 years. Industrial goods have gone up at a steady annual rate of 15 percent since the end of phase II last January. Thus the cost of living continues to grow and grow and grow, especially during the past few months since the end of phase II.

I recognize that controls, and especially an all-inclusive freeze, is not a permanent cure for inflation, but certainly the imposition of controls at this point could halt this skyrocketing inflation and give us, Congress and the Executive, breathing time to get the cards on the table, to get the truth to the public and to work out a solution. If the economy is to be healed, the people of this Nation must be persuaded that any cure for inflation will work. Otherwise there is no hope.

The first medicine which must be administered is the facts. The whole truth of the situation must be outlined. The President must explain what went wrong with our economy and then all segments of our society must work together to correct what went wrong. The President, to date, has not seen fit to do this. He needs no further authority to discuss with the public our economic facts of life. We gave him the authority to take emergency steps to cool the inflation. This authority has not been used. Since he has not seen fit to do this I urge my colleagues here in the Congress to take immediate action to do what I believe we should have done 8 weeks ago, impose an across-the-board, all-inclusive freeze on all aspects of our economy—prices, wages, interest rates, and everything. There is no other choice when you face a wholesale price index skyrocketing at the rate of 24 percent per year. The Congress must act.

In August of 1971, the President imposed a freeze which I believe was not sufficiently inclusive, but it was a freeze. At that time, the President said we had an economic crisis. Compare the 6 months prior to the imposition of that freeze and the situation in which we find ourselves today and we find inflationary trends today four times greater than in August of 1971.

Additionally it must be emphasized, as it was in the Washington Post a few days ago, that a "most striking difference between the present situation and 1971 is that over the past year wages have not contributed significantly to the inflation. But labor cannot be expected to exercise this kind of restraint much longer. It is perfectly apparent that business profits have benefited very sharply from the wave of price increases. In its efforts to correct this inequity, labor has no weapon but to increase the inflationary pressure by forcing higher pay scales."

Again let me say that our people can

not tolerate the type of inflation which we are experiencing today. This is especially cruel for those on fixed incomes. Let us act and act quickly to put a stop to this inflation, to bring back under control our economy.

RESULTS OF THE THIRD OPINION SURVEY OF THE 19TH OHIO DISTRICT

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year I sent out approximately 156,000 questionnaires to the citizens of the 19th Ohio Congressional District, which consists of Mahoning County and part of Trumbull County, including the cities of Youngstown, Warren, and Niles. I asked my constituents their opinion on some of the major issues facing our country and the Mahoning-Trumbull County area. More than 13,000 questionnaires were returned to me—many of them were completed by both husband and wife.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this time my newsletter containing the results of the survey for the information and consideration of my colleagues in the U. S. House of Representatives and the U. S. Senate and the President. The newsletter and questionnaire follow:

RESULTS OF THE THIRD OPINION SURVEY OF THE 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

Dear Friend:

In March of this year, you received a questionnaire from my office asking your opinion on some of the major issues that face our country. I am pleased to report the results of that questionnaire in this newsletter.

Of the approximately 156,000 questionnaires which were sent to the residents of the 19th Congressional District, more than 13,000 were completed and returned to me. Many of the questionnaires were filled out by both husbands and wives. I want to take this opportunity to thank everyone who participated for making the Third Opinion Survey a success.

By informing me of your opinion, I will be to better represent you in important matters pending before Congress. However, I will always make the final decision on these matters and assume full responsibility for every vote I cast. The results of the survey will be placed in the Congressional Record so that my colleagues in the House and Senate can also consider your views.

Since a questionnaire is necessarily limited both in the kinds of questions that can be asked and also in the kinds of answers that can be given, I would like to hear from you personally on issues which concern you most. You can be sure that I will pay careful attention to what you have to say. For a prompt reply, please write to my Washington office, where most of my congressional business is conducted, rather than to my residence.

FOOD PRICES

The high cost-of-living, particularly soaring food prices, continues to rob the pocketbook of every American. On February 27, 1973, I introduced a bill in Congress to roll back all food prices to the levels which existed on October 31, 1972. I also co-sponsored

a resolution which would create a committee to investigate the cost and availability of food to the American consumer. These proposals were pending in committee when the House took up a bill to extend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970. During the consideration of this bill, I voted for every amendment which would roll back food prices. Unfortunately, none of these amendments passed, and the bill was enacted into law with no rollback of any kind.

The President's March 29th announcement that he was imposing a ceiling on meat prices was a step in the right direction. However, under the Economic Stabilization Act, the President can, if he wishes, establish more effective controls on all food prices. I am very disappointed that he has been unwilling to take such action. Therefore, I have recently introduced a resolution urging the President to exercise his authority under the Economic Stabilization Act by immediately freezing all food prices at the retail level.

TAXES

Taxes were often cited as one of the most important issues facing the country, and I wholeheartedly agree. On January 3, 1973, the very first day of the 93d Congress, I joined with 48 of my colleagues in co-sponsoring a major tax reform bill. Our proposal would close eight loopholes in the Federal tax system amounting to \$9 billion annually. By stopping tax giveaways to wealthy individuals and big corporations, the Federal budget deficit would be reduced and a general tax increase would be unnecessary. As long as low- and middle-income people are paying more than their share of taxes while wealthy individuals and big corporations are paying little or no taxes, there can be no true tax justice in America.

In addition, I have co-sponsored a bill in Congress which will remove the unfair tax burden presently borne by single people and working couples. In 1972, millions of unmarried taxpayers were penalized because of their marital status. A similar problem exists for married people when both the husband and the wife work. My bill would establish a uniform rate structure for taxpayers so that earned income is taxed at the same graduated rate regardless of a person's marital status.

I have also introduced a bill to provide tax relief for the nation's Senior Citizens. This bill would provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax, in the case of an individual or a married couple, for amounts received as pensions, annuities or other retirement benefits. People living on a fixed income are the ones who suffer the most from inflation and skyrocketing prices. Meaningful tax relief for Senior Citizens is long overdue.

These three tax reform measures are pending in the House Ways and Means Committee, which is expected to act on tax reform legislation this year. I am hopeful that my proposals will be included in this legislation.

FOREIGN TRADE AND JOBS

Our country continues to be plagued by a large balance of trade deficit and high unemployment. Millions of American workers are concerned that foreign imports and growing U.S. investments overseas are threatening their job security. This is a serious problem in the Mahoning Valley.

To deal with this problem, I have co-sponsored legislation in Congress to limit excessive foreign imports and stem the flow of American jobs, factories and technology abroad. This legislation would provide the tools needed to prevent the unfair trade practices of foreign nations. The tax provisions in the bill are designed to discourage U.S. corporations from moving their factories out of the United States. In addition, this legislation would make it easier for American workers, businesses and communities to

receive economic assistance whenever they are seriously injured by foreign imports or plant relocations.

I have also reintroduced a bill to strengthen the provisions of the Buy American Act. This measure would require agencies and departments of the Federal Government to take into consideration the hidden costs of buying foreign-made products. Hidden costs include the increased unemployment, the loss of personal and corporate income, the loss of income tax revenue, and the increased unemployment compensation and welfare payments to American workers which might result from purchasing foreign-made products. I believe that the U.S. Government should award contracts to American companies to the greatest extent possible.

THE STUB CANAL

On May 18, 1973, I testified before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in support of an appropriation of funds for the Army Corps of Engineers to begin a study of the Mahoning-Beaver-Ohio Rivers Stub Canal. The Army Corps of Engineers advised me that it is capable of using \$10,000 on the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers Canalization Study in fiscal year 1974. The total cost of the study is estimated at \$470,000, and will take about 3½ years to complete. In my testimony before the subcommittee, I emphasized the great benefits a stub canal would have for the people of Eastern Ohio and Western Pennsylvania and the strong support for the stub canal in the 19th Ohio Congressional District.

Following my testimony, two Members of Congress from Pennsylvania testified in opposition to the stub canal feasibility study. Since part of the stub canal would be built in Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania's cooperation in this project is absolutely essential. Consequently, unless Pennsylvania officials can be persuaded to reconsider, the future of the stub canal is bleak.

LAKE MILTON DAM

In response to question No. 8 of the survey, many people indicated that the most important issue facing the Mahoning-Trumbull County area is the condition of Lake Milton Dam. Some persons also inquired about the possibility of Federal help to inspect, and, if necessary, to repair the dam. In July 1972, I wrote letters to the Army Corps of Engineers and to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in the Executive Office of the President. I was told that the Corps of Engineers completed a preliminary inspection of Milton Dam in November, 1971, and advised the City of Youngstown that the City should retain a qualified engineering firm to conduct a full investigation of possible safety defects in the dam. In addition, the Corps of Engineers informed me that Milton Dam is a local responsibility—the dam was built, and is owned, maintained and operated by the City of Youngstown, not the Federal Government. Consequently, no Federal money will be available to conduct the kind of detailed study required to determine the safety of Milton Dam.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

[In percent]

	His	Hers
1. Do you think the President has too much authority to act without the consent of Congress?		
Yes.....	64	53
No.....	31	40
Undecided.....	5	7
2. How would you rate mail service provided by the U.S. Postal Service, which was created in 1970?		
Excellent.....	2	1
Good.....	20	23
Fair.....	37	42
Poor.....	36	30
Undecided.....	5	

	His	Hers
3. President Nixon has stated he will request several billion dollars to reconstruct North Vietnam. Should Congress appropriate money for this purpose?		
Yes.....	8	14
No.....	86	80
Undecided.....	6	6
4. In a recent speech, President Nixon said that day by day our air is getting cleaner and our water pollution problems are being conquered. Do you agree?		
Yes.....	20	18
No.....	68	64
Undecided.....	12	18
5. What is your opinion of wage and price controls?		
Compulsory.....	81	74
Voluntary.....	4	3
None.....	8	5
Undecided.....	7	18

ATTITUDES CONCERNING THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

(In percent)

	Spend more	Spend less	Maintain same
Job training.....	35	24	41
Pollution control.....	58	10	32
Defense.....	12	54	34
Anticrime.....	63	6	31
Foreign aid.....	2	87	11
Housing.....	27	39	34
Health.....	59	12	29
Space.....	12	66	22
Day care.....	22	48	30
Education.....	52	21	27
Urban renewal.....	24	41	35
Antipoverty.....	28	42	30
Older Americans.....	63	5	32
Mass transit.....	48	23	29

MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING THE COUNTRY
(Ranked According to Number of Times Mentioned)

1. Inflation, High Cost-of-Living, Food Prices.
2. Crime and Drug Abuse.
3. Taxes.
4. Pollution.
5. Unemployment.
6. Government Spending.
7. Honesty in Government and Abuse of Presidential Power.
8. Poverty.
9. Health Care.
10. Miscellaneous.

MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING THE
MAHONING-TRUMBULL COUNTY AREA

(Ranked According to Number of Times Mentioned)

1. Crime and Drug Abuse.
2. Pollution.
3. Industrial Growth and Job Development.
4. Stub Canal.
5. Lake Milton Dam.
6. Education.
7. Prices.
8. Taxes.
9. Roads and Highways.
10. Water and Sewage.

A \$30 BILLION PRICE TAG FOR CALIFORNIANS ON NADER LAWSUIT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the following editorial appearing

on June 7 in the Daily Pilot newspaper of Orange County, Calif., should Ralph Nader succeed in abolishing nuclear power by his lawsuit, the cost to Californians alone would amount to \$30 billion during the period 1985-2000:

NUCLEAR POWER FEARS

Ralph Nader and the environmental organization Friends of the Earth have filed suit to shut down 20 nuclear power plants around the U.S., including the one at San Onofre just south of San Clemente.

Nader and Friends are asking a federal district court in Washington, D.C., to order the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) to revoke the operating licenses of the plants on safety grounds.

The suit follows by about a month a Stanford Research Institute (SRI) report urging the acceptance of nuclear energy to augment and replace fossil fuels in California.

If the expansion of nuclear power is not permitted, SRI said, California consumers will spend \$30 billion more between 1985 and 2000 for electricity from other sources. And that says nothing about the effects of pollution from those other sources.

Stanford Research also said that siting and safety criteria for nuclear plants are technical problems that can be resolved. The potential savings to Californians, who, realistically, will have to get their power from some source, would seem to make these efforts worthwhile.

The AEC currently is conducting lengthy hearings into whether existing requirements for emergency core cooling systems, i.e. back-up safety systems for nuclear power plants, should be modified. Friends of the Earth have been participating in those hearings with full rights to present technical evidence and question AEC experts. And when the AEC makes its determination, that decision will be subject to review by the courts.

So why the lawsuit, at best a negative approach? Why a moratorium when the safety record of licensed nuclear plants is excellent and when AEC procedures are carried out in public view and have proven workable?

One answer, perhaps, lies in the deep-seated fear most Americans harbor with respect to nuclear power—fears based on recollections of Hiroshima, Nagasaki and innumerable tests on remote deserts and atolls.

Maybe it is time to re-educate ourselves about nuclear power with an eye toward its great potential for positive influence in our lives.

LONG ISLAND VOTERS SHOW
STRONG OPINIONS ON FIRST
RONCALLO SURVEY

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the results of my first survey of the residents of the new Third Congressional District of New York. A total of 8,157 questionnaires were processed, of which 5,886 contained responses from two voters. The survey, therefore, expresses the views of 14,043 individuals.

I am pleased that the residents of my suburban Long Island district have the courage of their convictions. Rather than remain anonymous, fully 74 percent of those responding included their return

address. I am even more proud that nearly half took the time to include additional comments on the issues facing us in Congress.

In reviewing the survey, it is most appropriate to keep one statistic in mind. President Nixon was accorded an overwhelming victory last November when he won approximately 60 percent of the popular vote. When viewed in this light, the 10 issues on the questionnaire which registered at least 60 percent in favor of a particular course of action must be considered as representing strong views of the electorate. These opinions are listed below in descending order:

First. Elimination of agricultural subsidies in an effort to curb inflation—90.1 percent in favor.

Second. Removal of all import quotas in an effort to ease the energy crisis—82.6 percent in favor.

Third. Extension of U.S. territorial waters from the present 3 miles—81.2 percent in favor.

Fourth. Granting economic aid for the purpose of rebuilding North Vietnam—81.0 percent opposed.

Fifth. Changing the tax structure to relieve the elderly of the responsibility of property taxes—77.0 percent in favor.

Sixth. Extension of the U.S. claim of offshore rights from 3 miles to 200 miles—75.3 percent in favor.

Seventh. Reduction in the level of Federal spending on welfare—71.3 percent in favor.

Eighth. Granting unconditional amnesty to all draft dodgers—approximately 68.9 percent opposed.

Ninth. Increased spending on law enforcement—63.6 percent in favor.

Tenth. Increased spending on mass transit—61.3 percent in favor.

The survey was divided into four sections and the responses were tabulated in similar fashion. In section one the voters were asked to comment on proposed changes in the level of Federal spending in 12 categories. Three responses for each item were possible: "more," "less," and "same." A count was also kept for each item of the number of persons who had no opinion. Both the absolute number and percentage of responses are tallied for each category.

Spending for public housing for the elderly, mass transit, law enforcement, and the environment were the items on the Federal budget which the majority of voters thought should be increased. However the most prominent opinion, expressed by 71 percent of the voters, was a decrease in the level of welfare spending. The remaining categories in this section did not register a majority opinion in favor of changing the present level of spending.

In section two, voters were asked whether they were in favor of legislation in seven different areas. Two responses "yes" and "no" were possible. As before a count was kept of those who registered no opinion. Both absolute and percentage figures were tabulated.

Voters indicated definite preferences in five areas. They were emphatically in favor of:

First. Changing the tax structure to relieve the elderly of the responsibility of property taxes;

Second. Eliminating agricultural subsidies in an effort to curb the rise in food prices;

Third. Eliminating the Office of Economic Opportunity and other social programs in an effort to curb inflation; and

Fourth. Removing all oil import quotas in an effort to ease the energy crisis.

They were emphatically opposed to instituting a tax credit for families

whose children attend private or parochial schools.

In section 3, voters were asked to rank different policies concerning the question of amnesty for draft dodgers. It is apparent that people are substantially against the granting of unconditional amnesty. There is an almost equal division of opinion between those who would give no amnesty at all and those who would grant amnesty on the condition of an equal amount of time being spent in public service.

Section 4 is similar in structure to sec-

tion 2. The voters have expressed themselves strongly on three issues. They favor:

First. Extension of U.S. territorial waters from the present 3 miles, and
Second. Extension of the U.S. claim of offshore rights from 3 to 200 miles.

They oppose:

The United States granting economic aid for the purpose of rebuilding North Vietnam.

A copy of the complete results of the survey appears below:

VOTER SURVEY, 3D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW YORK, SPRING 1973, HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

SECTION I

[The administration has announced its determination to keep a ceiling on Federal spending of \$269,000,000,000 this year to help curb inflation. Would you favor increased, decreased, or the same level of spending in the following areas]

	More		Less		Same		No opinion	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A. Defense.....	1,834	13.1	6,521	46.4	4,950	35.2	738	5.3
B. Social security.....	5,470	39.0	1,385	9.9	6,446	45.9	742	5.3
C. Medicare.....	5,104	36.3	1,650	11.7	6,409	45.6	880	6.3
D. Veterans' benefits.....	4,420	31.5	1,333	9.5	7,327	52.2	963	6.9
E. Low-income public housing.....	2,847	20.3	6,051	43.1	4,095	29.2	1,050	7.5
F. Public housing for the elderly.....	7,690	54.8	1,365	9.7	4,040	28.8	948	6.8
G. Highways and roads.....	2,100	15.0	5,661	40.3	5,436	38.7	846	6.0
H. Mass transit.....	8,607	61.3	1,626	11.6	2,934	20.9	876	6.2
I. Criminal law enforcement.....	8,926	63.6	584	4.2	3,648	26.0	885	6.3
J. Pollution and environment.....	8,127	57.9	1,279	9.1	3,818	27.2	819	5.8
K. Health care.....	6,359	45.3	1,607	11.4	5,114	36.4	963	6.9
L. Welfare.....	772	5.5	10,012	71.3	2,406	17.1	853	6.1

SECTION II

	Yes		No		No opinion	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Would you favor—						
1. Changing of the tax structure to relieve the elderly of the responsibility of property taxes.....	10,808	77.0	2,631	18.7	604	4.3
2. Institution of a tax credit for families whose children attend parochial or private schools.....	5,261	37.5	8,306	59.1	476	3.4
3. Elimination of agricultural subsidies in an effort to curb the rise in food prices.....	12,652	90.1	720	5.1	671	4.8
4. Elimination of the Office of Economic Opportunity and other social programs in an effort to curb inflation.....	8,341	59.4	4,594	32.7	1,108	7.9
5. Granting the President standby authority to impose wage and price controls, without congressional approval, throughout his 2d term.....	7,015	50.0	6,336	45.1	692	4.9
6. The removal of all oil import quotas in an effort to ease the energy crisis.....	11,601	82.6	1,388	9.9	1,054	7.5
7. Legislation prohibiting the use of Federal funds in the construction of the proposed Oyster Bay-Rye Ridge.....	6,689	47.6	6,453	46.0	901	6.4

SECTION III

[As the new peace settlement in Vietnam takes effect and America's role is ended, the question of amnesty for draft dodgers must be dealt with. Please give a numerical rating to the following courses of action, with 1 being the most desirable and 4 being least desirable]

	1		2		3		4		No rank	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Granting of unconditional amnesty to all.....	1,011	7.2	475	3.4	1,089	7.8	5,590	39.8	5,878	41.9
2. Granting of amnesty on the condition that the same amount of time be spent in public service—Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.....	3,008	21.4	2,034	14.5	1,491	10.6	1,837	13.1	5,673	40.4
3. Granting of a pardon to those who are serving prison sentences for refusing to serve.....	1,422	10.1	2,637	18.8	1,898	13.5	2,202	15.7	5,884	41.9
4. No amnesty at all.....	3,792	27.0	626	4.5	725	5.2	3,348	23.8	5,552	39.5

SECTION IV

	Yes		No		No opinion	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Do you approve—						
1. Of the Vanick bill which would prohibit more favorable trade arrangements with the Soviet Union unless freedom of emigration is permitted for Soviet citizens.....	6,344	45.2	5,846	41.6	1,853	13.2
2. Of extension of U.S. territorial waters from the present 3 miles.....	11,409	81.2	1,505	10.7	1,129	8.0
3. Of the United States granting economic aid for the purpose of rebuilding North Vietnam.....	1,803	12.8	11,378	81.0	862	6.1
4. Extension of the U.S. claim of offshore rights—fishing, etc.—from 3 miles to 200 miles.....	10,569	75.3	2,088	14.9	1,386	9.9

HONORING MEN AND WOMEN WHO SERVED IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of North Carolina has passed a joint resolution honoring the men and women who served their country in the Vietnam war.

All of us in this Chamber, I am sure, share the sentiments expressed in the assembly's resolution, and I insert it now in the RECORD for the information and consideration of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

A joint resolution honoring the men and women who served our country in the conflict in Southeast Asia

Whereas, we recognize that Freedom is not solely a gift or blessing from God. That while God does bless Freedom-loving people everywhere, Freedom is a stewardship and must be preserved by those who would choose to remain free; and

Whereas, America, one of the great free nations of all times, has been richly blessed by God; and

Whereas, America has always had an abundance of men and women who would live up to their stewardship and come to their Country's aid whenever its safety was in danger and the Freedom of its people at stake; and

Whereas, America has had to assume much of the difficult role of preserving the Freedom for the free world; and

Whereas, our recent involvement in Southeast Asia was an effort to assist the people of that portion of the world to remain free; and

Whereas, three of our Presidents have committed our armed forces to aid these people; and

Whereas, many thousands of young men and women have answered the call to leave their families, their jobs, and have put their futures and even their lives on the line in an effort to assist Freedom-loving peoples; and

Whereas, this involvement in Southeast Asia was not always popular with elements of our society but, notwithstanding, these young men and women continued to serve while others chose not to do so; and

Whereas, the vast majority of these young men and women have served honorably in the Armed Services during this long period of involvement; and

Whereas, our involvement is fast coming to an end; and

Whereas, the members of the General Assembly wish to offer their sincere and grateful appreciation to these young men and women for their answer to the call to assist in preservation of Freedom;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the great State of North Carolina goes on record honoring these young men and women for their dedicated service during the trying times of our Southeast Asian involvement.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, Richard Nixon; the Governor of the State of North Carolina, James Holshouser; all members of the North Carolina Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C.; the State Headquarters of all Veterans' Organizations

in the State of North Carolina; and the National Commanders of each North Carolina Veterans' Organization.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall become effective upon ratification.

THE 1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 2

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of Members, their staff, and others who may be interested, a few excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 2, as of May 24," prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

This report reflects the Treasury revenue revisions of May 1, indicating a deficit of \$5.7 billion for fiscal 1974—a reduction of \$7 billion from the original deficit estimate of \$12.7 billion. There are indications that further upward revenue revisions may be forthcoming.

Of course, to date, the report shows little completed action on spending legislation. I should note, however, that it shows that the Congress already has some 15 legislative measures under consideration which, if enacted, would provide very substantial increases in "backdoor" and mandatory spending authorizations.

In the House we have acted on six such pieces of legislation which would increase budget authority by a net of \$1.6 billion in excess of the 1974 budget requests, with outlay impact of at least \$165 million plus undetermined amounts due to increased contract authority.

The Senate has acted on 12 measures which would increase budget authority by \$1.4 billion in excess of the 1974 budget requests, with 1974 outlay impact of at least \$500 million plus undetermined amounts due to increased contract authority.

Appropriation legislation scored in this report pertains largely to 1973 supplemental bills. However, we expect to move very quickly on the regular appropriation bills in the next few weeks.

The excerpts that I am inserting here include the scorekeeping highlights from the text of the report, the main scorekeeping table, and some summaries and analysis of the budget requests.

These text excerpts point up some of the new material, being incorporated in the report for the first time this year, relating to the controllability of the budget through current actions by the Congress, analysis of the unexpended balances in the "pipeline", analysis of the so-called budgetary reserves—impoundments—and some review and reconciliation of the 1973 estimates.

I would add that these scorekeeping reports, now in their sixth year, are the

most comprehensive current source of information on what is happening legislatively to the President's budgetary recommendations. They are authoritative, being carefully prepared by an experienced staff dedicated to complete objectivity, reporting the facts as best they can be ascertained. Some estimating is necessary, especially in regard to legislative actions affecting outlays—expenditures.

The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM 1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 2, AS OF MAY 24, 1973

SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

Fiscal year 1974

Appropriation Bills

To date, completed action on appropriation legislation reflects an increase of \$1.3 million in 1974 outlays under the 1973 Urgent Supplemental bill. In connection with the extension of the continuing resolution to cover vetoed Labor-HEW appropriation bill activities to the end of the current fiscal year, there may be a potential outlay increase due to inaction on certain 1973 budget amendments proposing reductions in these items.

Incomplete action on the Legislative Appropriation Bill—the only regular 1974 bill introduced to date—reflects House reduction of \$16.9 million in budget authority and about \$16 million in outlays. A relatively minor 1974 outlay change is indicated by incomplete House and Senate action on the Second Supplemental bill.

Legislative Bills—"Backdoor" and Mandatory

To date there is no completed action on legislative bills carrying backdoor or mandatory authorizations affecting fiscal 1974. However, there are 15 such bills which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress. House action pertaining to 6 measures would increase budget authority by \$1.6 billion, having an outlay impact of at least \$165 million excluding the undetermined effect of increased contract authority. Senate action pertaining to 12 measures would increase budget authority by \$1.4 billion, having an outlay impact of at least \$500 million plus undetermined amounts due to increased contract authority.

The scored backdoor or mandatory impact of these legislative bills includes the following major programs and amounts in excess of the budget:

Highway programs: additional backdoor contract authority of \$1,124 million as passed by the House, and \$414 million as passed by the Senate. The 1974 outlay impact is undetermined. (Pending conference.)

Traffic safety: additional backdoor contract authority of \$915 million as passed by the House and \$245 million as passed by the Senate. The 1974 outlay impact is undetermined. (Pending conference.)

Airport development: additional backdoor contract authority of \$280 million as passed by the House and \$60 million as reported by conference committee. The 1974 outlay impact is undetermined.

Veterans national cemeteries: mandatory veterans benefits of \$97 million in budget authority and outlays as passed by the House, and \$110 million as passed by the Senate. (Pending conference.)

Other veterans benefits: two bills authorizing mandatory veterans health benefits totaling \$248 million in budget authority and outlays as passed by the Senate.

Revenue Legislation

To date the only legislation affecting 1974 revenue relates to the proposed increase in

trust fund taxes to finance Railroad Retirement benefits. In its action on this legislation the House failed to provide the \$612 million in additional trust fund receipts. (Also automatic budget authority reduction.)

Fiscal year 1973

Appropriation Bills

Completed action on the Urgent Supplemental reflects an increase of \$1.8 million in budget authority and about \$500,000 in outlays. In connection with the final action extending the continuing resolution to cover vetoed Labor-HEW appropriation bill activities to the end of the current fiscal year, the Congress did not act on certain budget amendments proposed for these items. Although this inaction has the effect of increasing budgeted authority by \$966 million, due to the lateness in the fiscal year it is

unlikely to have any significant effect on the 1973 budget outlay totals.

Incomplete action on the Second Supplemental indicates reduction in budget authority, which is more than offset by inaction on proposed rescissions. At this time action on this bill reflects an estimated outlay reduction of \$225 million as passed by the House and about \$185 million as pending in the Senate.

Legislative Bills—"Backdoor" and Mandatory There is incomplete action on two bills carrying backdoor contract authority in excess of the 1973 budget estimates. The outlay impact of these increases on both 1973 and 1974 is as yet undetermined. The following programs are involved:

Highway programs: additional contract authority of \$1,575 million in the House version and \$1,324 million in the Senate version. (Pending conference.)

Traffic safety programs: additional contract authority of \$685 million in the House version and \$405 million in the Senate version. (Pending conference.)

Impoundment Restoration

In addition, there has been legislation to restore 1973 funds impounded for four rural loan and grant programs. Impoundment restoration legislation has been enacted relating to the rural emergency loan program, and this is expected to have the effect of increasing 1973 outlays by \$154 million. Another bill has been vetoed and one is in conference. Any scorekeeping on impoundment legislation at this time is tentative, and the possible further impact on the 1974 budget estimates cannot be determined pending action on the related current appropriation bills.

SCOREKEEPING TABLES

TABLE NO. 1.—ESTIMATED EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 93D CONGRESS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF MAY 24, 1973)

(In thousands of dollars)

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House (1)	Senate (2)	Enacted (3)	House (4)	Senate (5)	Enacted (6)
Fiscal year 1974:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1974 budget):						
1973 Labor-HEW appropriations (continuing resolution, Public Law 93-9)				(1)	(1)	(1)
Legislative branch (H.R. 6691)	-16,900			-16,000		
Urgent supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 93-25)		(2)		+1,300	+1,300	+1,300
2nd supplemental, 1973 (H.R. 7447)				-25,000	+75,000	
Subtotal, appropriation bills	-16,900			-39,700	+76,300	+1,300
Legislative bills (changes from the 1974 budget): "Backdoor" spending authorizations (not requiring further appropriation action):						
Federal Financing Bank (S. 925)			Indefinite		NA	
Federal-aid Highway Act of 1973 (contract authority) (S. 502)	+1,124,500	+414,270	(3)	NA	NA	(3)
Airport development (contract authority) (S. 38)		+280,000	+60,000		NA	NA
Traffic safety (contract authority) (S. 893, S. 502)	+915,000	+245,000	(3)	NA	NA	(3)
Subtotal, "backdoor"	+2,039,500	+939,270	+60,000			
Mandatory spending authorizations (requiring payments over which there is little or no control through the appropriation process):						
Uniform relocation assistance (S. 261)		+95,000			+95,000	
Eucalyptus tree fire hazard (S. 1697)		+16,000			+16,000	
Peanut support (H.R. 6646)	+8,600			+8,600		
Winema Forest expansion (H.R. 3867)	+60,000			+60,000		
Public safety officers death gratuity (S. 15)		+6,000			+6,000	
Public safety officers group life insurance (S. 33)		+20,000			+20,000	
Victims of crime—Payments (S. 300)		+7,000			+7,000	
Veterans' drug and alcohol treatment (S. 284)		+144,136			+144,136	
Veterans' dependents' health care (S. 59)		+103,800			+103,800	
Veterans' national cemeteries (S. 49, H.R. 2828)	+96,720	+110,000	(3)	+96,720	+110,000	(3)
Railroad retirement (revenue) (H.R. 7200)	-612,000			NA		
Subtotal, mandatory	-446,680	+501,936		+165,320	+501,936	
Subtotal, legislative bills	+1,592,820	+1,441,206	+60,000	+165,320	+501,936	
Total, fiscal year 1974	+1,575,920	+1,441,206	+60,000	+125,620	+578,236	+1,300
Fiscal year 1973:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
1973 Labor-HEW appropriations (continuing resolution, Public Law 93-9)	+966,000	+966,000	+966,000	(1)	(1)	(1)
Urgent supplemental, 1973 (Public Law 92-25)	+1,800	+1,800	+1,800	+500	+500	+500
Second supplemental, 1973 (H.R. 7447)	-326,196	+41,415		-225,000	-185,000	
Inaction on proposed rescissions	+382,888	+382,888				
Legislative bills (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
Federal-aid Highway Act (contract authority) (S. 502)	+1,575,000	+1,323,550	(3)	NA	NA	(3)
Traffic safety (contract authority) (S. 893, S. 502)	+685,000	+405,000	(3)	NA	NA	(3)
Legislative bills directing restoration of certain program reductions (impoundments) contemplated in the budget (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
Rural electrification loans (Public Law 93-32)	NA		NA	NA	+84,000	NA
Rural environmental assistance (REAP) (H.R. 2107)		(3)		+41,000	+51,000	NA
Rural emergency loans (Public Law 93-24)				+154,000	+154,000	+154,000
Rural water and sewer grants (H.R. 3298)			(3)	+50,000	+50,000	(3)
Total, fiscal year 1973	+3,284,492	+3,037,823	+967,800	+20,500	+154,500	+154,500

¹ The continuing resolution extended funding for items in the vetoed 1973 Labor-HEW appropriation bill to June 30, 1973, in lieu of processing another regular 1973 appropriation bill in this session. The revised 1973 budget estimates showed appropriations for these items at the level requested last session, and also proposed amendments to the then-pending requests. The level of the budget authority under the continuing resolution, the same as provided last session, is estimated to be about \$1,000,000,000 higher than shown in the budget, and no action is contemplated on the proposed amendments to reduce budget authority by \$966,000,000, with potential outlay effect of \$470,000,000 in 1973 and \$391,000,000 in 1974. The scorekeeping above shows the impact of inaction on the proposed amendments in budget authority.

² Committee action.

³ Subject to or in conference.

⁴ Does not reflect any possible effect on outlays resulting from denial of transfer authority requested for Defense Department.

⁵ Would provide for program continuation at higher level than requested, but would remove program from budget.

⁶ Enacted figure used for comparability.

⁷ Vetoed.

NA.—Cost estimate not available or undetermined at this time.

EDUCATION, AMERICA'S BEST INVESTMENT

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, America can make no better investment than in education, in my opinion. In addition to being a strong advocate of education in general, I have long been a sincere and active supporter of the University of Nebraska in particular.

My parochial interest in the University of Nebraska is due to its largest campus—Lincoln campus—being in the district I represent, to my having graduated from its law school, to my having served as local and national president of its alumni society and to my service as a visiting master of the campus.

There are many reasons why I point with pride to the University of Nebraska. Perhaps the most notable is because of the outstanding man who heads it, President Durward B. Varner. He is a nationally recognized educational leader. In our State, he has not only been tremendously effective in advancing the stature of the University of Nebraska but also has been a powerful force in harnessing the natural resources and promoting the cultural life of our State.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider legislation that will affect higher education, I believe we will benefit by reading a letter to me from President Varner:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THONE: I am sure you have had more mail than you would like on the problems which may result from President Nixon's proposed budget. However, you should have in your hands our analysis of the impact on the University of Nebraska.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

On all campuses, there will be significant realignments of student aid caused by a change from Economic Opportunity Grants and National Defense Students Loans to the Basic Education Opportunity Grants. We are concerned in this area primarily because the decision is not yet made on the number of the BEOGs and the method of selection. We are concerned also that the confusion which the students will face this summer may be overpowering and cause some of them to stay home out of frustration.

The University of Nebraska—Lincoln campus estimates it will lose \$792,782 from NDSL funds and \$699,308 in EOG funds next year; UNO estimates a loss of \$182,000 from NDSL and \$61,500 from EOG. Because the BEOG funds are available to the student who may use the grant anywhere he wishes, we are unable to estimate how much (how many students will bring their grant to the University) will come to the University from that source.

CAPITATION GRANT

Under the present legislation the University receives specific funds for teaching students in specific fields; those funds which are excluded from the President's budget are as follows:

Social Work	\$200,000
Gerontology	185,000
Nursing	74,000
Pharmacy	181,000
Dentistry	50,000
	690,000

If the budget now being discussed is approved as is, the University would lose this year the Dentistry funds (\$50,000), one-half of the Nursing funds (\$37,000) and one-half of the Pharmacy funds (\$90,500). Then next year the balance of the Nursing and Pharmacy funds and the full funding for Social Work (\$200,000) and Gerontology (\$185,000) would go. Incidentally the funds lost in Social Work will cause a reduction in the faculty of 40% and in Gerontology of approximately 60%. It will be very difficult, if not impossible, to find funds to replace even a minor portion of those lost.

I need not tell you how important all of the above programs are to the State and the University.

LAND GRANT COLLEGE FUNDS

As you know the President has suggested once again doing away with the continuing funds for teaching in the Land Grant Colleges. In our case that amounts to \$165,854 per year. His rationale for the elimination, as I understand it, is the money now is such an insignificant part of the total for the Land Grant College that we can forego the money. It is true we will do the best we can with the resources available, but it seems to me that the \$165,854 of Federal funds for the Land Grant Colleges of America is a symbol the Congress ought to continue. It is a continuous reminder to us all of why Congress in its wisdom more than 110 years ago established these colleges for the sons and daughters of rural America and set a course of public higher education which is the envy of all who are interested in education anywhere.

AGRICULTURE FUNDS

Our people estimate that we would lose next year \$322,200 which now is spent in agriculturally related teaching, research and extension, broken down as follows:

Hatch formula funds	\$186,639
Hatch regional funds	73,572
McIntire-Stennis funds (forestry)	6,208
Smith-Lever funds (extension)	46,300
Expanded nutrition funds	9,481
Total	322,200

In our State in which agriculture is our chief industry, these funds are especially important. We hope very much they will be restored and we can continue to serve the agricultural community as we have in the past.

On this item alone, I could write pages, but I know our people have written you already and I shall not repeat what they have said.

RESEARCH GRANT FUNDS

The President's budget puts in jeopardy a long series of grant funds for which our faculty and staff compete each year. Our estimates of the diminution of those to be received varies between \$1,300,000 and \$1,700,000. If the current budget proposal is approved without change, substantial amounts of research money and resources will not come to the University.

All of the above is not to ask that you work toward restoration of the status quo for we all know there needs to be a reordering of priorities and some reallocation of resources. What it is designed to do is to give you a picture of what the current proposal would mean to the University of Nebraska.

It seems to me some compromise between the current Presidential proposal and the Congress and the academic community would be in order. As you know I serve on the executive committee of the National Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities. In every meeting this year, the President's budget proposal has been the number one topic of discussion. Our executive director, Dr. Ralph Huitt, is knowledgeable about our concerns, and I hope very

much he and his associates will be given an opportunity to speak honestly to those who are going to be making the final decisions on these matters.

NAVY'S JOHNNY JOHNSON LENDS ANOTHER HELPING HAND

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, his many friends are very pleased that James E. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs has been installed as national vice president of the Boy Scouts of America on the 25th of May.

Johnny Johnson, is the first Negro to be elected a top officer of the Nation's largest youth organization. He began his volunteer Scouting service as a district vice chairman, and is a member of the advisory board of the National Capitol Area Council. He has been a member of the BSA's national executive board since 1969.

Born in Madison, Ill., the Secretary has an A.A. degree in real estate law from Santa Ana College and a B.S. in business administration from George Washington University. He has completed his requirements for a masters degree in business administration and received an honorary doctor's degree.

During World War II, Johnson enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps, advancing to the position of squadron adjutant. He was later supply fiscal officer and legal officer. He was graduated from Naval Justice School which qualified him to perform as counsel at special court-martials. Johnny, as he is known to thousands of admirers throughout the country, retired from the Marine Corps in 1965 as a chief warrant officer. He established several firsts for members of his race during his 21 years of active duty, including:

First to become master sergeant in the Marine Corps.

First to become warrant officer in the Marine Corps.

First to retire from the Marine Corps as an officer.

From 1965 to 1967 Secretary Johnson was associated with Prudential Life Insurance Co. in Anaheim, Calif. In that endeavor he became the first Negro to sell \$1 million of life insurance in 2½ months, and the first insurance salesman of any race to sell \$5 million of life insurance in his first year.

In 1967 Johnson was appointed by Governor Reagan to be director of the California State Department of Veterans' Affairs, and served in that capacity until, on January 21, 1969, President Nixon named him to be Commissioner and Vice Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission. In April 1971 the President nominated Johnson to his present post as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He has continued his string of firsts during his years of public service at the State and National level. He has been: The

first Negro to hold a cabinet-level office in California; the first Negro member of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and is the first Negro Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The Secretary is deeply involved in community service; his activities include being chairman of the District of Columbia Health and Welfare Council, past president of the Orange County, Calif., Chapter, Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital; member of the board of directors of United Christian Centers and member of the board of directors of the United Givers Fund.

WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SYSTEM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in each of the past two Congresses I have introduced legislation providing for the inclusion of several river systems in California into the national wild and scenic rivers system.

Again, today I am introducing a wild and scenic rivers bill which will provide for several additions to this system.

As in the past, I have included the Eel, Klamath, and Trinity Rivers of northern California. I have also included the entire Smith River system which runs into extreme northwestern California from Oregon and I have included the North Fork and Middle Fork of the San Joaquin River in central California.

Mr. Speaker, each of these rivers is worthy of inclusion in our wild rivers system, either in their wild, scenic or recreational status, a status to be determined by careful study.

The need to preserve the Eel, Klamath, and Trinity Rivers has been amply demonstrated by the fact that the California Legislature passed legislation which was signed by Governor Reagan which provides for a moratorium on the construction of high dams on these rivers.

While my bill goes farther in that it places these rivers under indefinite protected status, I view the California Legislature's action as a key indicator of public support for long-term preservation of the last free-flowing river systems in the State.

The Smith River is an integral part of the north coastal river system in California. It is presently undeveloped and unthreatened. Inclusion into the wild rivers system would insure its pristine nature.

Mr. Speaker, the San Joaquin River is overused and is polluted along much of its course. However, its headwaters are untouched and run through some of the most spectacular parts of the High Sierra.

Mr. Speaker, in this redrawn wild rivers bill I would like to include the Middle Fork of the San Joaquin and the North Fork from its origin to Mammoth Po/1.

This wilderness land can be further protected by yet another bill which I have introduced in this Congress. This bill provides for the creation of the San Joaquin Wilderness. This new wilderness area would be the last link in a chain of wilderness areas from Yosemite National Park to Sequoia National Park and would provide the ultimate protection for the John Muir Trail across the Sierra Crest.

Two other major California rivers which deserve consideration for inclusion into the wild river system are the American River and the Kings River. I hesitated to include the American River in this package, because of pending litigation on flow requirements. Inclusion of the American could well jeopardize the fate of the other rivers which deserve immediate attention. With regard to the Kings River, it is the contention of many local conservation and public officials that the river should be included in the national wild and scenic rivers system. I feel that the matter of its inclusion should be given further study.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hearings that the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee is holding this week on additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, I would urge the members of that subcommittee to seriously consider these worthy additions:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-542), to include the Smith River, the Middle Fork and North Fork of the San Joaquin River, the Eel, Klamath, and Trinity Rivers as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 3(a) of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 is amended to include:

"(1) The Smith River, California, in its entirety. To be administered by the Secretary of Interior.

"(2) The Middle Fork and North Fork of the San Joaquin River, California, from their origins to Mammoth Pool Reservoir. To be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(3) Klamath River, California. The main stem from one hundred yards below Iron Gate Dam to the Pacific Ocean; the Scott River from the mouth of Mill Creek west of Fort Jones to the river mouth near Hamburg; the Salmon River from Cecilville Bridge to the river mouth near Somesbar; the North Fork of the Salmon River from the intersection of the river with the south boundary of the Marble Mountain Wilderness Area to the river mouth; to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"4. TRINITY RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—The main stem from one hundred yards below Lewiston Dam to the river mouth at Weitchpec; the North Fork of the Trinity from the intersection of the river with the southern boundary of the Salmon-Trinity Primitive Area downstream to the river mouth at Helena; New River from the intersection of the river with the southern boundary of the Salmon-Trinity Primitive Area downstream to the river mouth near Burnt Ranch; South Fork of the Trinity from the junction of the river with Highway 36 to the river mouth near Salyer; to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(5) EEL RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Main stem from one hundred yards below Van Arsdale Dam to the Pacific Ocean; the South Fork

of the Eel from the mouth of Section Four Creek near Branscomb to the river mouth below Weott; Middle Fork of the Eel from the intersection of the river with the southern boundary of the Middle Eel-Yolla Bolly Wilderness Area to the river mouth at Dos Rios; North Fork of the Eel from the Old Gilman Ranch downstream to the river mouth near Ramsey; Van Duzen River from Dinsmores Bridge downstream to the river mouth near Fortuna; to be administered by the Department of the Interior."

LEAA HELPS DALLAS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the city of Dallas—like so many other cities in the past year—has experienced a most welcome reduction in crime, and I wish to give credit where credit is due. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has been a principal factor in that reduction.

Since 1970, crime in Dallas has been reduced by 10.5 percent—which is a very dramatic decrease. I doubt sincerely that this could have been accomplished without the financial assistance of LEAA, and that opinion is shared by many Dallas officials.

Since the Federal crime control program began, Dallas has received \$9.5 million from LEAA and has used a substantial amount of the money to improve police services.

These improvements were very crucial; they were profound and they were long overdue. They were needed to make the police department more responsive to the community and to enable officers to meet new and intense demands.

It has not been too long ago that our policemen lacked the proper training to do an adequate job. In terms of technology, they lagged behind—using nearly the same tools they had used at the turn of the century.

All that has changed now. Today the demands upon our police departments are far more intense, and it is imperative that they be especially well equipped and highly trained.

Nowhere has this concept been emphasized and implemented more effectively than in Dallas. With the help of LEAA I am proud to say the Dallas law enforcement system has experienced very gratifying results.

Let me cite a few examples for my colleagues. In 1968 a total of 15 members of our 1,500-member police force held college degrees. Today, 192 officers hold degrees. We have 1,052 enrolled in college, and the education level is such that the average number of college credits for each officer is about 52.

This has been accomplished through an incentive pay program financed by LEAA, and through LEAA's academic assistance program which helps police officers pay for their college studies.

Under the incentive program, each officer receives \$4 a month for each 3-

hour course he completes. An officer with a bachelor's degree receives up to an extra \$160 each month.

Another significant step in progress has been made through better utilization of our forces. Education and training are meaningless if a police agency does not make full use of its manpower resources. All departments make an effort to avoid wasting highly trained officers on purely routine duties, no matter how necessary they are.

One way the Dallas department has accomplished this goal is to create a police expeditor unit to free field units from answering routine calls. This unit was created in 1970 with LEAA financing. It takes calls over the phone and, if the complainant agrees, handles the complaint with a followup investigation not requiring an immediate, preliminary response by the field unit. Police officials in Dallas estimate that this unit so far has helped save more than 27,000 hours of field personnel time—freeing the officers involved to wage a more aggressive war on crime.

Another successful LEAA-financed program involves the hiring of police cadets from the 17- to 19-year-old age group. In 3 years the city has hired 58 cadets; 24 have been promoted to patrolman.

The bulk of the financial assistance which Dallas has received from LEAA has been devoted to what is called the high impact anticrime program.

Some \$2 million is being used to put 12 new crime control teams on the street. These units will be frontline troops in the war on street crime and burglary. They will operate in areas of the city where these crimes are most prevalent. Officers in the units will be especially trained to control murder, rape, robbery, and burglary.

It is the goal of Dallas officials to reduce these crimes by 20 percent in the next 5 years. That is an ambitious goal, but, by utilizing new deployment techniques rather than simply saturating the areas with officers, the officials believe they can accomplish it.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with pride about the efforts of Dallas to reduce crime. I hasten to add that I do not believe we should relax our efforts in any way. Unfortunately there is nothing to indicate that crime will spiral down as it spiraled up during the 1960's.

We would be doing a terrible disservice to our cities and to the country as a whole if we relaxed our efforts in any way. We do not have a lid on crime. We do not have it licked.

We can meet these challenges but it will take coordinated Federal, State, and local effort. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is a most critical part of that coordinated effort.

LEAA has been responsible for much of our progress in the past few years. We must not withdraw it from the struggle.

ENABLING THE AVERAGE FAMILY TO OBTAIN MORTGAGE FINANCING DURING PERIODS OF TIGHT MONEY AND HIGH INTEREST RATES BY DIRECT FEDERAL LOANS AT RATES NO HIGHER THAN 6½ PERCENT

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as interest rates continue to soar, more and more average income families which need good housing, and which could afford to buy homes if mortgage terms were reasonable, are being priced out of the market for housing loans. If we do not do something quickly to solve this critical problem, only the rich and the poor are going to be able to buy homes this year and into the foreseeable future. The average family, which pays taxes, and pays its own way in every respect is not able to swing the monthly payments necessary to support an 8½- or 9-percent mortgage.

The poor, under Federal subsidy programs, have been able to buy homes which are, in many instances, better than the homes owned by hard-working families not eligible for any subsidies. The rich, of course, do not need any help to buy the kind of homes they want. So the in-between families, who make up the bulk of the population and pay the bulk of the Federal income taxes to support other people's housing assistance, have no place to turn in trying to obtain financing they can afford for a home purchase.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to subsidize the average family. The cost of doing so would be prohibitive. These people do not want subsidies. But they do want the opportunity to obtain a mortgage that is within their ability to repay. And right now, such mortgages are not available to most families—interest rates are surging upward again and downpayments are being increased and the family making in the neighborhood of \$12,000 a year is just not in the market under these conditions. Yet these are the people who constitute the backbone of this country—its middle class—who make a neighborhood solid and stable: factory workers, civil servants, teachers, technicians, retail employees, police officers, fire fighters, postal workers, whose housing needs are being neglected in today's economy.

A DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM WITHOUT SUBSIDIES

In order to meet the present emergency in mortgage financing for average income families, and to meet recurring future emergencies whenever money becomes tight and interest rates go up, I have introduced H.R. 52, a bill cosponsored by Chairman WILLIAM A. BARRETT of the Housing Subcommittee, to provide for direct, unsubsidized Federal loans to credit-worthy average income families to buy homes valued up to \$24,000 under

mortgage terms of 6½-percent interest or less.

This program, known as the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation, would be administered by a nine member board of directors who would determine when mortgage money was not available "at reasonable interest rates" for average-income families, and would make such loans available through a revolving fund to be created by appropriations spread over 5 years.

This program would not compete with the lending industry under normal circumstances when adequate supplies of mortgage money are available at reasonable rates. It would function only when such money is not available to the average family. And the interest rates which would be set would reflect the ability of the Federal Government to borrow money on substantially better terms than private lenders can do. While it is true that the Federal Government is temporarily—we hope it is temporary—paying more than 6½ percent for funds, this program recognizes that the total borrowings of the Federal Government are at rates which average well below 6½ percent and that over the 30-year life of a direct loan authorized under this program, the Government would make a significant profit on a 6½-percent loan.

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

Mr. Speaker, I first introduced this legislation, with the cosponsorship of Congressman BARRETT of Philadelphia, in 1969. In the omnibus housing bill last year, we incorporated the idea as a pilot program, but the housing bill failed to clear the Rules Committee and died with the end of the 92d Congress. The latest reports on the surge in mortgage interest rates and the drying up of mortgage funds put new urgency behind this proposal.

We do not suggest the creation of a vast new bureaucracy to administer these direct loans. The existing FHA offices would be used to process all applications under the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation. The Corporation board of nine members would set national policy, make the determination as to when the program should operate—only when mortgage money is not available at reasonable rates—and oversee the operations of the program.

The Housing Subcommittee has decided not to try to include this measure in a pending "catch-all" bill on which we are now working, containing generally noncontroversial issues. I am sorry that decision was made. There is greater urgency to this problem than any other we are dealing with in that bill. But I appreciate the assurance of Chairman BARRETT that he will set time later in the session to take up H.R. 52. I urge the Members of the House, who have been hearing from their average-income constituents about the difficulties in obtaining financing they can afford for housing they need, to obtain a copy of H.R. 52 and study its terms.

It is only a matter of time before the Congress recognizes the necessity for

this kind of approach to middle-income housing needs during periods of tight money—such as right now. The longer we delay, the more imbalance we will see in our housing programs, geared as they are today only for the rich and the poor, and neglecting the great middle class.

THE FORT WORTH FIVE ARE STILL IN JAIL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Bownes, public relations chairman of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, has written to the President in behalf of the Hibernians about Irish-American relations. The Hibernians are particularly concerned about the Fort Worth Five and the President's failure to see bail set for these men and obtain their release.

The letter to the President is dated May 11 and as yet Mr. Bownes has received no reply.

Five men, Thomas Laffey, Kenneth Tierney, Mathias Reilly, Paschal Morahan, and Daniel Crawford, have been in jail almost without break since last fall. They stand accused of no crime; they have repeatedly been denied bail.

Their continued imprisonment makes little sense, but the President's failure to involve himself in any way to help these men and their family makes less sense.

I insert Mr. Bownes' letter in the RECORD:

JUNE 7, 1973.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLFF: First let me thank you for your continued help in the Irish problem. Your voice has been raised in support of The Fort Worth Five, and the innocent victims in Northern Ireland. We, of the A.O.H. in Nassau County, also support this neglected cause.

We mailed the enclosed letter to President Nixon several weeks ago, but to date have not received a reply. If you can help bring our request to the attention of the American public, it might help our cause, and would be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully,

JOHN BOWNES,
Public Relations Chairman.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your statement on the Watergate situation on Monday night, April 30, 1973, you stated you wanted justice for the American people at any price—and you talked of your goals for this country in the coming years.

We, of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, heartily agree with your objectives. We are especially interested in getting back to the

work of government and in that connection—for example—what justice have The Fort Worth Five received from this government? We think it is a disgrace to hold men in jail without bail two thousand miles away from their families. Have you ever received or even requested a report on this grave injustice from any of your staff, present or past? If not, why not? This might be one project for Mr. Connally.

While you mention securing peace in the Middle East and Asia, you fail to consider Ireland, of which you and your wife are descendants. Indeed, Mrs. Nixon received the American Irish Historical Society Award last year and you have sought—before election—to discover the roots of your Irish ancestry. Because the Irish were polite about this question during that period does not mean that they were not and are not now very concerned. For our part, we have written many letters to you in the past requesting your help in this cause. We received answers from your subordinates stating that this is an internal matter and you would not intervene. Yet there were newspaper accounts of British troops being relieved in Europe by U.S. troops to allow them to garrison Northern Ireland and other British troops trained here for the same purpose by our own Marines. These British troops have taken the lives of innocent Irish civilians.

Even worse taxpayers' money was spent to train British troops in the United States while England had her ships delivering supplies to North Vietnam even as our soldiers were fighting and dying in that war.

In addition, it was also reported that you were touted off visiting Ireland last year by a personal call to our State Department from Prime Minister Heath.

Whatever the full facts of these matters, your administration has studiously ignored the Irish question and we feel it is because British policy has such an impact on our internal affairs, almost as strong as it does on those of Northern Ireland. How else could five men be held prisoners in a Texas jail because they refused to testify about a matter affecting the internal policy of a foreign power, albeit the British Government? We feel you could help allay, if not actually solve, the problem.

The justice of Ireland's demands for a complete freedom from a foreign power is convincing to any informed person. The conduct of the British there for over 800 years remains one of the saddest commentaries on that country's generally sound colonial policy.

If we fail to bend all our efforts for the liberation of Ireland at this time, generations of Irish yet unborn will condemn us as cowards and cravens who lived in a day of opportunity but thought too much of our own wordly and selfish ends to use the power and influence that God has given us to secure freedom with justice for this small nation, which has done more per capita for American freedom in our 200 years than any single nation.

In that connection, our present immigration policies leave much to be desired with reference to Irish nationals anxious to come to this country. Indeed, those laws are frankly discriminatory against a people who have contributed more than their share to the strength, vitality and integrity of this country.

In the years remaining to your administration you have an opportunity to do justice where it is so long lacking.

Let us start anew on this and all our problems.

Respectfully,

JOHN BOWNES,
Public Relations Chairman.

TAX REFORM AMENDMENTS TO THE DEBT CEILING BILL

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 8410, the debt ceiling bill, comes to the floor on Wednesday or Thursday, Representatives ADAMS, MOSS, THOMPSON, and I will try to offer two tax reform amendments to it. Our statement to the Ways and Means Committee on June 4, 1973, explains the two amendments and our reasons for seeking to attach one or both of them to the debt ceiling bill. The statement follows:

TAX REFORM AND THE DEBT CEILING

The Ways and Means Committee is now considering the Administration's anticipated request to raise the public debt limit again, this month. This is the fourth time in less than a year and a half that Congress has had to pass debt-ceiling legislation. It is surely high time that we think about raising revenues, instead of raising the debt ceiling. Chairman Mills has promised us a major tax reform bill in the fall, which will be most welcome. But some tax reform is needed now, as part of the debt ceiling bill, for the following reasons:

1. INFLATION

We are in the grip of a boiling inflation. The Consumer Price Index is rising at an annual rate of between 8 and 9 percent, while the Wholesale Price Index (a better indicator of future inflation) is galloping ahead at more than 12 percent a year. Certain tax loopholes contribute to this inflation. Repealing at least one of them (the Asset Depreciation Range system) could help return the country's economy to a sustainable basis.

2. FEDERAL SPENDING

Inflation and anti-impoundment court decisions have made a myth out of the President's announced \$268 billion spending target. First, since the fiscal 1974 Budget was put together in December, prices have risen at an annual rate of 8.1 percent. The government is simply not able to provide the goods and services we thought it could for \$268 billion. Second, the May 8 federal district court decision in *New York v. Ruckelshaus* required the release of impound anti-pollution funds. If similar decisions are reached in cases involving other impounded funds, as much as \$14 billion could be added to fiscal 1974 total outlays. Tax reform now could raise revenues to prevent an inflationary increase in the deficit. It could do it right at the start of fiscal 1974, when we need to know.

3. EQUITY

The tax system is already so full of preferences that equity is seriously impaired. Joseph Pechman and Benjamin Okner, of the Brookings Institution, for instance, estimate that taxpayers with actual incomes of \$100,000 to \$1 million pay taxes of 29-30 percent instead of the 45 percent which statutory tax tables call for, while millionaires pay an average tax of 33 percent instead of the statutory 67 percent. The Administration has plans to make taxes still more unfair. Secretary Shultz tells newsmen that President Nixon is contemplating raising the federal excise tax on gasoline or even, despite election promises to the contrary, raising general income tax rates. A gasoline sales tax increase would place the heaviest burden, pro-

portionately, on the shoulders of those less able to pay—workers on their way to work, housewives to the market. Let us raise revenues and curb inflation by making the tax system more progressive—not more regressive.

Specifically, we urge this Committee to incorporate two reforms in the debt ceiling bill—repealing the Asset Depreciation Range and strengthening the Minimum Tax. The two reforms would raise an additional \$7 billion in revenues annually.

1. REPEAL THE ASSET DEPRECIATION RANGE (ADR) SYSTEM

The ADR, enacted in 1971 to stimulate investment in a recession economy, permits corporations to deviate by as much as 20 percent from the depreciation schedules carefully calculated by engineers to reflect the true life of an asset. The stimulus (together with the 7 percent Investment Tax Credit) was remarkably successful—investment in plant and equipment increased 14 percent in 1972 over 1971, and the latest McGraw-Hill survey estimates that investment will rise a further 20 percent in 1973. Furthermore, corporate cash flow (profits plus capital consumption allowances) is larger than ever—\$132 billion in the first quarter of 1973 over \$114.3 billion in the first quarter of 1972.

But this investment stimulus has cost us dearly in inflation and high interest rates. Inflation is particularly disturbing in the durable goods and heavy industry sector of the economy. This is where the alarming increases in the wholesale, industrial, and export price indexes are occurring. This is where bottlenecks are showing up. This is where there is overemployment of engineers and skilled workers. And the Federal Reserve, trying to undo by tight money the damage done by expensive tax incentives for investment in plant and equipment, has just raised the discount rate again to 6 percent—the highest since the credit crunch of 1969.

The hyperthyroid investment in plant and equipment we are now witnessing is not only inflationary: if we overbuild plant and equipment today, we are going to see underbuilding tomorrow. These fiscal policies will inevitably lead, if not to a boom and bust, at least to another unlovely combination of continued inflation, high interest rates, high unemployment, and industrial stagnation.

Other countries confronted with inflationary pressures are showing greater wisdom than we. The Federal Republic of Germany, for example, has also had a raging inflation in its durable and heavy industries. There, however, the government is moving to repeal accelerated depreciation allowances; and far from giving a tax incentive to excessive investment, it proposes to discourage such investment by placing an 11 percent tax on investment.

Let us follow this wise example by repealing the ADR, and thus raise \$2.5 billion annually and help curb inflation.

2. STRENGTHEN THE MINIMUM TAX ON PREFERENCE INCOME

The Minimum Tax was passed in 1969 to make sure that rich taxpayers paid at least a 10 percent tax on preference income. The tax has been far from effective. In 1971, according to preliminary data, the 24,000 taxpayers subject to the Minimum Tax paid at an average rate of only 4 percent!

The Administration has admitted that the tax must be improved. Former Under Secretary of the Treasury Edwin S. Cohen, testifying on July 21, 1972, before the Joint Economic Committee, said, in response to questioning on the Minimum Tax:

With respect to the minimum tax, I shall not try to defend the efficiency of the minimum tax.

In presenting the Administration's proposed tax "changes", Secretary Shultz told

the Ways and Means Committee on April 30, 1973:

Experience with the Minimum Tax since 1969 reveals that the provision has not been effective in requiring every individual to pay a reasonable amount of tax based on a substantial portion of his income.

Unfortunately, the Administration's substitute provisions are so timid (they do not apply to corporations, for example) that they are estimated to raise no more than \$800 million in additional revenues annually.

The following changes in the Minimum Tax would raise \$4.5 billion annually and introduce more equity into the tax system:

a. Remove the deduction for other federal taxes paid. This deduction was added on the floor of the Senate, was never adequately debated, and is completely unjustified.

b. Remove the exemption of the first \$30,000 of preference income. Since the goal of the Minimum Tax is to see that wealthy taxpayers pay at least something on all preference income, there is no reason to exempt a large chunk of that income.

c. Tax preference income at one-half the rate paid for federal income tax. This change would make the Minimum Tax progressive, rising from 7 to 35 percent in the case of individuals, or to a maximum of 24 percent in the case of corporations. In those rare cases when people in low tax brackets are subject to the Minimum Tax, the proposed change would reduce their burden from the present 10 percent to 7 percent.

We urge the Committee to incorporate these tax reforms in the debt ceiling bill. The time for fiscal responsibility is now.

JOHN MOORE AND THE NORTH CHICAGO TRIBUNE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my longtime friend, John E. Moore, editor and publisher of the North Chicago Tribune for 43 years, has decided that the time has come for him to retire from active service with the newspaper.

John Moore has been a tireless worker in the community of North Chicago, both with respect to his successful editing and publishing of the North Chicago Tribune, but also in many civic, veteran, and other activities. As a newspaper editor, he can be proud of the award that he received from the Illinois State Editorial Association for the outstanding editorial in weekly newspapers.

In addition, he has been commended for his services to the Boy Scouts of America, the American Legion, the Community Chest, the Red Cross, and the Salvation Army.

It is not my intention to enumerate John Moore's many activities and services to the community of North Chicago. I will say merely that he has come up the hard way, through individual effort and an untiring dedication to the opportunities and responsibilities of a journalist of the highest order.

It is good to know that John's good friends, Don and Sally Herson, will carry on as editors and publishers of the North Chicago Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing these re-

marks to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, I wish also to express in this connection my good wishes to John Moore and his lovely wife, Alice, for many years of good health and happiness together.

NO NARCOTIC DRUG CONTROL SHOULD MEAN NO FOREIGN AID

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which I believe, if passed, could help stem the flow of narcotic drugs into the United States.

Two years ago I introduced a similar bill amending the Foreign Assistance Act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to report to Congress annually on the effectiveness of measures being taken by countries to prevent narcotic drugs, "partially or completely produced or processed in such country, from unlawfully entering the United States" and on whether countries have undertaken appropriate measures to prevent narcotic drugs from unlawfully entering the United States.

That bill of 2 years ago provided that 90 days after such report, any country found guilty of not taking proper precautions to prevent unlawful entry into the United States of such narcotic drugs would thereafter receive no further economic assistance from the United States.

The bill I am introducing today is very similar. There are some modifications partially due to the fact that the Foreign Assistance Act was amended in 1971 to give the President the power to suspend aid to countries which in his judgment did not cooperate to prevent illegal transport of drugs to the United States.

I find a new bill necessary because the President has not invoked this authority. I believe a bill is necessary that will carefully spell out a machinery for mandatory cessation of foreign assistance. Just a few weeks ago the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette in my district carried the story of Afghan farmers who are harvesting a bumper crop of opium poppies on land newly irrigated that has been developed with U.S. foreign aid. The article goes on to quote officials as bluntly stating that:

The Afghan government has made little attempt to curb the growth of opium poppy or punish farmers, traffickers and smugglers.

Evidently "implicit" warnings have been made about the new powers to cut off assistance contained in the 1971 Foreign Assistance Act. The same article notes that total U.S. aid to Afghanistan since 1952 has been \$425 million.

I am not and have not been a supporter of the foreign assistance program and it is cases like this that have partially contributed to my opposition to such aid. But if the Congress is going to go ahead and provide foreign assistance, I certainly believe that the Congress should withhold such assistance to require com-

pliance with efforts to stem the international drug traffic.

The bill I am introducing today provides, like the earlier one, for the annual Report of the Comptroller General and the 90 day period thereafter before the termination of foreign assistance to any country found remiss in efforts to prevent narcotic drugs from unlawfully entering the United States.

Following this report and discovery of such violation, the President is required in my bill to suspend economic foreign assistance; under present law as amended in 1971 he does so if his own judgment dictates.

Under present law, as amended in 1971, it is up to the President to decide if such assistance can be revived, if the offending country comes into compliance with the law regarding efforts to prohibit unlawful entrance of narcotic drugs into the United States.

Under my proposal today, this power rests with the Congress. If the President finds that a country whose assistance has been suspended has now taken adequate steps to remedy this situation, or if he finds that it is in the overriding interest of the United States to resume foreign aid to a particular country, the President then issues a report to Congress and requests permission that the penalty be waived, the assistance restored.

In either of these two cases, the Congress will then determine if the suspension of foreign assistance is to be waived and if so passes a concurrent resolution to that effect.

Moreover, in this bill proposed today it is clearly stated that the concurrent resolution does not remain in perpetuity; a subsequent adverse determination by the Comptroller General would require a new suspension of economic assistance by the President and another waiver later by the Congress, if the assistance were to be restored.

Two years ago I indicated that I preferred a mandatory over a voluntary provision on this matter. I expect that the State Department will oppose this approach as State will argue that we need more pleading power, more voluntary compliance. We are not getting it. I think we have tried that approach. It is time we tried another and that is what I am recommending today. I believe this bill could be an important assistance to our efforts to control the source of the drugs that reach the United States. It is time we stopped hoping for compliance and started making sure that we get it.

PERSONAL APOLOGY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced the Alaskan Petroleum Transmission Act of

1973 with cosponsors. I regret to say the name of one of the four prime sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) was inadvertently left off. I am reintroducing the bill today with Mr. HARVEY as cosponsor and extend my apologies to him for the omission.

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III SENDS SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, for the second consecutive year since coming to Congress, I am mailing a questionnaire to every family in the 18th District of Pennsylvania which I represent.

Soliciting and receiving my constituents' opinions on the major issues facing our Nation is very valuable to me, as such responses are to my colleagues who also send such questionnaires.

The text of my questionnaire follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Friend: Once again I am asking you to share with me your opinions on the vital issues facing us as a nation by answering this questionnaire. Your interest in keeping me advised on how you stand on the issues through your letters and personal contacts, and now through this questionnaire, is vital to me in providing the kind of representation you deserve in Washington.

I can't hope to include everything that might be on your mind in these polls. Also, maybe you want to give more than a "yes" or "no" answer to some questions. In either case, feel free to expand your answers in a separate letter so that I can get a true picture of your feelings. It will help me when the times comes for me to vote "yes" or "no" on an issue.

This questionnaire will take only a few minutes of your time and cost you an 8-cent stamp to return. The questions are to be answered by up to two family members of voting age. These answers will be tabulated and the results made available to every household in the 18th District.

Important Notice.—I will soon be starting to send periodic special reports which will be more detailed on legislative matters and other activities I am involved with to better serve you. If you would like to be added to this mailing list, please check the box under your name and address on the return portion of this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

JOHN HEINZ,
Your Congressman.

(NOTE.—Each question provided boxes marked "his" and "hers" and "yes" and "no".)

1. Energy crisis: Which of the following statements reflect your feelings about the energy crisis? (Check one or more)

There is little the Federal Government can do or should do.

The best way to match energy supply and demand is to allow all fuel prices to rise (or fall) accordingly by lessening government regulations.

The Federal Government should enforce conservation of energy resources even if it means restricting auto and air travel or curbing use of electricity.

Other.

2. Amnesty: Would you favor the establishment of a Presidential Amnesty Commission to grant amnesty, order alternate service, or recommend prosecution for those who refused military induction?

3. War powers: Do you favor legislation to prevent the President from committing U.S. troops to hostilities for more than 30 days without Congressional approval?

4. Parochial schools: Do you favor Federal tax credits to reimburse parents for part of the cost of tuition?

5. Environment: Would you be willing to pay more for products and service if their manufacture and use could be made virtually pollution-free?

6. Federal spending: Should the Federal Government spend more (+), less (-), or the same amount (=) on the following programs? (Mark with appropriate symbol)

Agriculture & Farmers.
Defense Weapons Systems.
Education.
Environmental Protection.
Foreign Aid.
Health.
Housing.
Job Training.
Military Pay/Benefits.
Public Works.
Social Security.
Welfare Reform/Aid to Poor.

7. No-fault auto insurance: Which of the following best expresses your attitude? (Please check one)

The Federal Government should require states to adopt no-fault auto insurance.

States should be left to decide for themselves.

Opposed to no-fault insurance.

8. Day Care: Do you favor Federal funding assistance to state and local programs which provide day care for the children of working mothers?

9. New federalism: In principle, do you approve of President Nixon's program to return more responsibility to state and local governments?

10. Food stamps: If an individual or a family qualifies for food stamps because of low income, should they be denied food stamps because the wage earner is on strike?

11. Abortion: Do you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to outlaw abortion?

12. Priorities: What should be Congress' top three priorities?

13. Presidential priorities: Do you approve of the type of budget curtailment proposed by President Nixon to hold spending to \$269 billion?

14. My job performance: How would you rate the job I am doing as your Congressman?

Excellent.

Good.

Fair.

Poor.

Don't know.

What could I do to do a better job?

Personal information: (Please use underlined symbols on age, party and religion)

Age: a. (18-34); b. (35-54); c. (55-over).

Political party: Republican, Democrat, Independent, Other.

Religion: Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Other.

Years of education: (Number).

Union member in household? (Yes or no)

Municipality.

Would you like me to send you information on subjects in which you would appear to have a special interest, based on your answers to this questionnaire? If "yes", be sure to fill out return address on front.

SOYBEANS: A BULL MARKET FOR TRADING

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently sent a letter signed by 52 of my concerned colleagues to Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz. In this letter, we urged the Secretary to impose a moratorium on the export of essential feed grains, specifically, soybeans and soybean meal. One reason which makes the implementation of this action so important is the runaway cost of this essential feed ingredient.

With domestic supply at its present low, soybean prices on the floor of the Chicago Board of Trade are skyrocketing. Day after day the traders do battle with their paper weapons; fighting for control of what little remains. To the victors go the soybeans at an inflationary price. To the losers, the livestock producer, poultry farmer, and the consumer, go higher feed grain costs and continually higher food prices.

Thus, a day ends on the floor of the Chicago Board of Trade, this paper battlefield. Strewn in paper wads all over the floor is a record of the day's transactions. The effects of what is written on those papers may not be felt for weeks or months. But when the impact comes, the already reeling producer, farmer, and consumer will be on the receiving end once again.

Mr. Speaker, this seeming allegory becomes all too real when we witness the devastating effects this bull market has on grain and food prices. I would like at this time to insert some excerpts from an article in the June 5, 1973, issue of the Wall Street Journal, for the benefit of my colleagues:

"Within minutes of the opening one day last week, some traders in the soybean pit were so worked up that their faces were red and the cords in their necks stood out. One trader in a loud sport coat was bellowing so energetically he seemed about to lift himself into the air. 'I've never seen anything so wild,' said one trader on the scene.

But then, nobody has ever seen the prices of soybeans and soybean products shoot up to the dizzying heights they have reached in just the past two weeks. The price of a futures contract for July delivery of soybeans was selling for around \$3.50 a bushel a year ago. Yesterday, it closed at a record \$12.12, up 79½ cents from Friday. The price of soybean meal, an important livestock feed, has quadrupled in the past year. The price of soybean oil, used in margarine, paints and other products, has jumped 70% from a year ago.

Some speculators have made enormous profits in these booming markets, which have helped push up prices for corn and wheat, too. The word on the trading floor is that a few professional speculators have made paper profits of \$1 million to \$3 million or more since the first of the year, and as long as the price keeps climbing they aren't selling. Some elevators, grain merchandisers, exporters and others who own real soybeans are making big profits, too.

But the soaring prices are leaving a trail of painful consequences as well. Among the hardest hit are speculators who have sold short—that is, sold contracts for delivery of soybeans at a future date. Short sellers

gamble that the price of a commodity will fall and that they can fulfill their futures contracts at a price lower than they received, thus turning a profit. But if the price rises, of course, they lose money. . .

"The high cost of feeds is definitely limiting the expansion in hog production", says Phillip Bradshaw, an Illinois hog farmer and president of Illinois Pork Producers, a trade group. "We may get only a 2% to 3% increase in output at best instead of the 6% to 8% increase that some people were expecting." Beef, poultry, egg and dairy farmers say they are reconsidering expansion plans, too, indicating that if demand remains strong food price relief may be further in the future than President Nixon and other officials have promised.

This is heating up a controversy over whether the soybean markets are booming because of a legitimate imbalance of demand over supply or because of speculative skulduggery. A fast run-up in wheat prices at the Kansas City Board of Trade last summer, when the Russian grain deal was being made, already is under investigation by the Justice Department, and some suggest soybean prices might deserve similar attention.

"It smells to high heaven," asserts Oliver Eckles, manager of the commodity department of R. G. Dickinson and Co., a brokerage firm based in Des Moines. "The way the soybean market has been acting convinces me that somebody has a lasso around it. I figure it's a few big-time professional speculators down on the floor of the Chicago Board of Trade."

Some Congressmen also are calling for investigation of the soybean markets, but the Commodity Exchange Authority, an Agriculture Department agency that oversees trading in commodities produced in the U.S. says it has no evidence of price manipulation. The authority, however, is itself under fire; congressional and Farm Belt critics contend the agency doesn't adequately police or punish cases of "price rigging."

The big speculators themselves contend the price is shooting up because of great demand, bad weather and other factors. One of them scoffs: "Hell, I suppose we're the guys that make it rain all the time."

If there is any manipulation in the soybean markets, it's getting a lot of help from a superbullish combination that influences soybeans. A fundamental factor is unprecedented foreign demand for soybeans and soybean meal, caused by the increasing taste of Europeans, Japanese and others for meat and meat products colliding with reduced worldwide production of grains, fish-meal and other high-protein animal feeds. . .

BRUCE SAGAN, CHAIRMAN OF ILLINOIS HOUSING AUTHORITY

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bruce Sagan is the publisher of the Economist newspapers in the South Chicago area and its suburbs. He has recently been appointed by Gov. Daniel Walker as the chairman of the Illinois Housing Development Authority.

As the chairman, Mr. Sagan will serve for a 4-year term on the authority which funds Government-financed housing.

Mr. Sagan is president of Englewood Manor, Inc., which was the first moderate-income housing project in the

country, and is chairman of the planning committee of the Southtown Planning Association. The organization is active in urban renewal in the Englewood Community.

Mr. Sagan is to be commended for his active participation in these vital community activities.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, under the fiscal year 1974 budget, the administration has proposed the dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the elimination of Federal support for local Community Action programs. The President has suggested that continuance of Community Action programs be at local option with local financial support, suggesting possible usage of revenue-sharing funds. However, the transition from Federal to local support is difficult.

Recently, I received a statement regarding attempts to secure local support for the Oakland County Commission on Economic Opportunity in southeastern Michigan. Officials are trying to secure support from the 43 separate units of government currently served by the program. A copy of the statement, describing in detail the problems these efforts have encountered, follows:

STATEMENT

Since January 1973, the OCCEO Board, its eight geographic advisory councils, the agencies which relate to this organization and the various educational institutions located in Oakland County have worked diligently with the units of government to assure the continuation of the basic Community Action Agency in its program thrust through the use of Revenue Sharing funds.

Needless to say the organization is now at a stalemate. The local units of government are saying that they would like to contribute to the programing efforts of this agency so that it may continue to serve the poor and the disadvantaged in their geographical area, but they, in fact, have allocated all of their funds in areas not related to human services. They have also stated that they would like to see the County government provide the basic funding to continue these efforts.

The County legislative body also says that they have earmarked their funds and cannot redirect their priorities at this time and do not feel that the monies needed to continue this organization can be found at this time.

The Oakland County Commission on Economic Opportunity, as a Community Action Program, has operated in 43 of the 63 local units of government in Oakland County providing a wide range of services for the disadvantaged community and also has initiated a host of institutional changes that have benefited the total population in this County. If in fact, an individual wished to exert his many options and become a participant in any of these institutions for service it would allow him to become a tax paying individual rather than a tax consumer through becoming more employable.

It is extremely disheartening to be placed

in a position where you are dealing with the illogical and that illogic is; I'll contribute once someone else contributes; or, how much will the County contribute and then we will make a decision; or the County saying, how much has the local unit of government contributed and then we will contribute. All in all the \$859,000 did support a total budget amount equal to \$3.3 Million. This budget is linked to a central administrative system overlapping no other delivery system and comprehensively coordinating this money with the systems in Oakland County to assure a maximizing of both the Federal and local dollar.

For some reason it is extremely difficult to make the new politicians understand or see this dilemma and they do not feel that there is any obligation on their part to support an agency that was previously Federally funded.

Recognizing that they cannot understand or logically determine for themselves that the reason they have not had the problem brought to their attention through their local constituency is because this agency has adequately provided these services to their constituents and regularly provided the politicians with information regarding what was happening in the area of human services in their geographic area of concern. But now that it is their time to bear the burden and to share their wealth with the poor and the disadvantaged it is now an obligation that they do not see why they should have to assume.

Local units of government, and even the County government in Oakland, are not ready to assume the position of sharing their wealth and providing the bare essentials to serve the poor and disadvantaged in this County. But, they wish this agency to continue delivering its services by some magical way to their constituents. In recognizing the anxiety of the paraprofessional staff who have benefited from opportunities brought about by OCCEO, many have left the organization. This came about because they were threatened by the various news media articles being circulated regarding the status of OEO Nationally. When you explain the problem, their reaction is, you must continue to deliver those services, but without any financial commitment. This is beyond us, where they think the funding will come about to achieve this. They are also looking at building superstructures utilizing Federal Revenue Sharing monies without any consideration for the experience of any agency like this or the fragmentation and duplication that will come about if little empires are built providing big overhead costs and very little programmatic planning, development, coordination and knowledge of the system as a whole.

On behalf of the 67,000 poor families, as defined by the poverty guidelines in Oakland County, we appeal to you to use your influence in assuring that the Community Action Agencies are provided with a grace period, no matter how meager the funding might be, until the local politician is knowledgeable and geared to the fact that if they cannot establish as a priority the funding for services to the poor and disadvantaged that no one will.

Hopefully we will have your support when this comes before you in Congress.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that I was absent for rollcalls

Nos. 200 through 210 yesterday as I was attending the hearing in Miami held by the Select Subcommittee on Education, of which I am a member, on drug-abuse education.

LONDON NEWSPAPERS AND WATERGATE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues two articles written from abroad. The first is an editorial from the London Times dated June 5, 1973; the second article is from the London Sunday Express and is dated June 10. This article is written by Angus Maude, a Member of Parliament in Great Britain.

Both of these articles put Watergate in a slightly different perspective. Both seem to feel that the press coverage is less than totally unbiased. I felt they were of sufficient importance to deserve the study and attention of my colleagues.

It is my observation that publishers, editors, a number of columnists, and even working reporters recognize that coverage on Watergate has included a great deal of hearsay and extraordinary emphasis on political rumor. Certainly, the two articles I insert at this point in the RECORD reflect a degree of objectivity, which distance from the event makes possible.

[From the London Times, June 5, 1973]

DUE PROCESS OF LAW

The President of the United States is in the unenviable position of being tried by his fellow countrymen in three different forums, each of which has its own particular deficiencies and two of which have the power to offer freedom from prosecution to those whose evidence may accuse him. That is not to say the President is innocent, or that he would be innocent if any precisely formulated charges had been brought against him. It is perfectly possible for a wholly guilty man to be tried in a wholly unjust way. Indeed, many of the men who have been lynched in the course of history were lynched for crimes they had actually committed. That does not alter the fact that what Mr. Nixon is now receiving is a Washington variant of lynch law, and that while he may or may not be innocent, he may never be proved guilty by a process so clearly lacking in justice.

The three forms of trial, which are taking place simultaneously, are the Ervin Committee in the Senate (and this leaves out other related inquiries by five other Senate or Congressional committees), the Grand Jury, and the media, including *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post*.

PUBLICITY

The Ervin Committee is investigating precisely because the Senate thought that the due process of law was working too slowly. The Senators are trying to to ask fair and relevant questions; there is no allegation that this is a Senate committee on the lines of the McCarthy Committee, though it has approximately the same powers and rules. Yet Senate committees are not courts: they do not have an adversary procedure; they do not have cross examination by Counsel for the accused; they can take and certainly do take hearsay evidence. The Ervin Committee has already been warned by Mr. Archibald

Cox, the special prosecutor, of "risk of damage to investigations and any resulting prosecution". The enormous publicity given to hearsay evidence in televised hearings is so prejudicial that it alone would seem to preclude the possibility of fair trial for any accused, even including the President himself if there were impeachment proceedings.

The second tribunal is the Grand Jury. No student of British law will forget that we abandoned the Grand Jury procedure because of its notorious weaknesses as an instrument of justice. Grand Jury proceedings provide the prosecutor with opportunities to introduce prejudicial evidence which would not be admissible in a trial. The Watergate Grand Jury proceedings have been held in camera but have been widely leaked. The public has therefore a partial and unreliable account of these proceedings: that must be more damaging to the administration of justice than if there were a full account or no account at all. The publication of alleged reports of proceedings held in camera would be contempt of court under British law.

The third tribunal is the press, with television. But for the work of the Washington Post the real elements of the Watergate scandal would not have been uncovered. However, now we have a simultaneous process of trial by newspaper allegation, beside the Senate hearings and the Grand Jury. The American press, and particularly the Washington Post, deserve their full credit for forcing the Watergate affair into the open. They are however now publishing vast quantities of prejudicial matter, that would be contempt under British law, which again must tend to prejudice the fair trial of any accused, or if it came to that, of the President.

The latest and most damaging example of this is the evidence given by Mr. Dean. According to *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, Mr. Dean told Senate investigators that he conferred with President Nixon thirty-five to forty times between January 1 and April 30 of this year. The subject of these conversations was alleged to be the concealment of the fact that White House men were behind the break in of June 17 last year, the Watergate burglary. Mr. Dean also alleged that the President agreed to buy the silence of the accused. These allegations have been denied specifically by the White House, though it is agreed that the President saw Mr. Dean, who was indeed the White House counsel at the time.

This is evidence of the greatest possible importance. It is not too much to say that if Mr. Dean's evidence is true Mr. Nixon is not fit to remain the President of the United States. Mr. Dean's evidence, if believed, would convict the President on two counts, firstly of conspiracy to pervert the course of justice and secondly of deliberate, continued and systematic lying to cover up his own part in that conspiracy. In practice, if Mr. Dean's evidence comes to be accepted, it could well lead to the successful impeachment of the President of the United States, and it is the first evidence in the whole case which takes the central matter straight home to the President; not by hearsay but by direct account.

This evidence of Mr. Dean's has come out first in two great newspapers, the most important national newspapers of the United States. Perhaps one should consider what the quality of Mr. Dean's statement is as evidence. In the first place it was given to Senate investigators whose committee have the power to give or withhold immunity from prosecution to witnesses before the Senate committee. Mr. Dean has stated that he will not be the fall-guy, and one way in which he could avoid being the fall-guy would be to obtain immunity for himself in return for his evidence against other people. There is a long legal tradition that the evidence of those who wish to turn Queen's evidence should be treated with suspicion.

SLENDER EVIDENCE

Mr. Dean's evidence was a preparatory statement; it was not given on oath; it was not given in open hearings; it was not given in open court; it must have been subject to questioning by the staff of the Senate committee, but not to public examination. It was most certainly not open to cross-examination by counsel for the President. On these grounds alone it is hard to think how evidence could be less satisfactory. Yet on this evidence could well be based public conclusions which could destroy a President of the United States.

The case is in fact worse than this. Any cross-examination would have put to Mr. Dean the apparent contradictions between this statement, now so unfortunately leaked to the press, and the earlier statement made by Mr. Dean's "friends" in an interview published by *Newsweek* on May 6. Mr. Dean's friends reported that Mr. Dean did think that Mr. Nixon knew of the cover-up, but gave only the slender evidence of an interview in September, 1972, in which the President stated: "Good job. Bob told me what a great job you've been doing." Mr. Dean took this to refer to the cover-up. By May 6 we are therefore already dealing with a Mr. Dean who is a hostile witness to President Nixon. He makes no mention then of the thirty-five meetings, but provides much more remote evidence for his belief that the President knew what was happening.

That is not a crucial inconsistency; Mr. Dean could well have been dribbling out the truth, a little last month, a little this month. In the same interview, however, Mr. Dean's friends quoted another story of Mr. Dean seeing the President. Mr. Dean admitted that he had never conducted the supposed inquiry into White House involvement, and told the President so on March 21, 1973. "The President came out of his chair," in apparent shock. So by Mr. Dean's first account we have the President shocked by a fact which, if Mr. Dean's second account were true, the President could scarcely have failed to know. That little physical detail of President Nixon bouncing out of his chair when he hears that Mr. Dean has been organizing a cover-up tells strongly in the President's favour, particularly as it comes from a hostile witness, and particularly as it refers to a date as recent as March 21 of this year.

SAME PRINCIPLES

That is not to say that this contradiction cannot conceivably be explained. What it does do is illustrate the danger of prejudice inherent in press reports of unsworn, untested, uncorroborated evidence. This is leakage of evidence likely to prejudice the Senate committee, which when it is presented to the Senate committee will further prejudice any trial that may depend upon it. It is prejudice very close to the fountain of information on which justice at some later stage is supposed to be done. The Dean leak is lethal, if believed, and yet of minimal evidential value; it alone could make a fair public trial impossible.

The tragedy is that the whole case is concerned with justice. What the President is accused of that really matters is to have interfered with the course of justice. That would be as grave an offense as a President could commit. Yet are not the Senate committee who are taking and publishing hearsay evidence to the whole country also interfering with the course of justice? "It is much more important for the American people to know the truth . . . than sending one or two people to jail", said Senator Ervin, the Chairman of the committee. That is not only interfering with the course of justice, but justifying the decision to do so.

And what about the press? Of course the American law of contempt is very different from ours, but the principles of fair trial are the same. How can one justify the decision

to publish the Dean leak? Here is a real piece of hanging evidence, the missing element—if it is believed—in a chain of proof. Here is a piece of wholly suspect evidence—unsworn, unverified, not cross-examined, contradicting previous evidence, subject to none of the safeguards of due process, given by a man who may be bargaining for his freedom. How can the newspapers defend themselves from the very charge that they are bringing against the President, the charge of making a fair trial impossible, if they now publish evidence so damning and so doubtful with all the weight of authority that their publication gives?

THE WHITE HOUSE WITCH HUNT

(By Angus Maude, M.P.)

Have the Americans taken leave of their senses? Looking objectively at the handling of the Watergate Affair and its ramifications, one is almost forced to the conclusion that they have.

It is pretty horrifying to watch the way in which supposedly responsible Americans in the higher echelons of politics and public affairs are going about the business of discrediting not only their President but the whole system of government in the United States.

The Press and the other media are enthusiastically urging them on and revelling in the resultant mess. Every accusation against President Nixon and his staff, however untested and however tainted its source, is given the widest publicity.

Every possible innuendo is used to slant the impression given to the public, apparently in the hope of fixing the peoples verdict before half the evidence has been heard.

PRETENCE

Perhaps the most nauseating feature of the campaign is the self-righteous pretence of the smearers that they are only "acting in the public interest" and "helping to get at the truth." The only facts that they are interested in are those that can be used to discredit the President; and the way the campaign has been handled is not in the public interest at all, but deeply damaging to the United States and to all the best things for which America stands.

All the half-forgotten elderly whizz-kids of the Jack Kennedy era have been writing articles—many of them syndicated over here—viciously venting their traditional hatred of President Nixon, but adding sentimentally that the whole horrible business is really a blessing in disguise which will lead to much-needed reforms in the system of government.

Clearly they see it as a heaven-sent bandwagon on which they can hitch a ride towards the ultimate triumph of Senator Edward Kennedy. That a victory for this deplorable man would be for them and for most of the Eastern American liberal establishment, a desirable consummation of the present campaign is a sufficient guide to their sense of values.

Of course, the Watergate Affair is a sorry mess. It is at least obvious that the President appointed some pretty strange people to his personal and political staffs. But the widespread assumption that he himself is guilty of corruption and illegal practices is still unsupported by convincing evidence.

DAMAGE

In default of this, his detractors have resorted to the argument that if he were not guilty he would already have proved himself innocent—which is a typical inversion of the principles of fairness and justice for which they purport to stand.

The important point, however, is this. Whatever truth emerges at the end of the inquiries, whether the President is vindicated or brought down, the whole business is being handled and exploited in a way calculated to do the most, not the least, lasting damage

to America and to the true interests of its people.

Mr. Nixon's enemies, of course, are saying smugly that it is his handling of the affair that is doing all the damage; but even a cursory study of the American Press coverage makes it clear that this is not true. They are out to destroy him, and they do not seem to care who or what suffers in the process.

Of course I do not know what, if anything, the President has to hide. But at this critical juncture for both the American economy and his own foreign policy, he carries a burden of responsibility that must make him hesitate to become personally involved too deeply in the comparative irrelevancy of the Watergate inquiries. Any responsible householder is more concerned about an imminent threat to the fabric of his building than about a temporary smell in the drains.

You would have thought that any educated American could foresee the desperate consequences of a major constitutional crisis at this time. And that any responsible commentator over here would hesitate before light-heartedly handing out more ammunition to America's enemies in this country. Yet the B.B.C. seems to be positively revealing in it.

Why have the B.B.C.—and indeed ITV—news and current affairs men been playing up the Watergate business so assiduously? They cannot really believe that the British public find it all that riveting.

They, like their American counterparts, seem to be actuated by a compulsive hatred of Mr. Nixon. Everything is slanted against him. Often they refer to him contemptuously just as "Nixon"—a familiarity they would never resort to with, say, Mr. Brezhnev or General Amin.

Is this just a fixation of intellectual liberals? Or are our media too so deeply infiltrated by anti-American Leftists that they feel compelled to attack the one man who seemed likely to save America and restore its influence in world affairs?

Let us remember one or two things about President Nixon.

He won his landslide election victory because the American people recognised his practical achievements and wanted him to complete the job.

He seemed to be halting the hopeless drift towards anarchy and violence in which the country was involved. Peace had returned to the chaotic university campuses. A stand was at last being made for law and order. He was getting to grips with the problem of inflation.

CALIBRE

Mr. Nixon brought to its only possible end the hopeless bloody struggle in Vietnam—a struggle to which Kennedy and Johnson had committed America at the wrong time and on the wrong terms. He has laid the foundations of detente with Russia and China.

America, and indeed the whole Western world, already owes him quite a lot. If he survives we may yet come to owe him a great deal more. No possible successor is likely to be a statesman of anything like his calibre.

Above all, let us pray that if Mr. Nixon is brought down by the rabble now pursuing him, the damage to America and its friends may be less than they seem determined to inflict. Perhaps they will at least have the grace to stop appearing to enjoy it all so much.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 533

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 533,

I was especially pleased to have supported it when it passed the House on June 5, 1973. This bill will authorize the President to proclaim June 17, 1973, as a day of commemoration of the opening of the Upper Mississippi River by Jacques Marquette and Louis Jolliet in 1673.

As a student of history, I feel that the interest being shown in the Marquette-Jolliet tricentennial programs deserves our full support.

Mr. Speaker, Marquette and Jolliet traveled through the heart of what is now the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois, which I am proud and privileged to represent. There is great support in a number of local communities in my district for programs enacting the history of their movements and retracing their steps through the area.

As a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 533, I was very pleased that it received expeditious handling by the Committee on the Judiciary and that it received the overwhelming support of both the House and Senate.

MR. CONYERS LAYS IT ON THE LINE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a major speaker at the 20th Congressional District's recent community conference was my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS—who last year was reelected for his fifth term, with 88 percent of the vote from Detroit. Mr. CONYERS works with me on the Government Operations Committee and is also a member of the House Judiciary Committee. In addition to being a leader of Americans for Democratic Action and the American Civil Liberties Union, he is one of the most dynamic leaders of the Black Caucus in Congress.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the pithy remarks Mr. CONYERS made at our conference:

SPEECH BY JOHN CONYERS

I'm delighted to be here with you for a couple of reasons: the first is that I think conferences such as this are extremely important in terms of having a person-to-person communication with our constituents, and secondly, I'm delighted to be here because Bella Abzug told me to be here.

Now what if this was August of '72 when all these Watergate revelations were being made? Do you think there might possibly have been a different outcome to that November 5th debacle? If we had known then what we know now? I don't give too much credit to the media—sure they did their bit—but most of them kept it down: the Washington Post and the Times ran the stories and the rest of the people had to find it in small type on the back of newspapers. But back last summer I began thinking about this and I circulated to some members of the House of Representatives this brief statement which said "The Nixon Administration now stands accused of operating an espionage ring for the purpose of sabotaging the Presidential campaign of the Democratic candidate. These charges, widely reported in the media, have been given further substance

by detailed investigation by the Washington Post and The New York Times, C.B.S. News, the Los Angeles Times and Time Magazine

"From these sources a picture has emerged of a clandestine committee headed by past and present White House officials and Cabinet officers which used a massive and secret fund raised to support Richard Nixon's election for the following purpose: illegal electronic surveillance of the Democratic National Committee headquarters at Watergate, breaking and entering at the Democratic headquarters in order to steal and copy political files, deliberately issuing false statements and information in the name of the Democratic candidates for the purpose of defamation, deliberate attempts to wreck campaign events scheduled on behalf of Democratic Presidential candidates, assigning investigators to shadow and collect dossiers on the personal lives of Democratic candidates and their families.

"If these charges are true, they constitute not only flagrant violations of the law but an attack on the entire concept of free and democratic elections, consciously directed by those persons around the President for the sole purpose of preserving his personal power. Efforts to discover the truth about these charges before the election date have been consistently blocked by the executive branch and by leaders of the Republican party. The F.B.I. report cited by the press has not been released. The trial of the men caught in the Watergate has been postponed and with certain exceptions a gag placed on the parties to the case. White House aides have refused to testify before Congressional committees. And certain members of Congress have denied their committees the subpoena power needed to compel testimony from those parties allegedly involved.

"Thus, voters on November 7 will be denied the dispassionate presentation of the evidence that they deserve on so grave an issue. The White House claims that neither the President nor any of his aides has been involved in any improper or illegal activity, but sooner or later—no doubt, after the election—all of the facts will eventually come out into the open. At that time we will certainly know what has happened and who must bear the responsibility.

"We, the undersigned members of Congress, would like to go on record at this time to promise that if we find that the White House was directly involved in these acts, we will have no choice but to introduce a resolution of impeachment against Richard Nixon for the criminal sabotage of the electoral process of the United States.

"The Constitution assigns to the House of Representatives the task of enforcing the high standards of conduct expected of the President of the United States. We believe that the present charges against Richard Nixon, if proven to be true, grossly violate those standards and therefore a resolution of impeachment would be the only response consistent with our responsibility as members of Congress."

Now let's examine what it is we hope to find in the course of the investigations of Watergate: the grand jury nosing around, the F.B.I. probes that are now regularly talking to members and former members of the Nixon staff, including the former director of the F.B.I., who we now find is very largely involved. Not to mention two former Attorney Generals, and the President's own personal lawyer and the ex-C.I.A. and F.B.I. agents who themselves participated in the Watergate burglary.

What is it that a federal trial, a grand jury, an F.B.I. investigation, a Senate committee hearing the Watergate matter, an overall federal prosecutor, or the House Judiciary Committee can find out? Do we want to find another member of the White House Staff who is implicated? Are we looking for another ex-C.I.A. agent who is in-

volved? Are we looking for another member of the President's campaign? Another member or former member of the cabinet?

Not me. I'm not looking for any more of them. There's only one question I want to find out. Did the President of the United States or the Vice President of the United States have knowledge of the Watergate affair?

That's the question that remains to be determined, and I submit to you that none of these organizations, agencies, courts, and juries and special prosecutors is empowered to determine that question. The President is constitutionally precluded from being sued in an ordinary manner in any court. The doctrine of executive privilege precludes him from coming before any Congressional committee and, as you must know, it also precludes any of his aides who may want to invoke it. Also, those who have been accused or indicted of the crime have the privilege against self-incrimination operating for them so they would be absolutely insane to come before any special committee to take an oath to tell the truth, when they're on trial and could go to a federal penitentiary for their involvement. There is no way that we can find out, short of the President and the Vice-President coming forward and making the one statement that the people want to hear, their complete knowledge about the Watergate, not only before, but what they know about it after it started.

There happens to be a crime called being accomplice after the fact that could also be the grounds for an impeachment resolution running to both the President and the Vice President, if you please. It just so happens that these plans did not emanate somewhere in Washington: they started in the Executive Offices of the White House. The phone that was used was the one phone that is in the White House that is not a government federal phone, perhaps the only one that wasn't wiretapped. That was a phone paid for by the secretary of one of the members of the White House staff.

The President's personal lawyer was involved in those conversations. We know now that the former attorney general of the United States lied to the American people and denied any knowledge of this incident. And so I say to you that we're in a crisis that is unlike the Teapot Dome Scandal of 1924. This is far more serious. This is even worse than the Credit Mobilier Scandal during the Grant Administration. We have never had these wholesale resignations and convictions and indictments thus far, and every day new revelations are brought forward. Catching the plane from Washington this morning, I just saw the latest Washington Post headline. What did it say? "White House House connected to Ellsberg breaking and entering."

We must also show the insufferable connection between Watergate and Cambodia. That is to say, this Administration which came forward with the theme of Law and Order is the most lawless, disorderly, corrupt Administration the United States has ever had.

We're going through a crisis of confidence unlike any we've ever experienced in America. And so, therefore, I see a connection between what went on at Watergate and the surrounding activity. After all, Watergate was a part of a conspiratorial plan. That wasn't the sole activity. That was a part of an effort to subvert the political process in America.

And what about Cambodia? Can you imagine, after ten years of the most illegal and immoral war in America's history, undeclared and unconstitutional, that the President would violate the Paris accords and we now end up in a neighboring country of Vietnam, bombing away, just exactly like we did in Vietnam, not having learned the first lesson. American flyers are already being

killed and captured. Vietnam Two, all over again.

So I want to suggest something to you. Yes, a resolution of impeachment might be appropriate on Watergate to inquire into whether or not the President has knowledge of it. I am suggesting to some of my Republican friends that they ought to welcome such a resolution to clear the President's good name, that we should all join in a very fair and thorough and final dispositive hearing. But if for any reason some of them might not agree to that, I think that a resolution of impeachment unquestionably lies on the basis that the President of the United States has once again exceeded his authority as Commander-in-Chief of our armed forces when he unilaterally orders American troops and bombers into Cambodia and Laos when he has told us that those activities would not be conducted again without consulting with the Congress.

Now I'm hoping that we won't prematurely rush to introduce a resolution of impeachment. The day-to-day resolutions are now growing so rapidly that I think it should be deliberate. What we have to do is to begin to get the American people to understand that the resolution of impeachment is not a political tool one party grinds out against another party to harass or embarrass it or to merely run a vindictive, partisan game. It is a serious, valid, legitimate weapon of the parliament that's available to the Congress to utilize when it finds that there's a time appropriate for its being brought into use.

We're at the point now, as your Congresswoman has said, to examine if, when, and how we deal with this kind of matter. I'm hoping all of you will help all of us.

And there is another culprit. It's so easy to blame Richard for almost everything wrong with Washington and in the end I guess his responsibility is quite generic, but there is something else wrong with Washington and it's the Congress of the United States.

Let me tell you a couple of things that might have escaped your notice. Guess who passes legislation in America: the Executive Branch or the Congress? Guess who decides what programs will be implemented by the government: the Executive Branch or the Congress? Guess who is supposed to determine the Federal thrust of all the laws in this land? The Congress. It's about time we started to look inside our own political operation to find out what's wrong.

For example, when the President announced that he wanted to dismantle OEO, we had a big meeting and decided on "legislative strategy" which turned out to be a Concurrent Resolution. That really sounds great, I thought. But when my staff and I studied it, we found that it had not one ounce of substantive legislative energy. It was a "sense of Congress" resolution. It didn't stop anything. The dismantlement would go on. It didn't appropriate any money. It did not say to the President, "Thou shalt not impound or dismatte." It didn't demand that he bring before the Congress any reorganization efforts, as he is required to do by law.

So I wrote a bill in which Bella quickly joined me: "Thou shalt not impound," plain English. It said we halt all impoundments and any reorganization—call it by any name you wish—will be brought before Congress. Senator Hart cosponsored the bill in the Senate, and we have 54 cosponsors in the House.

I've begun to realize that all that business about following the rules and gaining seniority and making the Congress a more workable institution—that's a bunch of nonsense until you get rid of some of the people in there who don't have our philosophy in mind before they came, while they're there and when they leave. Until we change the makeup, the physical composition of the Congress and the Senate,

you're never going to get the progressive kind of legislative results you ought to be having and that you deserve and that brings us here today.

Somebody's got to go!

I mean they ought to be thrown out on their ear. And as I look around at the New York delegation, you've sent your share of do-nothing liberals and a portion of dried up reactionaries right out of New York.

Don't look at Michigan, because we're just as gully.

So, my feeling today is, let's clean up the Congress, and I'm talking about cutting out some of the rhetorical solutions and beginning to challenge the leadership. Until we do that, we'll be writing perfect bills that are going no place because the leadership, the bosses, the chairmen of the Congress are not disposed to enact them at this time. And so it's out of these concerns that I join you today and also to say that I finally found the courage to announce to you that from next year on, the First Congressional District of Michigan is going to be having this same type of conference.

Thank you very much.

ON MAKING GASOLINE FROM WATER

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when I originally read the item many years ago it was with considerable excitement and I have recalled it occasionally since. When I ran across it again recently it occurred to me that others might enjoy it.

The item first appeared in 1935 under the byline of Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen in their syndicated column called Washington Merry-Go-Round. Not long ago Mrs. J. D. Henderson of Costa Mesa, Calif., found it in her files as it was carried by the Des Moines Register. It has an uncertain and ambiguous relevance to today's energy situation. Mrs. Henderson thought it would make interesting reading and submitted it to the Daily Pilot newspaper of Orange County which reprinted the item on May 20, 1973, as follows:

INVENTOR WHO MADE GASOLINE FROM WATER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Today, with gasoline scarce along the Atlantic coast, certain U.S. naval officers remember with regret a mysterious inventor who turned up during the last war and said he was able to make gasoline out of water.

The story seems like a myth, but it is recorded in the U.S. naval institute proceedings, an official record, and the navy in 1916 was so convinced that gasoline could be made out of water that it was willing to pay \$2,000,000 for the process.

But suddenly, the inventor, a Portuguese, disappeared. The navy has never been able to find him since.

Here is the official version as written down by Captain E. P. Jessop, then senior engineering officer at the New York navy yard. He records that a Portuguese named John Andrews came to the engineering laboratory of the New York navy yard where he poured water from a navy bucket into the fuel tank of a navy motor boat engine, then took a small phial from his pocket and dropped 6 or 7 drops of a greenish fluid into

the tank. Then he said, "Start the engine."

The inventor had not examined the engine or altered it in any way. It sputtered a bit at first, then settled down to work and consumed every drop of fuel in the tank, developing 75 percent of its rated horsepower.

"By this time," writes Captain Jessop in the official record, "we were in a state of mind to describe. We had seen a gas engine assimilate a great percentage of water in its fuel, when all our experience had proved that a very small percentage of water in the fuel would make the engine refuse duty; and the simplicity of Andrews' equipment seemed to make it impossible for him to have deceived us."

WANTED CASH OR NOTHING

Next day the experiment was repeated with salt water. This time, to make sure there was no deception, the mixture was made in a room entirely bare of furniture. Again the inventor poured water into the gasoline tank, mixed a few drops of green liquid with it, the engine started and did not even sputter. It settled down at once, developing 75 percent of its rated horsepower.

Next, Inventor Andrews was taken to Washington for a demonstration before the navy's bureau of engineering. It was so convincing that the navy asked to buy his invention. The price asked was \$2,000,000. The navy countered by offering to put \$2,000,000 in the bank in escrow, the money to be paid when he had taught ten naval experts to mix the fuel. Andrews refused the offer, saying he wanted cash. This made the navy skeptical. They hesitated, and a day or two later the inventor disappeared. He has never been heard of since.

"Personally," concludes Captain Jessop, "I believe that John Andrews had a very valuable secret, and it is a pity some way could not be worked out to satisfy his requirement."

COURT BLOCKS ILLEGAL TENURE OF ACTING OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY DIRECTOR

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. district court in Washington held that Howard J. Phillips is serving illegally as Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The hypocrisy of the President's call for law and order is emphasized once again: Watergate, illegal impoundments of appropriated funds, and now an illegal appointment to a high Government position.

Not only is the administration's lack of respect for the law of the land an issue, but Congress must also deal with the White House's attitude that the poor are second-class citizens.

During the tenure of Howard J. Phillips as Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the administration began a deliberate, concerted attack on antipoverty programs. A court order was required to block Phillips' illegal efforts to dismantle OEO. Now, we learn, Phillips has been appointed to an important position of trust and responsibility in direct violation of the law.

The victims of this latest administration escapade into lawlessness are the 25.6 million poor Americans who must bear the burden of the emasculation of

Federal programs which were originally designed to help them into the economic, educational, legal, and social mainstream in this country. The efforts of the President and his officials to destroy the anti-poverty program will sentence the poor in the United States to further discrimination and degradation. Yesterday's court decision represents another roadblock for the administration's path of lawlessness.

THE WATERGATE AFFAIR AND A DUAL STANDARD OF MORALITY

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I do not condone anything that happened in the Watergate affair, and I believe that all persons who were guilty of illegal acts should be punished; but I do believe there has been a dual standard of morality and a dual standard of justice applied by many individuals, including segments of the American press.

Recently I have received a letter from a constituent whose name I do not submit because I have not requested permission to use his name. However, his letter was most effective and clearly states a point of view which I think should be expressed in this day and age. The letter follows.

MAY 17, 1973.

HON. CHARLES GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: This letter is philosophical, but I think it is something with which all of us had better concern ourselves. I don't like what I see. I am not as certain as the Birchers seem to be that this whole sordid mess is an insidious plot to destroy this nation, but if it is not, it sure as hell has all the symptoms of such a plot.

Let's make some comparisons of how certain news items are carried by the media and/or are seized upon by various groups and organizations and used for their own ends.

Watergate is treated as a horrendous crime. To date, we are sure of only one thing—a crime was committed—burglary. The rest appears to be allegations blown out from within the confines of allegation into "fact".

Yet, in 1960, and again in 1964, stolen ballot boxes were sluffed off with Mona Lisa smiles while break-ins of local Goldwater headquarters and the planting of spies inside the Goldwater Campaign was justified to save the nation from a "trigger-happy war-monger". Where was the righteous indignation of Congress and the news media then?

Ellsberg stole documents. Whether their revelation was harmful to the U.S. is not the issue, although it is of major concern. At issue was the stealing of documents (property) not belonging to Ellsberg. Result? He is a hero—not in my book—but among the news media and certain elements in this country. In my book—he was a spy, the same as Liddy, McCord etc. Could we not just as easily say that the motives of both the Watergate people and Ellsberg were the same? Ellsberg claims he did what he thought was right. What we have here is situation ethics.

The Watergate episode was justified on the grounds of National Security and protection of the President. This became unthinkable

as a despicable act, but the stealing of security documents becomes heroism.

Secrets are stolen and Congress dignifies the admitted thief by giving him credibility as a witness.

Angela Davis, Magee, Ellsberg and other radicals are treated as the persecuted minorities and acquitted with jubilation.

Refusal of reporters to testify is equated with courage and heroism. Refusal of Liddy to testify against himself becomes a criminal act. Murderers and rapists are the "victims of society" while the real victim sees no justice.

We find supporters of the Genocide Treaty that would supersede the Bill of Rights and permit an American citizen to be hauled off and tried in Russia, Cuba, Red China or other foreign countries on "genocide" charges. You also have many of these same people insisting that five Irish-Americans imprisoned in Texas for refusal to testify before a Federal Grand Jury should have been tried before a hometown Grand Jury in New York.

The President is charged, prosecuted, judged, convicted and sentenced by allegations of witnesses, the veracity of whom is highly questionable to the extent that even Jack Anderson stated there were no legal facts submitted. Senators Proxmire and Mansfield attacked the press and news media in stronger terms than Spiro Agnew ever uttered. The only ripple was a blast by the media against Proxmire and Mansfield, a blurb about the 1st Amendment and then they let it die.

There are some who seem more interested in destroying the President as a man. There are some who seem to go beyond that. They are more interested in destroying the Presidency. Then you have some of both who are more interested in their respective ends than the United States or its form of government. They could care less if it destroys the nation so long as their vindictive goals are achieved.

I would suggest that those who have all the "inside" information use those sources to find out who the people are that want to destroy the President and the Presidency itself, and while they are at it find the double agent in the President's Campaign Headquarters and/or his White House staff. There had to be one Charlie.

Quod licet jovi, non licet bovi.

SAD DAY FOR LITHUANIANS

HON. JOHN Y. MCCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. MCCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with all Lithuanian people in taking special note of today, June 15. This is a day of special sadness. Not only for the Lithuanians but for all freedom-loving persons throughout the world. On this day in 1940, Lithuania was forcibly annexed into the Soviet Union.

Lithuanians are still risking their lives in defiance of the Communist regime 33 years later. This courage and determination on the part of Lithuanian citizens in their country and in America serve to remind us that there has been no widespread acceptance among Lithuanians of Soviet rule.

To remember this day is not a happy task, but it is significant, because it symbolizes the will and spirit of those who have not given up in their quest for a free Lithuania. Freedom of self-govern-

ment is the right of every human being. It is hoped the injustices suffered by Lithuanians will be recognized and something soon will be done to correct this intolerable situation.

VEYSEY OUTLINES NATIONAL BLOOD BANK ACT

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week I reintroduced the National Blood Bank Act, an updated version of the bill which I authored with nearly 100 cosponsors in the 92d Congress. The new legislation, H.R. 8386, contains several improvements over last year's legislation. We have been assured serious committee attention to this bill in both the House and the Senate. The need for this legislation is well recognized. Our archaic blood bank system contributes to at least 50,000 cases of serum hepatitis annually, and this bill is directed squarely at eliminating that tragic and unnecessary statistic.

Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of my original legislation in November 1971, I have received literally thousands of letters of encouragement from throughout the Nation from serum hepatitis victims who survived, and from the families of serum hepatitis victims who were not so fortunate. On the other hand, the opposition to this legislation has been almost nonexistent.

The legislation would set up under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a national blood bank program, to be administered by the Secretary of HEW and with the job of assuring an adequate supply of safe blood throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the main thrust of my legislation will be to begin a transformation in our nationwide blood banking system—a movement to do away with our long time reliance on buying and selling blood to supply our needs. This legislation would direct instead, a nationwide campaign for volunteer blood, which by documented medical statistics ranges from 11 to 70 times safer than purchased blood. In short, the intent is to do away with the skid-row brokers of disease-ridden blood who are not controlled by law in most States.

My bill would require simply that predominately volunteer blood be labeled class A, and that commercial, or purchased blood be labeled class B unless the Secretary of HEW can otherwise justify classifying purchased blood class A from a particular blood bank's past performance.

Along with the drive to develop a reliable supply of volunteer blood, my legislation would institute a close watch on sources of diseased blood, through the establishment of a National Blood Donor Registry. Persons who are involved in the transmission of hepatitis will then be notified and screened out—for their own good as well as that of the potential unwitting victim.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the complete text of the National Blood Bank Act for the information of our colleagues, and include it as an extension of my remarks.

H.R. 8386

A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, and to establish a national registry of blood donors

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that human blood is necessary for medical treatment and that an adequate supply of pure and safe blood throughout the United States is essential to the welfare of the Nation. Congress further finds that interstate shipment of pure and safe whole blood and blood components is necessary for the welfare of the United States; that since human blood is a living tissue which cannot be manufactured, an adequate interstate supply of blood depends upon the willingness of individuals to donate their blood; that since the virus hepatitis, malaria, and other diseases are transmitted in human blood and are found significantly more often in the blood of persons who donate for monetary compensation than in the blood of voluntary donors, the purity and safety of the national blood supply is seriously threatened by the inadequate level of voluntary donation and by monetary compensation of blood donors. The Congress therefore finds that the welfare of the United States will be promoted by development of a 100 per centum voluntary blood supply as soon as feasible, that voluntary donation should therefore be encouraged and promoted, and that certain procedures and standards should be established with respect to the operation of all blood banks in the United States.

SEC. 2. There is established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Blood Bank program.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to assure an adequate supply of pure and safe blood throughout the Nation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

- (1) promulgate regulations for licensing and inspection of blood banks;
- (2) develop, by grant or contract, new procedures, materials, and techniques to inform the public of the need to donate blood voluntarily;
- (3) provide direct assistance to establish an adequate supply of voluntary blood in those parts of the country where it is presently unavailable;
- (4) develop a national program to honor and recognize voluntary donors;
- (5) establish yearly goals of voluntary donors for each blood bank;
- (6) conduct evaluations of the effectiveness of various recruitment techniques and inform the licensed blood banks of the most effective techniques;
- (7) classify blood banks as either "class A blood banks" or "class B blood banks";
 - (A) a class A blood bank is one which collects no more than a specified percentage of its blood from paid donors. The Secretary is authorized to qualify a blood bank which does not meet this percentage as a class A blood bank if, in his opinion, its previous record of performance qualifies it to be so classified;
 - (B) a class B blood bank is any blood bank not classified as a "class A blood bank";
- (8) annually increase the percentage of voluntary donors to qualify as a class A blood bank to the highest level consistent with an adequate national blood supply; and
- (9) require that each unit of blood collected by a blood bank be clearly labeled as obtained either from a class A blood bank or a class B blood bank.

(b) The Secretary shall maintain a registry of all persons who give blood after July 1, 1973, to a licensed blood bank and shall identify donors on such registry who may have been implicated in the transmission of hepatitis or who should otherwise be disqualified as blood donors. The Secretary shall notify all blood banks of such disqualifying information.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Advisory Council to be composed of the following nine members appointed by the President:

- (1) two representatives from each national blood bank system, one of whom shall be a person with not less than five years' recent experience in blood bank administration;
- (2) three representatives of blood consumer groups including:
 - (A) one hospital administrator;
 - (B) one representative of organized labor;
 - (C) one representative of business management; and
- (3) two persons experienced in advertising and public relations neither of whom may be employed or retained during their service on the Council by any firm or other organization which is engaged in operating a blood bank.

(b) DUTIES OF COUNCIL.—The Advisory Council shall—

- (1) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to long-term policy goals to be pursued by the Secretary in carrying out his functions under section 3 of this Act;
- (2) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the encouragement of blood donation and the motivation, recruitment, and recognition of blood donors;
- (3) make recommendations to the Secretary relating to reciprocal transactions between national blood bank systems to the extent that no agreement relating to such transactions exists between such systems; and
- (4) make recommendations to the Secretary relating to the removal of the cost for purchasing blood, as distinguished from the combined cost of the blood and its processing from coverage under health insurance plans.

(c) TRAVEL EXPENSES: PER DIEM.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Council, members of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

BLOOD ASSURANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. No person other than a blood bank which is classified as a "class A blood bank" may maintain any program in which individuals deposit blood in advance of their need for blood or pledge to give blood upon request.

PURCHASE OF BLOOD BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 6. No agency, department, or other instrumentality of the Government of the United States shall contract for or pay for the provision of blood from any person other than a class A blood bank and such agency, department, or other instrumentality shall take such measures as may be necessary to insure that such blood has been tested according to the best available test for hepatitis.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than \$1,000 or both.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

- (a) "Blood" means human whole blood, or any component thereof.
- (b) "Blood bank" means any person or other entity engaged in the bleeding of individuals and performing any of the following functions—
 - (1) recruitment of blood donors;
 - (2) processing of blood for transfusions;
 - (3) storage of blood;
 - (4) crossmatching of blood;
 - (5) administration of blood to individuals;

or

- (6) preparation of blood components for transfusion.

(c) "Blood donor" means a paid blood donor or a voluntary blood donor.

(d) "Paid blood donor" means an individual who receives monetary compensation or an adjustment in his scheduled period of prison confinement for his donation of blood or any component thereof.

(e) "Voluntary blood donor" means any individual donating his blood other than a paid donor.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

MAY WE HAVE QUIET, PLEASE?

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it seems obvious from an analysis of the current fuel shortage that because the causes are so many and the problem is so enormously complex no simple, short-range "solution" is possible. Steps have already been taken, however, to relieve immediate pressures and to deal with the most critical needs. The administration initiated a voluntary allocation formula on May 23, 1973, and indications I have received from Idaho's Second District are that those who have contacted regional offices of the Office of Oil and Gas within the Department of the Interior have received the necessary assistance and complete cooperation.

The Oil Policy Committee will soon be taking testimony on the question of whether the voluntary program is adequate and whether mandatory controls should be instated. Reports of the results of the voluntary program thus far have been encouraging. However, I am deeply concerned over the prospects for later this summer when harvesting operations on the farms are at their peak. If the usual recreation and vacation demands for petroleum create still stronger competition with farmers, a voluntary allocation system may prove insufficient.

Those of us who represent rural areas know that there simply is no greater problem facing us at this moment than assuring an adequate supply of vital petroleum to farmers and the related transportation industry.

Apparently a majority of the Senate shares my concern, as that body recently passed legislation which would make the allocation program mandatory. The bill is now before the House and we shall

soon have to decide the question. Though I do at this point have some reservations regarding the practical effectiveness of the mandatory mechanism incorporated in the Senate bill, my concern over its being able to cope from hour to hour with farmers' needs across the Nation is even greater.

Again, more thoughtful study will be necessary before the proper answers become apparent. The potential consequences of any ill-advised action in a nation as technologically oriented as ours are such that we must take a calm, level-headed look at the problem. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues an address which was recently delivered by one of Idaho's and the Nation's most respected authorities on the subject of power, Mr. Ralph H. Wickberg, who has been a long-time and dedicated commissioner on the Idaho Public Utilities Commission. To bring Mr. Wickberg's analysis of the problem to the attention of my colleagues, I include his address as part of my remarks:

MAY WE HAVE QUIET PLEASE!

(By Commissioner Ralph H. Wickberg)

The present energy crunch or crisis poses some very unusual possibilities. The conventional wisdom indicates that the United States has consumed its available energy resources in a profligate manner. This consumption of energy resources without regard for economic consequence or for future availability has now created some interesting trade offs.

The U.S. consumer has been provided a high standard of living that cannot be maintained by the continued use of cheap energy resources that have been but are not now available. We now must seek out alternative energy sources if our standard of living is to be maintained at its present level.

There have been numerous studies discussing our shortage of fossil fuels, particularly petroleum products, and there have been many suggestions as to how the U.S. can develop other energy sources to replace those now in short supply. There are so many conflicting interests involved in assessing our apparent energy shortage and possible cures thereto that it resembles the Tower of Babel. The public is being torn between all of these conflicting interests that on the one hand contend that disaster will overtake the human race if more energy resources are not developed, and those interests who contend that there is no energy crisis and that in their belief the absence of additional energy will bring back the good life. Since national and community leaders are themselves divided on this issue there can be no national consensus.

As a state regulator it is my considered judgment that an unnecessary crisis is quickly approaching because of a lack of consensus amongst our intellectual, scientific, political and technical leaders. It is impossible for anyone to alert the American public to the true situation when everyone is talking and no one is listening.

It would seem to this individual that some basic criteria could be established that would inform not only the leaders of this nation but also the general public as to what penalties the energy crisis would impose on this nation's economic and social fabric if certain energy requirements are unmet.

There have been glowing pictures painted of our increasing affluent society that has been predicated in our past use of an apparent unlimited supply of reasonably priced energy. Many people have also assumed that the work day and work week may decline without additional energy supplies and still the U.S. standard of living will continue to

flourish. This, in my opinion, is an unwarranted assumption and those that practice this theory must be ill informed as to the role that energy plays in our affluent society.

There may well be legitimate conservation practices that this nation and its people may adopt, but each has economic and social consequence. In other words, any long range economic forecast that has promised continued affluency to those people now affluent with glowing additional promises to the disadvantage that they will become affluent, inevitably will be inaccurate and misleading to the degree that energy could become unavailable or extremely expensive. Should energy become scarce the promises of a better material life will wither away.

Our present national debate on energy does not place the problem before the American people in its true perspective. In my judgment, this nation must decide, through a soul searching inquiry, our national goals for the furnishing of goods and services for the present and succeeding generation. Should the country decide that the material standard of living is too high and that the consumption rate of natural resources cannot be maintained, our energy goals will be determined by those decisions.

The consequences of slowing down our economy by failing to provide for adequate supplies of clean energy would be catastrophic. Many millions of our citizens would be added to our presently defined poverty class vis a vis other heavily populated energy short countries. Our great middle class would gradually fade away and we would become a nation composed of a wealthy minority and an economically deprived majority. In other words those that have and those that will never have.

Every person should understand that the majority of energy is used for and by the masses and that if energy becomes scarce the one who will suffer will be you and I.

If, on the other hand, we decide to maintain or improve our supply of goods and services, that decision will also help set our national energy policy.

This nation has a large number of well trained experts in all of the necessary disciplines to accurately project population trends for several years into the future. Setting economic goals and service levels for the projected population would be more speculative, but at least we should be able to ascertain some beneficial results by using our national intellect in a major effort to solve our present and future people problems.

This nation is blessed with the capability of solving not only our energy requirements, but we can also address ourselves to the pleasurable task of attracting people to meet these national goals. A well articulated national policy should include benefits for all citizens including the young, the old, minorities, scholars, the disadvantaged and, yes, the affluent.

Establishing these attainable goals should set the stage for the third century of progress for this nation and its people.

NO LONGER A MIRACLE

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents from Westlake, La., makes some salient points concerning pollution of our environment. She is Ms. Suzanne Pelley, a graduate of Westlake High School and now a freshman at

Northwestern State University in Natchitoches, La.

She writes:

It seems that the pollution problem has gotten completely out of hand. It is no longer a miracle to walk on water.

Also, for some reason, "fresh air" smells funny.

Surely something can be done to prevent industries from polluting our water and air. I feel that with the combined efforts of concerned citizens and our government, this problem can be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, when the act of walking on water ceases to be a miracle, any efforts we make in Congress to clean up the environment will be useless, for then the age of miracles will truly have passed. Only our decisive action now will avert an irrevocable situation and protect the miraculousness of water-walking.

HISTORIC I. & M. CANAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the year, numerous communities in Illinois will commemorate the historical events relating to the passage of Father Marquette and Louis Jolliet through what is now Illinois and neighboring States. Commemorations such as this properly stimulate an interest in other historical events.

One of the truly historical facilities in the State of Illinois is the old Illinois and Michigan Canal. Mrs. Sonia Kallick, an active member of the Lemont Area Historical Society, has contributed a very fascinating article on the building of the canal and its direct impact on the growth of the Lemont community. The article follows:

I. & M. CANAL SPARKS LEMONT'S GROWTH

(By Sonia Kallick)

Throughout history, cities and urban areas have developed because of their proximity to transportation, and in the past the seas, streams and lakes were the highways of the day.

As early as 1673, Father Marquette and Louis Jolliet were hindered by a portage between the Chicago and DePlaines River. In his journal, Jolliet pointed out that a short canal at the Chicago portage would allow a ship to travel from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico. But, nothing was done until after Illinois became a state in 1818.

Then, urged by the success of the Erie Canal in New York, pressure was brought to get Congress to pass enabling legislation to construct such a canal and thereby open our area to settlement.

On March 30, 1822, Congress authorized Illinois to build the Illinois and Michigan Canal and to finance the surveying with the sale of land along the route of the canal. By 1830, the first lots were sold in Chicago and Ottawa. Only \$18,000 was received from the first sale and some people began to have doubts about the future of the area and the canal.

Surveying also revealed that a longer canal had to be built, since the upper reaches of the river could not be used.

On July 4, 1836 the canal was begun with a big celebration at Bridgeport. Contractors and land speculators flocked to the area.

Some few contractors finished their portions of the canal early, such as N.J. Brown, who by 1837 had completed one mile of the canal that fronts on Lemont, but most contractors ran into financial and labor difficulties and the main portions were not dug until between 1843 and 1848.

The promise of construction brought workers, farmers, storekeepers and families, each looking for wages and land or both. Public land along the canal could be purchased for 25 cents an acre (before the panic of 1837) and by 1845 the going wage for a canal worker ranged from 50 cents to \$1.50 per day depending upon a man's skill.

The first settlers in the 1830's were mainly from the eastern seaboard (especially Pennsylvania and New York) and of English, German or Scottish ancestry. Here in Lemont, Jeremiah Luther and Forbes H. Miner were the first to settle in 1833, both coming from the East. They farmed the land near 131st St. and Derby Road.

These settlers were farmers looking for the fabled rich farmland of Illinois and were attracted by the ease of transportation through the newly completed Erie Canal, and by the lack of an Indian threat (the Black-hawks were defeated in 1833). They also saw opportunities to supplement their farm income by surveying, contracting, supplying animals, operating boarding houses, taverns, inns, selling equipment and offering a whole array of services to the laborers.

The unskilled and semi-skilled laborers on the Illinois and Michigan Canal were largely immigrants from Western and Northern Europe along with part-time local help and non-farmers. The largest groups of immigrants were from Germany, Scandinavia and Ireland.

The immigrants came for many reasons (some of the same reasons that cause people to emigrate today.) In the Scandinavian countries and Germany, the practice of leaving all the inheritable land to the eldest son drove many younger sons out to seek land in the new world.

In Sweden, the society was based on property and a non-land owner could not vote but he had to serve in the military for three months a year for three years. This draft was not popular and many left to avoid service.

In Germany, liberal student groups were attacked for the murder of a conservative writer. A series of repressive measures, including press censorship, dismissal of teachers and arrests sent many young Germans to the United States and eventually to Illinois.

The Irish came because of overcrowding, political unrest and famine. A young Irishman, Daniel O'Connell, created agitation against the Protestant English authorities and the fearful landowners encouraged the Irish Catholic emigration to reduce the number of people (Ireland had 8,200,000 people in 1841 compared to 3,000,000 in 1961). The landowners often paid passage for the emigrants.

To add to the problem in Ireland, in 1846 and 1847 the potato crop failed due to a blight, and faced with famine, the families of those who left earlier followed them to the new world.

The working conditions were severe and life hard for the immigrant canal digger; part-time workers, farmers and townspeople looked down upon them. Those with no land or money in reserve and families to support had to live in tent cities. Many spoke no English or did so with a strange accent. Religious differences became a reason for misunderstandings.

The canal was built with hand tools and black powder and much was dug through marshy bottom land. The men working on the canal stood knee deep in water a good deal of the time and were subject to such diseases as dysentery, cholera and malaria.

If it rained, work was halted and the men not paid, but the daily hotel or boarding

house bill continued to pile up. Lonely men in a strange country often drank too much, got into fights and met violent deaths.

Accidents were common among the unskilled and there was no health insurance for the disabled or permanently injured.

Unscrupulous foremen would start fights that led to such disagreements that no one was paid. Or from 1837 to 1842, workers were paid in script rather than money. Some businessmen would honor the script but much of it was never redeemable, especially as the state of Illinois grew closer to bankruptcy due to the cost of the canal and other internal improvements.

Original plans for the canal called for a six foot depth of water and a 60 foot wide canal from Bridgeport to LaSalle. The water level was to be maintained from Lake Michigan—but the increased building costs caused a change to a shallow cut canal with feeder canals from the Calumet, Fox and Kankakee Rivers to maintain water levels.

The canal was finally completed in 1848. Lemont had grown from two people in 1833 to 3,000 people 15 years later. This growth was due mainly to the canal. The I and M Canal brought goods and people into the area and carried out farm products and limestone to the Midwest and South.

The first boat to pass through the entire canal was the "General Thornton" of LaSalle—it carried a cargo of sugar.

One of the best known passenger barges on the canal was called "the Queen of the Prairie." It had a 50 foot cabin, nine feet wide and seven feet high. It held 30-50 people traveling six miles per hour. If that seems slow, remember it was considerably more comfortable than traveling dirt roads filled with ruts and holes in dry weather and a sea of mud in rainy weather.

The greatest contribution of the I and M Canal to Lemont was the people it attracted to work and live here. From all over the United States and the world they came. Some moved on when the canal was completed but many stayed. They saved their pay, bought land or shops, became farmers, shopkeepers and tradesmen. They or their children learned English and the customs of the country. They built the churches we see today. They became citizens of this country and the pioneers of the Lemont area.

TRIBUTE TO "BIG JIM"

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in Congress, on both sides of the aisle, in paying tribute to a great American.

James A. Farley, now 85 years old, has been a towering figure in American political life for some 35 years. As the leader of the Democratic Party, as a confidant and close friend of Franklin Roosevelt and as Postmaster General, Jim Farley helped to shape and initiate the New Deal and move our Nation toward progressive and compassionate policies. Today, as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., Farley is an important figure in the world of business.

Now, as American politics and politicians are being dragged through the mud of corruption, deceit, and dishonesty, it is encouraging to think back to the glorious days of the New Deal politics and

remember colorful men, such as James A. Farley, and to rededicate ourselves to living up to the examples and legacies that have been left.

ABANDONING OUR VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam veterans, like the veteran of earlier generations, deserves adequate benefits.

It is deeply disturbing that veterans aged 20 to 24 have an unemployment rate of 9.1 percent while 7.7 percent of nonveterans in the same age group are unemployed.

It is also a matter of grave concern that educational benefits for veterans are insufficient in many instances.

Today, an informative article by Peter Braestrup appeared in the Washington Post entitled "Abandoning Our Vietnam Veterans."

Indeed, it is essential that we not abandon our Vietnam veterans, or veterans of earlier wars, for that matter.

Prisoners of war, recently returned, are certainly deserving of the honors they are receiving. At the same time, there are thousands more veterans who have also shown courage and dedication to our country and merit special attention and assistance as they go through the sometimes painful process of moving back into the mainstream of American life.

For the interest of my colleagues, I am inserting the perceptive article by Peter Braestrup in the RECORD:

ABANDONING OUR VIETNAM VETERANS

(By Peter Braestrup)

Amid widespread attention to the 600 returning POWs since February, there has been little new emphasis in Washington on schools, jobs, and other benefits for the 2.5 million other veterans who served in Vietnam in 1965-72.

Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.), chairman of the Senate veterans committee, and a handful of likeminded colleagues on Capitol Hill voiced the hope that Mr. Nixon's focus on the POWs, climaxed by last month's White House dinner in their honor, would help the Vietnam ex-GIs as well.

According to both congressional and administration sources, no such effect has occurred. Indeed, the administration, largely on budget grounds, has quietly resisted congressional pressure for more "action" to help veterans.

"Our POWs," observed Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) recently, "deserve all the attention they are getting. Our disabled and unemployed veterans deserve equal attention which they are not getting."

Veterans Administration sources said that the \$12 billion a year agency had received no fresh guidelines from the White House Office of Management and Budget to speed up VA benefit payments, including GI Bill checks, in response to recent criticism, notably in Denver and San Diego.

Moreover, these sources said, OMB was still exploring ways to cut VA disability payments to Vietnam amputees and others as an anti-inflation measure. A VA "draft" plan, ordered by OMB, to cut such benefits

up to 60 per cent was withdrawn last February by White House order after an uproar on Capitol Hill.

Education and jobs have been the chief congressional concerns.

One major contention by Sen. Hartke, Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) and their allies is that the current \$1,980-a-year allowance to Vietnam veterans for tuition, living expenses and all other college costs fails both to meet 1973 costs and to match, in real terms, the tuition-plus-\$75 a month GI Bill enjoyed in the '40s by World War II veterans. Veterans Administrator Donald E. Johnson has not argued otherwise in congressional testimony.

Under a law signed by President Nixon Oct. 14, Johnson had six months to produce a comparative study of World War II and Vietnam era GI Bill costs and benefits. Congress wanted the study by April, 1973, in order to revise Vietnam veterans' benefits in time for the start of 1973 school year.

In April, Johnson quietly informed the Senate and House veterans panels that his agency had been unable, because of various procedural problems, to get started on the study. He said it would be ready in September.

Hartke was enraged. He wrote Johnson May 3 that Vietnam veterans "may infer that this delay is intentional" so as to handicap any congressional action to increase GI Bill benefits "prior to the start of the 1973 fall term."

On May 7, Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) with the backing of four other senators, introduced legislation adding up to \$1,000 per year in tuition payments to the current \$1,980 GI Bill benefits—theoretically enough, with work-study programs and other aid, to get the ex-GI through most schools, despite inflation. A similar bill is being circulated in the House.

However, Hartke plans no hearings on McGovern's bill, on grounds that the more conservative House, buttressed by White House objections as in the past, will reject it both as too generous and as conducive to "profiteering" by educational institutions.

Hartke's own revived proposition, also likely to encounter White House objection but more House sympathy, is to allow Vietnam veterans to borrow up to \$1,000 a year for school costs, repayable with safeguards at low interest in 10 years, from the \$7 billion National Services Life Insurance trust fund. The fund is financed by GI insurance premiums paid mostly by World War II veterans.

None of these congressional initiatives has stirred administration support or the fervor of most congressmen. Only after a lawsuit by veterans did the U.S. Office of Education agree last month to start spending \$25 million appropriated by Congress last fall as incentives to colleges to admit and counsel ex-GIs—too late for the 1973 spring term. Not one of 70 new Labor Department specialists, ordered by Congress in the 1972 law to monitor civil service hiring under veterans job preference regulations, has been hired.

Meanwhile, for veterans aged 20-24, the April unemployment rate is 9.1 per cent, versus 7.7 per cent for their non-veteran contemporaries.

JIM FARLEY, GREAT AMERICAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we all join in happy congratulations to see Jim Far-

ley celebrate his 85th birthday. Dick West in the Dallas Morning News captures the spirit of this dynamic American. I particularly call your attention to the description of this "sensible, compassionate, and knowledgeable" American. Jim Farley is one of our greatest elder statesmen. The editorial is as follows:

JIM FARLEY AT 85

The Hon. James A. Farley was 85 the other day. This is hard to believe. He still is erect as ever, still as alert, still as sensible, compassionate and knowledgeable.

"Jim" was the political power of his day—the terrible depression years which spawned the New Deal and Franklin D. Roosevelt. He now lives at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City, and at a press conference on his birthday made these comments on a currently emotional subject:

Impeachment of President Nixon because of Watergate "would be disastrous because I have such high regard for the office of the President." Such action, he said, "would divide the country in a way it never has been divided before."

National chairman of the Democratic party and Postmaster-General during Franklin D. Roosevelt's first two terms, Mr. Farley is not gloating over the GOP's present embarrassments. This is typical of him; he puts his country's interests first, rather than to seize on a political scandal to advance his own party's interests.

The News applauds an attitude like this. It also wishes Jim many, many more birthdays. There are too few, like him, who put integrity, personal faith and devotion to country ahead of expediences.

PERSONAL INCOME TAX RETURNS AND THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I note that in the Federal Register, for today, June 12, 1973, at page 15437, there appears Executive Order 11722 which opens any income, estate, or gift tax return for the years 1964 to 1974, inclusive, for inspection by the House Committee on Internal Security. This is a broad grant of authority.

There is no doubt that a committee of Congress has the right, and sometimes the duty, to inspect tax returns. But as is the case with any confidential material, clearance to see confidential material is not sufficient; there must also be a need to know.

Mr. Speaker, I question whether any committee of Congress has a need to know the tax returns of every American for the past 10 years. This merely facilitates a fishing expedition into the personal and private affairs of citizens.

I would remind my colleagues that the term "return" does not only include forms, schedules, and statements. It also includes records, reports, information received orally or in writing, factual data, documents, papers, abstracts, memorandums, or evidence taken, or any portion thereof, relating to returns. Internal Revenue Code Regulations, section

301.6103(a)-1(a)(3). This is material that an individual files under penalty of law, not voluntarily. We should be wary of any grant of authority which permits a congressional committee or anyone else to conduct a fishing expedition into the personal and private affairs of individuals.

POWER ON CAPITOL HILL

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the current issue—June, 1973—of the Ripon Forum magazine contains a very interesting article written by one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Titled "Power on Capitol Hill," my good friend discusses the energy problem, eruditely identifying the principal requirements for a truly effective solution.

Because of CHUCK MOSHER's great expertise in this area and also because of the germaneness of the subject at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, I herewith insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

POWER ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Charles A. Mosher)

The complex imperatives of "the energy problem" cut across and into all other policy considerations—economic, social, ecological, moral, philosophical, aesthetic, political, and jurisdictional. It will be involved in and foster all other national policy issues and decisions for many, many years to come.

Thus, there is only one center of authority and power in American life capable (hopefully) of providing the innovative coordinating leadership and leverage required to begin to deal effectively with these "energy crisis" problems so innately part and parcel of all national problems—and that is the presidency.

It has been popular recently in the Congress to call for the creation of some form of new coordinating and action mechanism in the bureaucracy, an Energy Council or an Energy Czar; but I am convinced that no such device can possibly succeed, except as a direct arm of the President right at the White House level.

And even a strong President can succeed only by enlisting big majorities in the Congress, persuading public opinion, winning some key decisions in the courts, negotiating effectively with other nations—no simple, easy assignment. Can Richard Nixon do it?

One starting point certainly must be a radical reorganization to consolidate and coordinate, to make coherent the responsibilities for energy now fragmented and often at cross purposes in literally dozens of government offices, committees, commissions, and councils.

Many of us were heartened when Mr. Nixon decided to create an energy staff in the White House and named Charles Di Bona to head that new, small, competent group. Its mission is to identify and assess energy problems and opportunities that abound in each and all of the three policy jurisdictions assigned to President Nixon's top assistants—Shultz, Ehrlichman (formerly) and Kissinger—in economics, domestic issues and national security, respectively; to coordinate energy policy in all three areas, to use the authority and powers of the presidency

to pull together a coherent national energy action program.

Obviously, as with every other aspect of this "crisis," it is a complicated, difficult assignment for Di Bona to act as special energy consultant to the President, heading a staff that will work with all three presidential assistants and their respective staffs. I assume there is implied considerable authority to knock heads together, to begin to force all of the many scattered government energy policies and activities into a coherent system.

It is much too early to know whether this strategy will succeed. Di Bona has been there only a few weeks, and I suspect he had to concentrate all his attention until April 18 in an effort to pull together ideas for Mr. Nixon's second energy message, sent to the Congress on that date. Months before Di Bona arrived, others in the White House—Peter Flanigan and Jim Akins especially—had been studying, analyzing, writing and rewriting in what must have been a frustrating, discouraging effort to produce an energy message acceptable to the President and his advisors.

Few "hurrahs" greeted the President's energy recommendations when finally announced. The message was a mixed bag and provoked mixed reaction.

Interior Secretary Rogers Morton (using excessive hyperbole characterization of this Administration's view of its own policies) immediately declared, "President Nixon's energy program is one of the most far-reaching and significant pronouncements in recent history..."

Administration critics, of course, took the opposite view. U.S. Rep. Morris Udall pointed to reliance on "oil from the Arabs" and "the all-out dig-dam-drill approach" as two "unacceptable... nonsolutions." Hobart Rowen, *Washington Post* finance writer, called the message, "a great disappointment... he has produced nothing more than a dry hole... a bit of Pabulum."

My own personal reaction is at the "well yes and no" level. Certainly the President does for the most part point us in good directions; but I hear no clarion call, no imperative demand, no great sense of urgency at several points where I am convinced the need for greater urgency is very real.

His proposal for a new cabinet-rank Department of Energy and Natural Resources (DENR) makes good sense; but his somewhat similar recommendation to the 92d Congress was ignored. Now, by including "energy" in the proposed department's name, he adds a welcome new emphasis; but it seems doubtful that this Congress will adopt the plan. U.S. Rep. Chet Holifield (D-Calif.) probably is one formidable obstacle. As chairman of the Government Operations Committee, Holifield will control that reorganization bill; but he also is the leading congressional champion of the Atomic Energy Commission. He is reported to be very dubious about the President's plan to transfer major energy functions from the AEC to a huge new DENR. The DENR would absorb almost all of the present Interior Department, plus parts of the AEC and several other agencies.

Pending action on the DENR concept, Mr. Nixon directed the Interior Department to establish a new Office of Energy Conservation. Secretary Morton has taken that action as part of a larger, related reorganization in his department which also creates other new offices, for Energy Data and Analysis, Research and Development, Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration, and Land Use and Water Planning, respectively—all to be involved in supporting the President's energy program.

Significant changes designed to strengthen energy-related policy also are in progress in the National Science Foundation, NASA and, perhaps most importantly, in the Office of

Management and Budget. (We in the Congress resent it and fight it, but OMB's increasingly powerful role in making crucial policy decisions is currently undeniable.)

The President certainly is right in abolishing the oil quota system and tariffs on imported oil. The move should have been made two or three years ago; but it is a prime example of how an expedient solution to one public problem so often creates two or three other problems. He was forced to end the quota system, because that is the only way to obtain sufficient oil to meet the next ten or so years; now, however, we have got to rely increasingly on oil from the Mideast during those years.

That also perhaps justifies the legislation he proposes for federal licensing to encourage the building of deep sea ports and rights-of-way for pipelines to carry into land the oil unloaded far out at sea.

But obviously, all those actions will encourage our increasing reliance on Mideast oil, and who wants that? Our resulting balance of payments problems, the threat of increased Arab wealth being used to disrupt world money markets, our increasing dependence on the erratic political and military situation in the Mideast or our own increased political and military involvement there... all these are extremely unhappy prospects.

So, how do we manage to obtain that imported oil for the next few years when we desperately will need it, but at the same time feel confident of being able to end that reliance early in the 1980's when we will have developed adequate domestic sources?

Mr. Nixon proposes to accomplish that trick by opening the flood gates to imported oil now, but then by gradually increasing license fees on imports to be levied in the years ahead, and by a much higher fee on imports of refined petroleum products than on crude oil (to encourage increased refinery production here)—those licensing devices, plus new tax incentives to encourage oil prospecting, plus tripling the federal leasing program for offshore oil and gas exploration—plus his urgent support for construction of the Alaska pipeline, and speeding up the leasing of oil shale areas of the public lands in western states. Obviously, these are controversial plans, and it is too early to judge how readily or how far the Congress may go in accepting them.

One imperative necessity (both in the short term period of dependence on imported oil and looking to the long term availability of more domestic oil) is the construction of new, modern refineries (designed not to pollute) at strategically located cities especially in the northeastern states; the White House also is pushing strategies to accomplish this.

But I am so convinced that the nation (and eventually the rest of the world, too) must end entirely our dependence on oil and natural gas as energy sources and I believe so urgently in that necessity, that I tend to be very doubtful and impatient about these plans to import oil and gas in vast new quantities, and to increasingly tap new domestic supplies. No matter where they are, these resources are in the long view extremely limited and therefore extremely valuable; we have an imperative obligation not to use them recklessly, but to conserve them diligently. That is our profoundly moral and practical obligation to future generations.

Mr. Nixon did say we must achieve a "national energy conservation ethic." I hope that a really tough-minded, strong-willed somebody, able and skilled, will be named to run Interior's new Office of Energy Conservation. There is a suspicion that considerably more than the efforts mentioned in the President's message—voluntary labeling of appliances to indicate their relative efficiency in use of electricity, for example—are needed. The President is demanding cooperation for energy conservation in all the federal agen-

cies and major efforts are underway in the General Services Administration, National Bureau of Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Housing and Urban Development, National Science Foundation, and undoubtedly others.

Note well that many proposals for reducing energy use would require difficult, controversial adjustments in the average guy's present way of life. Guy Stever, recently named science advisor by the President and director of NSF, comments, "The pathways out of this dilemma are tortuous and complex."

Most significant of all are critical doubts about the Administration's energy research and technology development funding effort. Substantial appropriations beyond those allowed by OMB in the FY 1974 budget proposals could produce big dividends if used effectively for concentrated R & D efforts in certain energy areas. (As a matter of budgeting philosophy, I look upon all good R & D not as expense but as capital investment from which there will be profitable return.)

There were advance rumors that Mr. Nixon might recommend an added \$100 million or so for energy R & D. But his message did not offer a cent more than already proposed in his original budget. He plans to obligate about \$772 million for energy R & D in FY 1974, compared with approximately \$537 million actually used in FY 1973—obviously a very substantial increase. And the private sector also will spend more than \$1.1 billion on energy-related R & D in 1974. But Sen. Jackson is getting a lot of attention for his bill which projects federal funding at average levels of \$2 billion per year for 10 years; and our "Energy Task Force" of the House Science Committee chaired by U.S. Rep. Mike McCormack recently declared that at least an additional \$1 billion per year could be well invested for R & D in that area. I agree.

I recognize the very real budget constraints right now. I willingly accept the President's demand that federal expenditures shall not exceed a total of \$268 billion for FY 1974; in fact, most everyone in this Congress accepts that total, and it is a good guess we actually will appropriate a bit less than that. But each of us has his own vigorous disagreements with the Nixon expenditure priorities within that \$268 billion total, and perhaps a majority of us may agree on a higher priority for energy R & D.

Agreed, for the short run (10 years, maybe) we will have to scramble, using almost any expedient to try to find enough of our traditional fuels; and such expedients are evident in the President's energy message. Yes, it really may be essential, as the President suggests, that some states will be forced to postpone (very selectively and temporarily, I hope) fully implementing their air-quality standards. Unhappily, that may be required by a genuine short term need to burn increased amounts of dirty coal. As yet, there is no adequate technology to remove the sulphur oxides in stack gasses.

But for the longer period (from 1980 to 2000) surely we can have a coherent plan, and I assume that means: 1) Decreasing reliance on oil and gas; 2) A huge new reliance on coal, after we have succeeded in a crash R & D program to achieve (sulphur free) coal gasification and coal liquification on a commercial basis; 3) Continuing construction of a good many nuclear fission power plants, with increasing emphasis on safety and pollution abatement technologies; 4) Moving as rapidly as possible to achieve commercially successful breeder reactors—but using them only in that intermediate period.

And then, our ultimate goal (beginning in the next century) must be to diminish as quickly as possible any reliance on today's principal energy—let us forget oil, gas, coal, nuclear fission—and by that time depend on thermonuclear fusion and solar energy.

So, if the above, sketchy, oversimplified plan for 50 years of energy progress makes good sense, then let us recognize that it can happen only if given sufficient momentum right now, only if we have the foresight, will and courage to embark now on a really tremendous, vigorous, urgent R & D effort, using the total systems approach.

I am guessing the prime candidates for considerably greater R & D funding immediately should be the following: 1) Coal stack gas removal. 2) Coal gasification and liquefaction, plus vastly improved techniques for mining safety and environmental protections in mining. 3) Fast breeder reactors, with increased emphasis on alternatives (gas cooled?) to the currently emphasized liquid metal fast breeders. 4) Long term nuclear waste disposal technology. 5) Thermonuclear fusion. 6) Solar energy. 7) Pollution controls. 8) Energy conservation technologies, including new concepts in building construction, more efficient storage and transmission of electricity, and surely more efficient economically feasible, productive systems for recycling wastes.

Let us acknowledge that all of the above R & D needs are recognized to some extent in the President's April 18 message, or in his executive agency planning. In fact, his 1974 budget proposes substantially increased funding for several such efforts, notably fast breeders (up \$63 million), fusion (up \$22 million), coal production and utilization (up \$28 million), and solar energy (up \$8 million). And Guy Stever of NSF, the new science advisor, assured the House Science Committee that, "When additional funds are found to be essential for proper implementation of well-conceived and designed research programs, (the President) will make every effort to see that they are provided. . . (but) it is clear that we must identify the trade-off . . ."

Nevertheless, I am one of those who remain unhappy with the level and tone of Mr. Nixon's commitment to our national energy R & D needs . . . and in fact his attitudes in the whole realm of national policy making for science and technology; the essential sense of genuine awareness and urgency does seem lacking. I cannot help but feel that he is allowing OMB to skimp on R & D funding to an extent that produces false economies.

THE FEATHERSTONES HONOR MEDGAR EVERS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today on June 12, 1963, Medgar Evers was shot to death at his home in Jackson, Miss. He was the executive secretary of the Jackson branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Medgar Evers represented the hopes and aspirations of hundreds of thousands of black Mississippians who had an unyielding faith in this Government and its processes. He traveled the length and breadth of his State attempting to make it a more decent place for its black citizens to live in.

Today Medgar Evers is still remembered. He is remembered as an ordinary man whom circumstances made a giant and a leader. He is remembered as a man who loved and was loved by his family. He is remembered as a black hero who

lived and died for the dream of justice and equality in America.

In Detroit, Mich., Arthur and Ruth Featherstone have chosen to remember Medgar by naming their first born child Medgar Evers Featherstone. Arthur was a roommate of Medgar Evers in college. The Featherstones chose to honor Medgar Evers in their own way. Today, on this 10th memorial of one of America's truly unsung heroes, I would hope and urge those of us who shared in his dream to reflect on the Medgar Evers contribution, and in doing so, renew our determination to eliminate injustice and inequality wherever it exists.

MOUNTING EVIDENCE ABOUT RED CHINA AND NARCOTICS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting evidence pointing to the involvement of Communist China in the production and sale of narcotic drugs.

Recently, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held a series of hearings concerning the worldwide narcotics traffic. Among those testifying was former Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Gen. Lewis Walt. Walt gathered his information for the subcommittee when he visited 15 countries during the spring of 1972.

He testified that there is strong circumstantial evidence leading to the conclusion that Communist China is deeply involved in the production and distribution of narcotics.

The director of British customs in Hong Kong told General Walt that he was looking for evidence of Communist China shipment of narcotics but, for political reasons, no searches are made of ships or cargo coming out of Communist China. What this adds up to, says Walt, is that—

We have no way of knowing whether illicit opiates are coming out of China. . . . China's ability to move contraband through Hong Kong and Macao—if she is disposed to do so—is further enhanced by the fact that a large number of ships of Hong Kong registry are operated by companies known to be controlled by the Peking government.

In addition, reports General Walt, increasing numbers of Chinese seamen, many of them based in Hong Kong, are being apprehended in the United States and Britain with quantities of heroin. In the case of the Hong Kong seamen, Walt points out:

Virtually all of them are members of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union, which is completely controlled by pro-Peking Communists.

Communist China, it must be remembered, has not signed the 1961 single conventions on drugs. Consequently, it does not report to the U.N. on its illicit opium agriculture, nor does it accept inspection of any kind, nor does it participate in any international drug control operations.

Recently the New York Daily News published an important series of articles by reporters Frank Faso and Paul Meskil concerning Communist China's involvement in narcotics.

These reporters revealed a Red Chinese heroin business which flourishes amid espionage, murder, and "protection" by the Chinese Communist Army and Navy. In one instance, heroin profits were to go to a Maoist youth organization in Seattle. The heroin, they note, is being brought in by ship jumpers, some of whom had what they thought were secret meetings with Communist Chinese personnel at the United Nations.

Reporters Faso and Meskil find it difficult to understand the silence of official Washington concerning Communist China's role in the narcotics traffic. They write that—

The Nixon Administration insists that Peking is not sending drugs or spies to the U.S. But agents of the F.B.I., C.I.A., Immigration and Naturalization Services, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and other federal agencies are still trying to find out what all those ship-jumping seamen are up to.

It is time for an open and complete discussion of this subject. I wish to share with my colleagues the articles which appeared in the New York Daily News of March 20, 21, and 22, 1973, by Frank Faso and Paul Meskil, and insert them into the RECORD at this time:

COLOR NEW DRUG EPIDEMIC HONG KONG HUE (By Frank Faso and Paul Meskil)

At 2:43 a.m. last July 8, a prosperous Chinese businessman named Hong Moy entered the Rickshaw Garage, across the street from the Elizabeth St. police station, in Chinatown.

President of the 2,000-member Moy Family Association, Moy was one of Chinatown's most influential business and civic leaders. He had about \$3,000 cash on him, the receipts of the supermarket, book store and two coffee houses he owned in the Chinese community.

He intended to drive home to Port Washington, L.I., where he lived with his wife and four children. As the night attendant went to move a car that was parked in front of Moy's 1972 Cadillac, three young Chinese men slipped into the garage and seized Moy from behind. Pressing a gun muzzle to his head, they made him kneel on the floor and handcuffed his arms behind him.

They went through his pockets and took his wallet and bankroll. When the attendant returned, they pointed pistols at him, and told him to stand still. Then one of the men pulled a hunting knife and calmly stabbed Moy in the back. As the three departed, the stabber wiped the knife handle clear of fingerprints and dropped the weapon near the garage door.

ROBBERY WASN'T THE MOTIVE

Moy died an hour later in Beekman Downtown Hospital. A detective called the killing "a routine robbery murder," but it was far from routine. The unarmed victim offered no resistance, made no outcry. There was no need to kill him to get his money. And if the stabber was some sort of homicidal maniac, why didn't he also kill the only witness?

"Robbery was not the motive," a high-ranking police official said recently. "This was a carefully planned execution."

Pressed for details, he said: "I can't say anything more. It's a federal case now."

The FBI, which normally has no jurisdiction in a city homicide investigation, has

been quietly checking Moy's background. So has the federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

SEEN WITH SUSPECTED DRUG DEALERS

Federal agents told reporters that Moy had been seen with several suspected drug dealers who came from China and were in this country illegally.

Since President Nixon went to Peking, the official Washington line is that China is not involved in the global dope trade. Still, the rumors and charges persist.

The latest accusation against China was made by two veteran New York crime fighters—Frank Rogers, citywide prosecutor of narcotics cases, and Brooklyn District Attorney Eugene Gold.

At a January press conference announcing the bustup of a smuggling ring that brought hundreds of pounds of heroin into the U.S. last year, Rogers showed reporters a plastic bag on which the words "People's Republic of China" were printed in English and Chinese.

BAG CONTAINED HEROIN

He said the bag had contained "brown rock heroin" from mainland China. Rogers added that he had additional evidence of a Chinese connection including tape recordings of phone conversations between dope smugglers and dealers.

"This is the first clear and substantive evidence we have that mainland China and Hong Kong (a British colony) are being used as a means of getting heroin into the United States," Gold said.

The boss of the smuggling ring, The News learned, is an important Chinese national who makes frequent trips between the U.S., Canada and Peking where he confers with top government officials. He has not been arrested.

Of the 36 persons arrested during the five-month investigation of the smuggling ring, 24 were ship-jumping members of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union. A secret report prepared by the Strategic Intelligence Office of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs confirms that Hong Kong seamen are deeply involved in the international dope traffic.

The report states, "The smuggling activities of Chinese seamen imply a loose but rather extensive arrangement between the seamen and their United States contacts to carry out the movement of narcotics from Southeast Asia on a continuing basis . . .

"Sensitive sources also reveal frequent communications between Chinese heroin traffickers in New York, Seattle, San Francisco, Portland (Ore.) and Vancouver (British Columbia), suggesting that an extensive wholesale mechanism exists."

Other recent Narcotics Bureau and CIA reports on the Asian dope trade mention "ethnic Chinese" and "Chinese seamen." Their reports say the opium poppies are grown in Burma, Laos, and Thailand, and that opium, morphine base and heroin are transported from Bangkok, Thailand, to Hong Kong, the main transfer point for shipments to the U.S.

A secret CIA report on narcotics operations in Southeast Asia states that tons of opium and morphine base, from which heroin is made, are carried from Bangkok to Hong Kong in fishing boats. The report says: "One trawler a day moves to the vicinity of the Chinese Communist-controlled Lema Islands—15 miles from Hong Kong—where the goods are loaded into Hong Kong junks."

Chinese army and navy units guard the Lema Islands and no boats pass there without inspection. The opium fleet could not possibly operate off these islands without Peking's knowledge and consent.

MAJOR DRUG CENTER

So much Asian heroin is flowing into New York that Chinatown has become a major drug center. Over the years, detectives and

federal forces have made sporadic raids on Chinatown dope dens, but the addicts and sellers there were members of the Chinese community and the traffic, mostly in opium, did not amount to much.

In 1971 there was only one big case here involving Asian heroin. But last year there was a virtual deluge. Of the 273 pounds of heroin seized by the Federal Narcotics Bureau here in 1972, nearly a third originated in Asia. Additional seizures of Chinese heroin were made by police and customs agents. Among the major heroin hauls of 1972:

Jan. 28—Customs agents raided an apartment in Sunnyside, Queens, and caught two Chinese seamen with 18 pounds of pure heroin, worth about \$4 million on the addict market.

April 11—Narcotics Bureau agents arrested seven Chinese men and one woman in an apartment at 60 East Broadway and confiscated 11 pounds of heroin, part of a 100-pound shipment.

April 26—Eighteen pounds of heroin, hidden in a teakwood trunk, were seized in Port Washington, L.I. Two Chinese were arrested.

June 27—Four more Chinese seamen and three pounds of heroin were seized at the Sunnyside building raided earlier.

July 21—Six pounds of "pure brown rock heroin" from China were confiscated by federal agents; three Chinese were arrested.

Aug. 23—Four Chinese, including the self-styled unofficial mayor of Chinatown, were grabbed by federal agents while completing a deal to sell 20 pounds of heroin for \$200,000 cash.

Oct. 6—A Westchester dope dealer was arrested after selling "brown China" to an undercover agent. The evidence was described as "brown, granular, rocklike crystals of heroin from Communist China."

Dec. 29—Bureau agents recovered 18½ pounds of heroin and arrested two suspects—a Danish seaman who allegedly brought the dope from Hong Kong and a Chinese restaurant owner.

Of the 23 Chinese involved in these cases, all but two were present or former members of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union. Daniel P. Casey, regional director of the bureau, said Chinese seamen are "attempting to become the key suppliers of heroin in the United States."

Jerry Jensen, deputy regional director, said the amount of heroin smuggled into this country from Asia does not yet equal the dope imports from Europe and Latin America, "but if the growth continues as it has in the past year, it will catch up."

UNDERGROUND RAILWAY USED BY CHINA AGENTS

(By Frank Faso and Paul Meskil)

On a sunny spring day in 1971, United States border patrolmen went into the woods near upstate Perrys Mills and found the bodies of two men lying about 200 yards apart.

One was Donald Levac, 37, of Montreal; the other, Chan Sun Tung, 56, of Hong Kong. Investigation of their deaths uncovered a smuggling ring that brought hundreds of Chinese seamen, some of them Peking agents and dope dealers, into this country from Canada.

PICKUP IN A RESTAURANT

Levac was one of the few non-Chinese employed by the smuggling ring. A former Eagle Scout, he owned a Montreal automatic laundry and held a prized black belt in judo. A friend introduced him to Chan Chu Lok, one of three partners in a Montreal restaurant where ship-jumping Chinese seamen could buy transportation to New York.

Levac was hired to smuggle the aliens over the border. He drove them to a Bronx restaurant that was the southern terminus of the Vancouver-Montreal-New York route. He carried three passengers per trip and received \$300 a head, or \$900, for the run.

Around 3:30 p.m. Dec. 5, he picked up three Chinese seamen at a restaurant in downtown Montreal. Chan Chu Lok gave him \$500 cash, the remaining \$400 to be paid on his return.

Levac's girl friend, Rita LeVerdiere, went along to help drive. They took Levac's usual route—a dirt road from the village of Hemmingford, south of Montreal, to a farm field directly on the U.S.-Canadian border. When they reached the field around 5 p.m., it was dark and snow was falling.

Levac told Rita to drive the car across the border legally at an official port of entry three miles away. She was to meet Levac and the seamen on a country road near Perrys Mills.

When the car left, the four men walked through the field and over the border.

Although Levac was an experienced woodsman, he became lost in the darkness, driving snow and tangled trees. They spent the night in a tiny clearing, huddled together for warmth.

Next day, Levac collapsed and froze to death. So did one of the seamen. The remaining two Chinese were badly frostbitten but made their way out of the woods.

SEVERAL ROUNDED UP

By the time border patrolmen learned what had happened and searched the area, the bodies were buried in deep snow. They were not recovered until the spring thaw.

Canadian authorities closed the smuggling ring's headquarters, the Yung Garden Restaurant. Its owners were deported to Hong Kong. Immigration officers rounded up several of the Chinese who were driven to New York by Levac.

The Montreal ring was linked to similar smuggling operations that brought Chinese seamen over the border in New England, Michigan, Washington state and other parts of the U.S.

Immigration officials estimate that 4,000 to 5,000 Chinese seamen are sneaking into the U.S. illegally every year. Most of them carry no identification except their membership cards in the Hong Kong Seamen's Union.

A FRONT FOR PEKING

Many of the illegal aliens are simply looking for better jobs, but some are working for the People's Republic of China. Although the seamen's union is based in Hong Kong, few of its members were born in the British crown colony. They enter Hong Kong from mainland China, then sign up and ship out.

According to a secret FBI report, the seamen's union is a front for Peking's "propaganda, subversion and clandestine intelligence operations." A summary of this report says:

"HKSU has approved a policy of placing Communist seamen on Western ships for the purpose of sabotage or capture in the event of future hostilities."

"HKSU is a major distributor of Chi-Com (Chinese Communist) propaganda to union members, overseas Chinese and other sympathizers."

"HKSU has been able to penetrate many foreign shipping lines that recruit seamen in Hong Kong."

A VARIETY OF TRANSPORT

Hong Kong mariners have been caught crossing the border in the Maine woods, at Niagara Falls, in the Detroit area and near Blaine, Wash., where a hippie commune helped smuggled Chinese over the line.

The border-jumpers cross by foot, car, truck, snowmobile, boat and private plane. Several small boats have been apprehended while carrying Chinese aliens across Lake Huron and Lake St. Clair from Canada to Michigan. One such vessel had six Chinese aboard. Five carried Hong Kong Seamen's Union cards and one also had "classified material" indicating that he was a Peking secret agent.

SLAVE MARKET

The 21-foot cabin cruiser was piloted by the sixth man, a young Chinese who had entered the U.S. illegally and had applied for citizenship. The boat was owned by his uncle, a wealthy restaurateur living in Grosse Pointe, Mich.

Questioned by federal agents, the restaurant owner insisted he knew nothing about his nephew's alien-smuggling activities. A few weeks later, he flew to New York and visited a Mott St. barbershop described in federal intelligence reports as "a terminus, where smuggled Chinese crewmen are dropped and where the payoff is made."

According to investigators, a New York Chinatown restaurant serves as a "slave market" where prospective employers gather every weekend to hire illegal aliens for coolie wages. Chinese businessmen are among the "slave" traders and several have switched sides from Taiwan to Peking.

Former members of Peking's Red Guard are among the Hong Kong sailors who have surfaced here. Trained in guerrilla warfare and terrorist tactics, these men helped organize the street gangs that have sprung up in Chinatown.

Some of these gangs are led by militant Maoists. Others consist of young thugs hired by the local tongs, or business groups, as protection against the Maoists. Warfare between the gangs has resulted in the worst wave of Chinatown violence since the Tong wars of the 1920s.

KWA LIN: THE DOPE TRADE'S DEALER IN DEATH (By Frank Faso and Paul Meskill)

This is the story of Kwa Lin, a Hong Kong hitman who littered New York's Chinatown with corpses.

Kwa Lin is probably not his real name, but it's the one that investigators know best. He has used a score of aliases and has worked at many jobs—on freighters as a seaman and oiler, in restaurants as a cook and dishwasher, in offices and shops where he was self-employed.

His principal occupation, according to investigators, is enforcer and executioner for a Peking-based Hong Kong-based network of seagoing spies and smugglers.

He is only 5-2 and 140 pounds, but his tiny frame ripples with muscles, and his hands are deadly weapons. He has been trained in Oriental hand-to-hand combat. Moreover, he is equally adept with gun, knife or hatchet.

A member of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union, he sailed to Canada in 1970, jumped ship in Vancouver and slipped into the U.S. illegally. He rented a small apartment on Delancey St. in Newark, obtained a social security card in the name of John Lee and started a small business dealing in Chinese herbs and spices.

His first New York target, investigators said, was a fellow Hong Kong seaman, Sing Hop, 27.

TWO MORE TARGETS

At sunset on Aug. 5, 1970, Sing Hop was walking along Park St., a short, narrow street that runs downhill from Mott St. to Mulberry St. in Chinatown, when a small neatly dressed man approached and fired three rounds from a snub-nosed revolver into his head. Sing Hop fell dead near the rectory of the Church of the Transfiguration. His killer hurried down Park St. into a crowd.

Sing Hop lived in a furnished room at 28 Chatham Square. A search of his meager possessions turned up a forged passport and documents including what investigators described as classified material.

These investigators believe he was killed because he disobeyed orders to return to Hong Kong or China for a new assignment.

A month after Sing Hop was murdered, a man named Kuee Tang was shot to death outside a Chinese social club on Canal St.

A police intelligence report describes the club as "a known gambling establishment frequented by illegal aliens, including seamen involved in smuggling operations."

The same report describes Kuee Tang as a ship-jumping member of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union, an illegal alien and "a Communist courier involved in smuggling operations."

Jerry Ginn and Larry Wong also were Hong Kong seamen who entered the U.S. illegally and entered the dope trade. They sold samples of pure Asian heroin to Cuban and Puerto Rican drug dealers here and offered similar wares to Mafia narcotics racketeers. But instead of sending the profits to their bosses in Hong Kong and Peking, they kept some of the money and dope. Ordered to return to Hong Kong, they refused.

September 1970, Ginn and Wong decided to cool off at an air-conditioned movie house. A federal agent trailed them to the Sun Sing Chinese Theater, 75 East Broadway, under the Manhattan Bridge.

They left the theater at 6:30 p.m. and started walking west on East Broadway toward Chatham Square. The glare of the setting sun was in their eyes and they did not notice the little man until he was directly in front of them, an automatic pistol in his hand.

ESCAPES WITH HELP OF FRIENDS

Shot three times in the head, Ginn fell dead near the intersection of East Broadway and Market St. Wong was hit once in the jaw and survived. At least 30 persons witnessed the shooting, including the federal agent. He was unable to intervene, lest he blow his cover.

The agent and several other witnesses followed the killer, believed to have been Kwa Lin, down Market St. one block to the headquarters of I Wor Kuen, a militant Maoist organization, on the southeast corner of Market and Henry Sts.

The gunman opened the door to the I Wor Kuen club and shouted to those inside. Several young men rushed out. Some of the youths held back the witnesses to the shooting. Others walked away with the killer.

Later that night, Kwa Lin boarded a bus. FBI agents kept him under surveillance all the way to Montreal, where the Royal Canadian Mounted Police took over.

On Oct. 18, 1970, Kwa Lin returned to the U.S. in a car driven by another man. They carried Canadian identification papers and crossed into Washington State without incident. The following day, a 23-year-old Hong Kong seaman named Choy Lung was shot to death in Seattle's Chinatown.

According to an intelligence report on the Seattle murder, Choy Lung was a Peking courier who was supposed to have delivered \$18,000 to a Maoist youth group in Seattle. When he kept the money for himself, an enforcer believed to have been Kwa Lin, was ordered to kill him.

Kwa Lin's last New York mission was accomplished at 9:32 p.m. June 1, 1971, when Hong Kong seaman Lee Wing Sun, a suspected dope dealer, was shot dead at Chrystie and Division Sts. Two weeks later, Kwa Lin flew to Montreal and from there to Vancouver, where he visited a travel agency known to intelligence agents as a center for Chinese ship-jumpers, spies, smugglers and couriers.

As Kwa Lin left the travel agency, Mountie agents arrested him. The New York City Police Department was notified. The department asked Canada to hold Kwa Lin for New York authorities. However, he reportedly was turned over to the Central Intelligence Agency.

What happened to him is a closely guarded CIA secret. But members of other agencies say Kwa Lin has turned informer and provided the first major intelligence breakthrough concerning Peking's undercover operations in North America.

Interrogation of Kwa Lin led to the arrests of at least 20 other members of his narcotics ring, a federal source says. All were ship-jumping seamen. U.S. agents also seized forged documents, Communist propaganda, narcotics and classified information, the source says.

The Nixon administration insists that Peking is not sending drugs or spies to the U.S. But agents of the FBI, CIA, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and other federal agencies are still trying to find out what all those ship-jumping seamen are up to.

The official Washington explanation for Chinese operations here is that the Hong Kong seamen caught selling heroin and committing other crimes are professional criminals, not Peking agents. Yet investigators have tailed several of these ship-jumping felons to secret meetings with members of China's United Nations mission here and the Chinese Embassy in Ottawa. There is no official explanation for the conferences between Peking's diplomats and Hong Kong's extraordinary seamen.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES RESOLUTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statement by Senator HUMPHREY relating to House Concurrent Resolution 216 which I recently introduced. This national priorities resolution deserves, I believe, the full support of all Members of both Houses of Congress:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD proceedings and debates of the 93d Congress, First session, Washington, Tuesday, Mar. 6, 1973]

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO NATIONAL PRIORITIES
(Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am introducing today a resolution on national priorities that I believe will help prevent an era of retrenchment and retreat in the pressing domestic problems in our country.

This resolution would call for a fiscally responsible Federal budget for fiscal 1974 while at the same time placing the Congress clearly on record for reduced military expenditures and a reformed tax system. It would provide a means for meeting our domestic needs in public employment, health care, urban rehabilitation, rural economic development, housing, education, and pollution control.

Mr. President, this resolution squarely challenges the assumption that, in a time of peace, the United States must have a bigger and higher military budget. It certainly is an ominous sign that at the time when the energies so long postponed by the Vietnam war should be turned to the problems at home, the fiscal year 1974 budget ushers in an era of domestic retreat.

We saw the same thing happen after the Korean war in the 1950's. We should have moved ahead then—on our domestic problems. We did not, and in part, the problems of the 1960's resulted from the indifference of the 1950's.

We simply cannot allow that to happen in the 1970's.

Under my resolution, we can take the first step toward meeting the responsibilities of the 1970's.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that \$5 to \$7 billion can be pared from the military budget in such areas as weapons procurement, weapons research and development, and by economizing in foreign assistance and space programs, and that through the elimination of unwarranted tax preferences in the internal revenue code another \$5 to \$7 billion in revenues can be produced.

We can use these funds to promote full employment, quality education and health care, environmental protection, safe and improved living conditions in urban and rural areas, and equal opportunity for all Americans.

We can do these things while at the same time providing, through a fiscally responsible Federal budget, for the promotion of national security, stable prices, and tax justice. We can place the additional dollars realized through the paring of nonessential defense expenditures and the elimination of unwarranted tax preferences, into programs to meet vital domestic human needs.

In short, through a rearrangement of priorities, we can fund some of the programs that the Nixon administration refuses to fund.

And, we can do so without increasing the Federal deficit.

Mr. President, I am asking for nothing more than that the Congress apply the same standards toward defense, space, military assistance, and tax subsidy budgets that the President has applied to domestic programs.

We have streets that need repair. We have critical air and water pollution problems to solve. We have poverty and racial injustice to overcome. We have massive housing and transportation problems. We have serious health needs and educational needs.

These are the priorities before us. These are the challenges of our time. And we must seize the opportunity now to target Federal funds effectively in serving these vital national interests. That is the purpose of my national priorities resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. CON. RES. 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), Expressing the sense of Congress that certain economizing and tax reform measures shall be taken to assure through a fiscally responsible Federal Budget for Fiscal 1974 effective action to promote national security, stable prices, tax justice, full employment, quality education and health care, environmental protection, safe and improved living conditions in urban and rural areas, and equal opportunity for all Americans.

Whereas the Constitution of the United States places the power of the purse in the Congress of the United States and requires the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," and

Whereas it is in the national interest that the Legislative and Executive Branches work in harmony to promote prosperity and opportunity for the American people, and

Whereas the priorities, revenue policies and spending decisions of Federal Government play a critical role in assuring the health of the economy, equal opportunities for all citizens, a secure national defense, and a high quality of public services, and

Whereas control of inflation requires fiscal responsibility, the avoidance of unjustified deficit spending and the most prudent use of taxpayers' dollars, and

Whereas the Federal Budget for Fiscal 1974 and future budget projections call for the expansion of military programs but the elimination or drastic reduction of some \$14 billion in domestic programs annually notwithstanding the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, and

Whereas it is estimated that the Administration's budget requests for military, foreign assistance and space budgets can be reduced by between \$5 to \$7 billion without danger to our national security and without jeopardizing our international commitments, and

Whereas it is recognized by Treasury Department officials, the appropriate Committees of Congress and recognized experts that minimal, long overdue tax reform can produce \$5 to \$7 billion in new revenues and without increasing the tax burden of the average taxpayer, and

Whereas unilateral elimination or reduction by the Executive of federal domestic programs, contrary to law, without thorough evaluation of those programs by the Legislative Branch neither serves the national interest nor complies with the spirit or letter of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that (1) equally rigorous economies shall be applied by Congressional review to military, foreign assistance, space programs, and unwarranted tax preferences.

(2) Congress shall set as a target for action the proposed Federal Budget for Fiscal 1974, by the relevant committees with respect to

(a) the realization of savings of \$5 to \$7 billion by paring unneeded weapons procurement, weapons research and weapons development, by reducing excessive forces in the military, and by economizing in foreign assistance and space programs, and (b) the elimination of unwarranted tax preferences in the Internal Revenue Code, to produce additional revenues of \$5 to \$7 billion.

(3) These budgetary resources—all within a fiscally responsible and non-inflationary budget ceiling as developed by the Congress—shall be redirected to promote full employment, quality education and health care for citizens, environmental protection, safe and improved living conditions in urban and rural areas, and equal opportunities for all Americans, with particular but not exclusive emphasis given to providing for health care and national insurance coverage of health care costs for all Americans, expanded public service job opportunities, improvements in public assistance and social services programs, increased federal assistance for housing, education, and the rehabilitation of urban areas, adequate law enforcement, the promotion of rural economic development, and new programs designed to improve the living conditions of American working families.

CAPITOL POLICE

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, on June 4 the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill to promote 32 members of the Capitol Police and to reduce by 15 the number of positions on the force. A two-thirds majority vote being necessary for passage under suspension of the rules, the House agreed to the motion by a vote of 299 to 0. Unfortunately, I was

detained in my district and unable to vote on the motion. Had I been present, I would have agreed to the motion.

REV. JOEL PUGH

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, members of the Falls Church, the historic church around which the city of Falls Church, Va., grew, have called my attention to an excellent sermon preached by their new rector, the Reverend Joel Pugh, on May 27, 1973.

Mr. Pugh was quite recently installed as rector of the Falls Church. He is a graduate of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., where he received his BA degree in 1954. Thereafter he received his BD degree in 1957. Between 1960 and 1962, he did graduate work at Oxford University in England, where he also was assistant chaplain from 1962 to 1966. In 1966, he returned to the University of the South, Sewanee, where he became chaplain in which position he remained until the end of 1972.

As I believe Mr. Pugh's sermon would be of interest to all those seeking to live their lives in the Christian faith, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE FALLS CHURCH, FALLS CHURCH, VA., BY THE REVEREND JOEL PUGH, RECTOR, ON MAY 27, 1973, THE SUNDAY BEFORE MEMORIAL DAY AND BEFORE THE ROGATION DAYS OR DAYS OF SOLEMN SUPPLICATION

It is absolutely fundamental to the Christian faith that the whole world belongs to God. Our sacred Scriptures begin with the proclamation of this fact. Page one of Chapter one of Book one drives this home as it unfolds God's hand in and dominion over heaven and earth and all that is contained within them. And in case we might want to make exemptions, Chapter I of Genesis lists what it means by all contained therein: grass, herbs, fruit trees, stars, moon, sun, birds, fish, beasts, cattle, creeping things, and man and woman.

The Christian observance of the Rogation Days which is a very old observance in the Church plays on this theme of God's dominion over the world. It was the custom—and still is in many places in England—to "beat the bounds of the parish" during this week. That means that the clergy and laity of the parish church process around the geographical boundaries of the parish and at each landmark stop to ask God's blessing on all within and to re-dedicate their labor and life to him. This ceremony is to proclaim that everything inside these boundaries—farms, houses, shops, and government are Gods. We are only his overseers and his stewards, and like stewards must give an account of our stewardship to the owner.

The church building is not a sacred space dedicated to God within a secular world alien to him. The church building is to remind us that all the space around it as far as the eye can see—and farther—is God's domain, and is thereby hallowed.

For that reason to destroy natural beauty, for example, with no other motive than profit is not just esthetically unpleasant. It is an offence to the owner who is God. Dishonest

business is not just unfair to the customer; it is a sin against God. Political absolutism and unaccountability are not just illegal; they fly in the face of the God who is King: King of all princes, governors, and magistrates wherever and wherever they are. And no matter how high or mighty they may be, they stand as his servants and accountable to him for their administration of power.

Anyone who believes Christianity is what you do in your spare time on Sunday morning has read neither the Bible nor the Prayer Book, nor has he taken on board what the Church has been up to for almost 2000 years.

Now most of us are aware of this. Our problem is not that we are stupid on these matters. Our problem is the fundamental religious problem—and that problem is idolatry: putting something in the place of God. We have been duped into thinking that because we don't set up golden statues in the market place and dance around them as in a good old fashioned Hollywood movie that we have gone beyond idolatry. That is simply not true. In fact we are all the more susceptible to idols because we do not recognize them as such. It is no accident that the First Commandment was and still is "Thou shalt have no other Gods but me." Idolatry is the crucial issue for each of us. For putting something other than God in God's place will end every time in sorrow and tragedy, with ourselves facing the abyss of darkness with nothing to hold on to. For our idols desert us sooner or later. They cannot bear the burden of being God.

The problem of idolatry is further compounded because our idols are seldom evil. Usually they are good and admirable: our family, our work, our country, our healthy ambition, our way of life, our own good. Even the Church can become an idol. Idolatry is taking something good which can lead us to God—can disclose the Almighty to us, and instead of letting it do just that—idolatry is stopping with that good thing and saying: "This is enough. I do not need to go further."

And so we dethrone God and put in his place that which is not God, and believe me, my brethren, our idols will fall us every time. They cannot deal with disillusionment or suffering or failure or death. They cannot even deal adequately with our success and joy and whatever richness life gives us. We are even frustrated in these and unable to cope with them without the God who is God.

Where do we begin to deal with our idolatry? I think we begin only on our knees in confessing to God, to others, and to ourselves our flirtation with our idols. Only out of this will we begin to see our idols as that and begin to see that with God we do not need our idols.

From our confessing our idolatry we begin to have a vision of the God who is larger than our idols: the God who is Lord of more than we know.

Lord of more than we can see,

Lord of more than we love.

And out of this vision can come a peace: a peace that is not of our making; a peace that passes all understanding.

It does not mean that we forsake our loyalties to home, to work, to country, and to Church, but we begin to see them as avenues to God; not as idols to replace him.

Let me give you two examples of the breadth of vision, of the greatness of soul, of the peace that can come of this knowing God rather than idols.

The first is ancient—it comes from the middle of the second century A.D. Some of you have heard me quote it before. It is a letter by an anonymous writer and is known to us by the title of "The Epistle to Diognetus":

"Christians are not distinguished from the

rest of mankind by country or language or customs . . . This doctrine has not been discovered by them through any inventive faculty or the careful thought of pretentious men; they are not champions of a man-made principle, as some are. While they live in cities both Greek and oriental, as falls to the lot of each, and follow the customs of the country in dress, food, and general manner of life, they display the remarkable and confessedly surprising status of their citizenship. They live in countries of their own, but as sojourners. They share all things as citizens; they suffer all things as foreigners. Every foreign land is their native place, every native place is foreign . . . They pass their life on earth; but they are citizens in heaven. They obey the established laws, but they outdo the laws in their own lives. They love all men; and are persecuted by all. They are not understood, and condemned. They are put to death, and yet made alive."

The second example is from our own century.

The most cataclysmic event in western civilization in our time was the First World War. It destroyed our illusions. It almost destroyed our civilization. It had a brutality that would have made savages blush with shame. And the participants were the most civilized nations history had ever seen. The death toll was terrible; far worse in Europe than here. A whole generation of young men was almost completely wiped out. Toward the end of that war an Oxford teacher said to a friend with tears in his eyes "My life has been wasted. All my pupils have been killed." 2700 alumni of Oxford University were killed in France at a time when the university student population did not exceed 3000. By contrast Harvard University lost 373. In the chapel of New College, Oxford, is a tablet to the members of that one college who died. It is 30' long; half the length of this church. Below it is a small tablet with this inscription:

"In memory of the men of this College who coming from a Foreign Land entered into the inheritance of this place and returning died for their country."

Below the inscription are the names of three young Germans who died in that terrible war.

To be able to put up such a plaque is what we mean by civilization: Christian civilization.

Christian civilization is with God's help to look beyond the limits of our vision. . . . in our sorrow, our devastation, our anger, our tragedy to see the Lord of the universe who looks with love on all creation: even as we make a mess of it and bloody ourselves doing it.

If Memorial Day is only a time to reinforce our prejudices and nourish our partisanship and confirm our hatred we shall have failed. We shall only allow the idols to creep in and deny the God revealed in the Christ who loves us all—sinners though we be.

This is surely a time when in our bewilderment we beseech God for understanding, when in our hatred we beseech God for his compassion, when in our resentment we ask him to give us magnanimity of spirit.

O Lord, our Christ, may we have Thy mind and Thy spirit; make us instruments of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let us sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is discord, union, where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

O divine Master, grant that we may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life. Amen.

THE OEO'S HISTORY OF FAILURE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Office of Economic Opportunity has some pluses in its favor. But according to every responsible report, the minuses dominate the picture.

Much of this ugly record of failures is the fault of the Congress. Because perhaps never in history has the Congress delegated so much loose-end authority willy-nilly, so many blank checks, to a bureaucracy to spend tax money free of meaningful guidelines and controls. The net result has been a dismal failure, replete with unprecedented waste and favoritism.

The documented record of waste, corruption, extravagance, mismanagement, abuse, and misuse of power by OEO would fill several volumes.

Recent efforts by the Nixon administration to dismantle this outfit have run into obstacles. Opposition comes from OEO jobholders, politicians, courts, free spenders, and others who show no concern for the plight of the American taxpayers.

The time is overdue for the Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike—to forget about politics, face up to its responsibility and, even though somewhat belatedly, do its duty by supporting the dismantling process. The Nation will acclaim our action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on the OEO written by John E. Peterson of the Detroit News.

The article follows:

THE OEO'S HISTORY OF FAILURE: TWENTY-FIVE MILLION STILL LIVE IN POVERTY

(By John E. Peterson)

WASHINGTON.—When the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was set up as the command post for President Johnson's "war on poverty" in 1964, its announced goal was to help the nation's 25 million poor become self-sufficient.

Today, after OEO and a dozen other federal agencies have spent nearly \$200 billion in efforts to upgrade the poor, 25 million Americans still have incomes below poverty level.

Even many of its supporters are conceding that the anti-poverty program has failed to meet its main objectives and an investigation by *The Detroit News* has turned up widespread abuses.

Nevertheless, the Nixon administration has come under fire from Congress, a number of civil rights leaders and thousands of anti-poverty workers for its decision to dismantle OEO and transfer only its most effective programs to other agencies.

These critics have depicted that decision as cruel, cold-hearted and, in words of one, "further evidence of callous insensitivity toward minorities."

Some observers see the criticism as valid but others charge that some politicians—particularly those with large urban constituencies—seem to have used the issue to court votes among the poor.

"A lot of congressmen know better," said a black OEO official who has been with the agency since the Johnson administration.

"I know because I've sent them case after

case where none . . . I mean absolutely none . . . of the millions funded for particular programs ever trickled down to poor blacks.

"Most of it ended up in the pockets of friends or relatives of politicians or with radical and militant groups the politician was trying to appease."

Anti-poverty workers (nearly 200,000 are employed by OEO funded agencies) are hypocritical, the black official said.

"A large number already have used thousands of dollars in OEO funds to charter buses to come to Washington to protest the cutbacks," he said. "And more rallies are being planned."

"The anti-poverty program has become like all bureaucracies. Its chief concern now is not helping the poor but perpetuating itself."

A Mexican-American who works as OEO administrator in Los Angeles said:

"Sometimes I really believe that most of the social workers we fund at local levels are out to unionize the poor . . . to set them up as a separate class, so they (the social workers) will always have jobs."

While some good programs have been implemented and well-publicized, OEO files contain examples of alleged misuse of funds, graft and embezzlement.

OEO officials blame much of the waste on lax accounting procedures at the local level and a lack of following up OEO inspection reports by middle-level officials.

"There was not a conspiracy at the top to hamper inspections," said Howard R. Phillips, the 32-year-old Bostonian appointed by President Nixon to oversee OEO's dismantling.

"But we, as an agency, have been remiss in not following up the findings of our inspection people."

Phillips has received some criticism because of his expressed enthusiasm for his dismantling job.

"All I said was that I was really going to enjoy this job," he said, "and all of a sudden the media was painting me as Attila the Hun."

"What they left out, however, was the main reason I'm enjoying this job . . . and that's because taxpayers and the poor are getting ripped off. We've got a hell of a lot of people using federal anti-poverty monies to line their own pockets and/or radicalize the poor and use them for their own purposes."

"The idea behind the anti-poverty program was to help the poor out of poverty and not set them up as a class apart."

When Phillips talks about persons enhancing their bank accounts with funds meant for the poor, he could cite, among others, these cases—all documented during the course of a three week investigation by the *News*:

The finance officer of a rural Kentucky health center took for himself more than \$18,000 in funds meant to help the poor meet medical bills.

More than \$250,000 turned up missing in an OEO Community Action program in Delaware County, Pa. Subsequently, OEO inspectors and General Accounting Office (GAO) investigators found that the program's board chairman had hired members of his family in OEO jobs.

The director of a Chicago-based OEO health project used federal funds to finance a private group attending a conference in Los Angeles about the People's Republic of China. OEO investigators are still attempting to audit \$210,000 in grant funds, which the director transferred to a private bank account.

The director of a South Duxbury, Mass., community action council was found to have

illegally increased his salary by \$6,000 a year, taken \$1,600 from the program to buy a new car and illegally used a government credit card to make \$5,000 in personal purchases.

An Atlanta employee of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) received \$150,000 in OEO funds to serve as a consultant on black business problems, while still earning \$12,500 a year as a full-time HEW employee.

A wealthy Montana attorney received more than \$20,000 in salary and fees from a community action council on an Indian reservation to act as a "tourist specialist" and "economic consultant."

The attorney was also employed to represent the reservation in legal matters and was closely associated with a management consultant firm receiving an OEO vocational training contract from the community action council.

Community organization in Chicago received an OEO grant of nearly \$1 million for an attempt to "de-alienate" two rival youth gangs.

A subsequent OEO investigation showed that recruiters for the program had encouraged hundreds of youths to drop out of school so they could receive government stipends. An audit of books also indicated the theft of more than \$200,000 through payroll forgeries.

In addition to these specific instances, the *News* investigation found nearly 100 other examples of possible graft, theft, embezzlement and nepotism involving amounts ranging from \$682.50 to more than \$875,000.

Together, the cases amounted to more than \$3.8 million in OEO funds over a period of four years. OEO officials claim they have hundreds of other such cases in their files.

"A lot of these reports were never acted upon when they came in from the field," said a high-ranking OEO administrator. "Many carried memos that dismissed them as 'nickel and dimes cases' and 'isolated instances.'"

"But when you add up all those isolated instances, of course, what you have is graft and kickbacks and theft and waste involving billions of dollars."

The average administrative cost of a federal program is 30 to 35 cents on the dollar, the official said, but the average administrative cost of OEO programs often runs twice that amount.

"The poor, in most cases, just haven't been getting anywhere near what they should have from these programs," he said.

"And you have to remember the cases we're talking about don't even come close to rivaling many of the ones still under investigation. What you have is the tip of the iceberg."

But Phillips and other federal officials say they are even more troubled by the hundreds of examples of misuse of federal funds for political purposes uncovered in OEO files during the last year.

"We aren't turning our back on the poor," Phillips said. "Our expenditure on the poor for the fiscal year beginning July 1 will be slightly higher than last—\$30.4 billion, compared to \$30.1 billion."

"But we are—and I think quite properly—cutting back on funds used for 'politicizing' the poor. I want to emphasize that very few cases involve Republicans or Democrats . . . that almost all have concerned radical groups like the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society), Black Panthers, etc."

Phillips is particularly critical of OEO-funded lawyers who, he said, have attempted to "radicalize" the poor.

"Whatever has been fashionable with the New Left," he says, "has been either preceded or followed by legal service activities in those same areas." * * *

NEW PENSION PROGRAM FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on behalf of my bills, H.R. 4693 and 4694, to increase the earnings limitation for veterans' pensions to take into account the social security raise last fall and to establish a new pension program for the veterans of World War I.

I am certain that all of us have received letters from elderly pensioners and their widows regarding the reductions in pension they have suffered as a result of the social security increase. While very grateful for the 20-percent increase Congress enacted last year, they nonetheless sorely miss the dollar cut from their VA pensions, particularly in these inflationary times.

H.R. 4694 would raise the annual income limitations for eligible veterans and their survivors and provide an average 8-percent increase in the pension rates. In addition, the bill would increase the income ceiling for "old law" pensioners and for parents receiving dependency and indemnity compensation. I urge the subcommittee's favorable consideration of this legislation, retroactive to January 1, 1973.

My second bill, H.R. 4693, deals with the unique difficulties faced by World War I veterans. In at least their late seventies, these veterans of the "war to end all wars" often live in ill health on the fringe of destitution. H.R. 4693 would provide \$135 per month for unmarried veterans and \$150 per month for married veterans, compared to the present \$78.78 for old law pensioners. Widows covered by the bill would receive \$100 per month, nearly double the present \$50.40 payment. The income limitation for old law pensioners would be increased to \$3,000 for single veterans and \$4,200 for married veterans. In addition, the measure gives priority for hospital and medical care to veterans receiving a pension under its provisions.

This legislation would provide a long-needed reform for the World War I veteran who for pension purposes is treated like the World War II and Korean veteran, and yet has never had the many other veterans' benefits which have been made available to these other veterans groups. There was no "readjustment assistance bill" for the returning warriors of 1918. For many of these men the additional money contained in H.R. 4639 will mean the difference between financial self-sufficiency and the necessity to resort to welfare. While welfare is designed to help those who have no other resources, the tragic irony of public assistance is that those it is intended to help are too proud to accept it. Enactment of H.R. 4693 would help the remaining veterans of World War I receive adequate medical care when they are most in need of medical aid. As

a strong supporter of educational benefits for the Vietnam veteran, I urge the Congress to pass a GI bill for the World War I veteran—by increasing pension benefits to see him through the final years in dignity and self-respect.

The Compensation and Pension Subcommittee of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee is today holding a hearing on veterans' pension legislation and I hope that the committee and the Congress will approve H.R. 4693 and 4694, or similar legislation.

LIFE WITH AUTISTIC CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post published a front-page article concerned with autistic children. The story depicts the difficult life of Mrs. Leslie Grant and her two autistic children, Mooza and Linda. An autistic child is considered by some experts to be one of the sickest of the mentally disturbed children, and he can suck dry the deepest wells of love and devotion. Yet Mrs. Grant, as well as thousands of other parents of autistic children, has devoted her life to her children. This is in direct contrast to the stories that parents of autistic children were told in recent years that their lack of love for their children caused the disease.

Ten years ago, very few people who were not health professionals knew about autism. The recent interest in newspapers and magazines creates the impression that autism is a relatively new disease, although it has been plaguing man for centuries. This, coupled with National Autistic Children's Week at the end of the month, will let more Americans know about the plight of autistic children. The Washington Post article clearly depicts the hardships placed on both the family and the children. But knowledge of the disease and suffering does little to alleviate the situation. H.R. 5785, which I introduced with 30 colleagues, will coordinate the fight against autism under the Director of the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development.

The Post article on autism is printed below:

LIFE WITH AUTISTIC CHILDREN

(By Philip A. McCombs)

Linda was hitting herself, the movie showed. Her mother grabbed her, but Linda hit and hit—sharp, upward thrusts, the bony backs of her hands striking her temples. She flopped on the ground and hit at the big, red welt on her temples.

A self-destructive, autistic child, that's what they call Linda Grant. Those are flat, hollow words for describing the depths of human agony etched in that tortured, puffy, white, childish face trying to smile but full of fear and confusion, crying, hitting, looking about wildly.

And where are words to describe the parental love that has kept this child out of mental institutions for 20 long years? Twenty screaming, exhausting years of daily, nightly,

unrelenting, holding, fighting, rocking, soothing?

That love shines in Linda's mother's face. Mooza Grant is a whirlwind of a woman who steamrolls over obstacles with the force of her personality. Her face is handsome and strong and happy, with darting, sensitive eyes.

Mooza Grant was born the daughter of a lieutenant in the Imperial Russian Navy in St. Petersburg in 1917. Her family fled the Revolution and she grew up in Brooklyn as part of that tough, uncomplaining world of Russian emigres—a world of fallen aristocrats where generals washed dishes in restaurants run by noblemen, and where private tutors climbed the dingy stairs of walkups to teach art, literature, music, poetry, and ballet to children like Mooza Grant.

She flourished, came to Washington, married a lawyer from the Midwest. They had two autistic children.

That was more than 20 years ago. "I've washed diapers now for 20 years," she said. "Do you know what it means to change diapers for 20 years?"

Mrs. Grant, who was driven by these circumstances to found the American Foundation for Autistic Children in Chevy Chase, says there may be more than a quarter of a million autistic children in the United States. She knows of at least 70 cases in the Washington area and thinks there are more.

Autism is a word that has been used during the past several decades to describe a little-understood mental disorder. Basically, an autistic child is one that seems to live in his own world with little or no response to other human beings.

An autistic child may be as intelligent as any normal child—but no one knows because the child seldom displays intelligence.

"The autistic child may be mute, unresponsive, excessively restless, withdrawn," wrote Dr. Milton J. E. Senn in 1966 in McCall's magazine. "His behavior is so often confused with mental deficiency that frequently you find him in an institution for the feeble-minded."

"Yet such a child astounds and confuses professional workers and parents alike by his amazing memory, his interest in music and rhythm, his ability to perform certain difficult tasks, his skill in the use of numbers and in mathematics."

A small percentage of autistic children are also self-destructive, which means that they hit themselves or hurt themselves in other ways. Linda is self-destructive, but Mooza, the Grants' older daughter, is not.

What is the prognosis for autistic children? No one including Mrs. Grant and psychiatrists who have studied the problem, is exactly sure. That's because the condition has only in the last several decades been identified as separate from schizophrenia, feeble-mindedness and other mental conditions. Experts still disagree on the point.

As a result, autistic children have been mixed in with other children who have mental problems—and they are among the children you see, from time to time, in photos taken in mental institutions—straitjacketed, chained to posts, groveling and screaming their lives away in a nightmare world.

But Mrs. Grant and her husband, Leslie, a legal counsel in the State Department's Agency for International Development, could not bear the thought of placing their children into an institution. No matter what the consequences to themselves, they decided that they would keep the children at home and hope that somehow, through the struggle, they could help them.

They have performed near miracles. They stopped Linda's hitting two years ago by badgering and cajoling military scientists to manufacture an electric-shock apparatus that jolted Linda every time she hit.

Now Linda, Mooza and several other autistic children attend daily sessions at the Center for Autistic Children that their parents set up in a frame house at 4510 Cumberland Ave., in Chevy Chase.

Mrs. Grant is seeking land and money to expand it into a national institution that will survive and grow and care for increasing numbers of autistic children.

It didn't dawn right away on the young couple that their children were having problems. Mrs. Grant:

"In January, 1954, Linda was born, and by then I had already noticed peculiarities in the older child of not being able to relate to me when I called to her, which I didn't notice until the age of 2. Until then, she related just like any other child, imitating sounds and words and melodies. She would look at you and imitate you."

"The change almost seemed like a sudden thing. I took a photo of her, and I noticed she wasn't really looking at me, I noticed the eyes looked off to the side. Then she would cry at night, sleep badly, run from wall to wall all day. In the car she sat without looking to the right or the left."

"She didn't respond to her name. She was dramatically, rapidly withdrawing from the environment."

"People don't pay attention because they think it's just a compliant, quiet child. But there's a gradual restlessness away from you rather than with you; instead of crawling into the kitchen and grabbing stuff, getting into drawers and boxes, she didn't do that."

Mrs. Grant called a psychiatrist and was told the child could be seen in eight months. "That really frightened me because I realized I had no help." She kept telling herself not to get excited, that after all the child had said "cheese" and hummed melodies before the age of 2. And Mrs. Grant comforted herself with this: Mendelssohn had not spoken a word until he was 5.

After the second child, Linda, was born, it soon became apparent that there were grave problems with her, too.

"What happened was that we were focusing attention on the older child and I went once to Catholic University and there was a doctor there who said to me, 'You better pay attention to the younger child, too. There's something wrong with her.'"

That was the true beginning of a nightmare.

"Linda began to rock in her crib and started to hit herself against the bed and I padded the crib around. Then gradually she began to strike herself with her hands when she was 16 or 17 months."

"At first it was intermittent. Then all sorts of devices were created (to stop it). We tied her arms in back, put her arms in wooden things. I put (tubes) on her arms so she couldn't bend the elbow to strike. Meanwhile the problems with the elder child were getting more pronounced. The doctors said she was suffering from childhood schizophrenia."

For all sorts of understandable, human reasons, the full impact of the growing nightmare did not hit the Grants all at once.

For one thing, they were close to the situation and, for all they knew, the apparent abnormalities would fade away. And because doctors disagreed on what was wrong with the children, there was a tendency to discount what the doctors said.

But even the flimsy sense of assurance and hope that the Grants built up faded one day in 1956. It was just another visit to another doctor's office, but for some reason everything crystallized for Mrs. Grant at that moment.

"I remember when we went to the doctor's office, the neurologist, and he said that this child (Linda) is definitely never going to be up to par."

"Linda was 2 and I remember this was the

first time in my life I felt the walls were moving, and I just swayed in that room. I walked up and down the hall, down the street and around the building, and I just felt like it wasn't me."

It is widely accepted among psychiatrists that an autistic child will generally have a shattering effect on his parents and their marriage because of the extraordinary demands he makes. An autistic child is considered by some experts to be one of the sickest of mentally disturbed children, and he can suck dry the deepest wells of love and devotion.

"I find that a great many difficulties arise (in your marriage) that ordinarily wouldn't," Mrs. Grant says. "One thing you really begin to lose is a real sense of communication. In a case like this, your communication very often revolves around the problem. It's very tense and only leads to a great deal of (frustration). You can't really relax in a state of communication that is pleasurable. It's usually something that is insurmountable."

"Also, you're very, very tired. It completely cripples one's ability to act because one doesn't know what to do. Over all these years it has crippled absolutely and completely any opportunity of doing anything together. We've never been on a trip together, never able to go out and visit someone together."

"For years, until the last two anyway, it has been impossible to sit in the living room and talk calmly together. Somebody had to hold the self-destructive (child) all the time; then all the time you have to watch the other one, too."

"I think one of the principal things that holds a marriage together is the recognition that each one of us has a special job to perform to help the children. The father must be given the opportunity to make money, and the mother had better keep her mind on the job."

"In fact, they may even hold you more together, because you very quickly realize that without the support of both, it's all over."

"I have many times gone to institutions, some of the most outstanding ones, but when I see what I found there, I couldn't envision sitting in Chevy Chase with roses growing around outside and my child being in an institution."

As Linda grew older, it became more difficult to hold her because she became stronger. Linda's self-battering finally got so bad that her mother had to spread-eagle her on her bed, with her arms and legs tied and her head secured in a device designed for people in traction.

"She was like that for a month and getting worse. I had to feed her, change her like that—you couldn't possibly let her go, she was absolutely a wild tiger. No medication worked. To the wonderful girl who helped me for eight years I said, 'We can't go on. Get me the cattle prod.'"

At various times over the years, the electric shocks of the cattle prod, medication and other forms of control kept Linda from hitting herself for brief periods.

Linda attended Eunice Shriver's summer camp for children for several summers, and that helped her. There were respites of a week, a month, or even longer here and there over the years. But Linda always went back to hitting herself.

In desperation, Mrs. Grant went to Walter Reed two years ago with the idea of constructing a helmet and arm device that would give Linda an electric shock every time she hit herself.

In less than a day, the device stopped the hitting. That was two years ago. She hasn't hit since, and wears a small knit cap that stimulates the headgear. As long as the cap is on, she is conditioned not to hit.

Now that autism is increasingly recognized

by psychiatrists, and the association and the center set up by the Grants and others is drawing about it a core of interested physicians and professionals, and promises to expand, the future looks better for the Grants and their children.

The center, which first was housed in the North Chevy Chase Christian Church, now is in a house donated by the tiny municipality of Somerset.

At the center last week, Linda ran up to a visitor and hugged him affectionately, touched his hand, then ran off to play with a counselor.

In small classrooms upstairs, counselors and teachers worked with Mooza, Linda and a small child, Larry, who is thought to be somewhat schizophrenic and also autistic.

The classroom work is helped along by the use of small bowls of candy with which the children are rewarded when they do well. They are also rewarded with hugs.

The teachers work patiently, drawing numbers and pictures on blackboards and then getting the children to repeat the drawings or say something about them.

Mooza, in the middle of one session, jumped up and down happily, squeaking with joy. She had got several numbers right and had been rewarded with a big hug by her teacher, Lewis Stein.

Mrs. Grant and others watch the classroom work through one-way windows. Mrs. Grant looks at her happy daughter with delight shining on her face.

"It never dawned on me to run away," she said. "My only thought was I had to do more. The lower you sink, it's like a cork—the higher you jump up above the water."

PHANTOM JETS TO SAUDI ARABIA

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I have read with concern a memorandum from the American Israel Public Affairs Committee regarding a proposed sale by the United States of Phantom jets to Saudi Arabia.

The demonstrated hostility of the Arab nations toward Israel makes the increased flow of offensive arms such as the Phantom jet unthinkable.

I would hope that this policy decision by the administration to sell these offensive planes to Saudi Arabia might be not only reconsidered but reversed.

I am placing in the RECORD at this time the full text of the memorandum by I. L. Kenen, chairman, American Israel Public Affairs Committee:

PHANTOM JETS TO SAUDI ARABIA

We are dismayed to learn that our Government plans to sell Phantom jet planes to Saudi Arabia and possibly to Kuwait and we urge the Administration to reconsider.

We can understand the reasons why our Government feels impelled to provide military equipment to the Persian Gulf states. Our reservations have to do with the type of equipment—the highly sophisticated Phantom. Saudi Arabia is at war with Israel and will be under temptation to use these long-range fighter-bombers against Israel or make them available to Egypt for that purpose.

There are several possible explanations for the arms deals:

1. The British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf has resulted in a power vacuum. Kuwait is threatened by a Soviet-armed Iraq,

while Saudi Arabia is exposed to attack from South Yemen and other radical forces, internal and external.

2. There is an understandable desire to maintain cordial relations with pro-Western Arab countries in order to ensure an uninterrupted flow of oil. Moreover, trading guns for oil helps our balance of payments.

3. We now sell Phantoms to another Persian Gulf state—Iran. (But this non-Arab state has excellent de facto relations with Israel and has accepted large-scale technical assistance from her.)

4. It has been suggested that if we do not sell Phantoms to Saudi Arabia, France will provide Mirages. (But she probably will in any case. Besides, there is a vast difference between the Mirage and the much more powerful Phantom.)

We have been providing weapons such as the F-5 Freedom Fighter and the Hawk ground-to-air missile to Saudi Arabia—beginning with 18 tanks in 1956, which prompted a Senate inquiry. Our weapons have been intended primarily to buttress the Saudi regime from radical revolt or attack.

But the Phantom is an offensive plane which poses a grave threat to Israel's security.

Israel is not at war with Saudi Arabia. On the contrary, her very presence in the region has been a barrier to any Egyptian move against Saudi Arabia in the past.

But Saudi Arabia, a feudal dictatorship, is in a holy war with a democratic Israel. Former King Saud once said that the Arabs should be willing to sacrifice 10 million men to destroy Israel. King Faisal has been no less virulent. Saudi Arabia still bars Jews from the country. It strongly objects to Israel's presence in Jerusalem. It has always challenged Israel's right to transit the Straits of Tiran. Its frontier is just a few miles from Eilat and Israel's oil pipeline.

We cannot be complacent if Saudi Arabia is permitted to acquire weapons deadly enough to give belligerent effect to its bigoted hostility.

Late in 1968, the U.S. decision to sell Phantoms to Israel was widely supported in Congress and in the press because of Israel's urgent need for deterrent capacity. The Phantoms enabled Israel to repel Nasser's war of attrition and opened the way to the U.S.-initiated truce in 1970. The Phantom was a concrete expression of America's commitment to Israel's survival.

But the balance of strength, so essential to the maintenance of the truce, will be impaired if Saudi Arabian Phantoms are able to blitz Israel's cities and to strangle Israel navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Red Sea. Newly-endangered, Israel would be forced to build new defenses and to plunge more deeply into debt.

While Saudi Arabia may promise not to transfer the Phantoms to Egypt or any other country, no one can really guarantee the durability or the enforceability of such an agreement. The United States armed Iraq from 1954 to 1958, a palpable blunder which we protested at the time, and a radical group overthrew the Hashemite rulers, inherited the weapons, and expelled the Americans, turning to Russia along with Egypt.

In 1966, our Government assured Israel that Jordan would not use its new American tanks against Israel, but King Hussein rolled them across the Jordan River when he entered the Six-Day War.

There is evidence that Egypt, which persists in threats to go to war and which spurns negotiations, has been collecting weapons from all sides, despite their alleged non-transferability. French Mirages have been coming via Libya, and there are reports that British Hunter jets are on the way from Iraq, and that British Lightning jets may be headed from Saudi Arabia.

Saudi oil revenues continue to subsidize Arab terrorists and to lubricate Egypt's war machine. Who would dare to interfere if the

Saudis permitted Egyptian pilots, masquerading as Saudis, to train in Phantoms and fly them across the Red Sea to the Nile? And who can guarantee that American Phantoms dispatched to tiny Kuwait may not fall into the hands of others in a left-wing coup?

It is axiomatic that Arabs will never make peace with a weak Israel they think they can destroy. Our new arms deals with Saudi Arabia and Kuwait may total \$1.5 billion, to which should be added a \$600 million training deal with the British—and an unknown amount of arms from the French. If the balance of strength tilts in favor of the Arabs, what hope is there for a negotiated peace?

We have often been told that the Arabs intend to use oil as a weapon against Israel. We have never construed this as a serious threat to withhold their oil from the West. But if they can alchemize oil into bombers, no one can predict where their blackmail will ultimately lead.

We hope that our Government will reconsider the proposed sale of Phantoms to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

I. L. KENEN,

Chairman, American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

June 4, 1973.

U.S. BOTANIC GARDEN DOING A GOOD JOB

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the little noticed operations here on Capitol Hill is the U.S. Botanic Garden. Although there is seldom any official recognition given Botanic Garden, it plods along from day to day performing an outstanding service for offices and individuals on and off Capitol Hill. I was surprised to learn, for instance, that the garden sometimes receives as many as two dozen questions a day concerning plants and flowers.

Earlier this year there was an interesting article in the Wall Street Journal regarding the U.S. Botanic Garden. I would like to share its contents with my colleagues. Therefore, I am pleased to insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 2, 1973]

ARE YOUR GARDENIAS GRUMPY? JUST CALL THE BOTANIC GARDEN—BESIDES HELPING YOU PERK UP YOUR PLANT, NURSERY SERVES AS MAIN FLORIST TO CONGRESS

(By Carol H. Falk)

WASHINGTON.—J. Edgar Hoover frequently brought his problems there. Lonely old ladies, schoolchildren, Congressmen, worried mothers and the National Geographic Society still do.

They all come to the little, two-story house at the foot of Capitol Hill and ask, well, things like:

How can you keep a gardenia plant happy in the Washington climate? (This was a continuing concern of the late FBI director.) How do you grow a mango from seed? Can this sick rubber plant be saved? And can this child be saved? (The latter query coming from an anxious mother whose offspring had just eaten part of a household African violet.)

They all come, the great and the merely ordinary, to the U.S. Botanic Garden, which fields as many as two dozen questions every

day about grumpy gardenias, ailing philodendrons and the like. Not that fielding questions is the garden's only business. As the chief nursery and florist for the Congress, it has some weightier responsibilities as well.

For instance, the garden staff is busy right now readying plants and floral displays for Capitol Hill festivities connected with this month's inaugural. Looking well ahead, they're already starting the trees that will be set out in tubs around the Capitol grounds for the nation's bicentennial in 1976. And their routine duties include raising the shrubs and trees that landscape the Capitol grounds, loaning plants to decorate the offices of Senators and Representatives, and arranging flowers for official Capitol Hill parties.

THE REGULARS CALL IN

But to Assistant Director Jimmie L. Crowe, the garden's top-priority mission is public education. (Mr. Crowe is the man actually in charge of the garden, although since 1934 the Architect of the Capitol has held the title of "acting director.") So Mr. Crowe, a professional horticulturist, personally handles every one of the individual questions that pour into his tiny office each day—by phone, by letter and on foot.

Repeatedly, he'll pick up the phone to hear some plaintive voice begin, "I have a sick plant." Mr. Crowe, a spare man whose twinkling eyes hint that he enjoys people at least as much as he does plants, often recognizes the voice as a regular caller.

The other morning he took a call, listened a moment and then cheerfully launched into a spiel on how to grow a Bird-of-Paradise plant from seed. "What's the temperature of the house? About 70? Put a thermometer in the pot; I'll bet it's around 60. You need to get it up to 72 degrees for the seeds to germinate. Let the heat blow right on it and keep it pretty moist." After hanging up, he explained that the woman caller had just brought seeds back from Hawaii. "Every time she makes a trip somewhere we get a call," he chuckled.

Some callers are probably just plant hypochondriacs looking for someone to talk to. Others, though, can be quite emotionally attached to their plants. Mr. Crowe and James I. Jones, the garden's administrative officer, recall one letter that arrived on black-bordered stationery. The writer feared his plant was dying. Then there was the young mother, distraught because her little boy had watered her cactus with Lux soap. Mr. Crowe told her to relax; the soap was biodegradable and therefore harmless.

A CRUCIAL LIST

More serious are the calls from parents or hospitals worried about potential plant poisoning. Mr. Crowe keeps a list of poisonous plants by his desk and offers advice or reassurance. Actually, most house plants, including African violets, are nonpoisonous, though some may produce a toxic reaction in certain individuals, he explains. So Mr. Crowe had good news for the mother whose child ate some bright red seeds from a magnolia grandiflora not too long ago. The seeds were unlikely to cause any serious problem. Another question involved a classroomful of school children who had sampled each of the various kinds of cacti they were growing as a project. They didn't fare as well; a few broke out in a rash.

The unbureaucratic nature of the botanic garden's operations probably invites such queries. With a staff of only 56, including growers and night watchmen, and an annual budget of under \$800,000, the garden seems far less formidable to citizens, prominent or otherwise, than, say, a huge bureaucracy like the Agriculture Department, which oversees Washington's National Arboretum.

Not all the questions come from little old ladies or worried mothers. Some come from

people who are frankly interested in making money. Garden officials report "hundreds of queries" on ginseng—a plant whose roots are valued for their curative powers by the Chinese—and how to make a profit by growing and marketing it.

Recently a Hendersonville, N.C., man wrote to report that he had two acres of land and wanted to grow ginseng or whatever "medicinal plant would yield the most profit." He provided detailed descriptions of the moisture, sun and shade conditions, evaluation and even the dates of first and last frost. The garden told him that ginseng probably would work out but suggested he check soil and water samples with state university or county agricultural experts.

Each day's mail usually brings the garden three or four samples of sickly leaves and sometimes even the bugs that are the suspected culprits. After a quick examination, the bugs are dispatched to the incinerator, before they can start feeding on the Botanic Garden's own delicacies.

Those delicacies include plants and trees from all over the world, growing in permanent exhibits in the garden's conservatory, a giant greenhouse just west of Capitol Hill. (A couple of miles away the garden also maintains 10 acres of greenhouses and growing grounds.) In addition, the conservatory features special annual exhibits of poinsettias, azaleas, spring flowers and chrysanthemums.

Just like these exhibits, the incoming questions and leaf samples follow seasonal cycles. Thus, when mangoes reach the grocery stores each fall, "we always get at least 50 requests on how to plant the seed and care for it," says Mr. Jones. "Everyone just loves mango seeds. They're so big and ugly-looking." But the garden doesn't hold out much hope to the would-be growers; the fruit usually has been picked too early for the seed to have ripened fully.

Every fall, too, brings an influx of brown or mottled magnolia and azalea leaves. People knowing these two plants to be "evergreen," think there's something wrong when they start losing some of their leaves. Actually, says Mr. Crowe, it's perfectly normal: magnolias and azaleas replace some leaves every fall.

MR. POINSETT'S PLANT

This holiday season, of course, has brought the usual queries about Christmas trees and poinsettias. Why isn't last year's poinsettia plant blooming this year? Probably, explains Mr. Crowe, because the plant needs 16 hours of darkness daily for a couple of weeks to trigger its blooming process. Even the striking of a match in the darkness will delay the bloom.

Schools tours and letters from schoolchildren claim a big share of the garden's time and attention. But even Hollywood and the National Geographic Society have weighed in with problems.

Moviemaking filming scenes in Georgetown for the movie, "The Exorcist," had to construct an addition to a house that appears in the movie. The problem was that the addition blocked the sun from some venerable English boxwood. The garden staff was consulted on the design of a removable partition that would allow light to reach the boxwood at least part of the day. And the National Geographic Society magazine once sent over a photo to make sure its photographer got the name of a particular plant right.

There are limits to the advice Mr. Crowe will give, however. He refers all questions on the identification of poisonous and nonpoisonous mushrooms to specialists at the National Arboretum or the Agriculture Department, and he declines invitations to speak on specific horticultural subjects before garden-club groups. When you agree to match wits with highly informed garden clubbers who may spend all their time on say, African violets, he explains, "you're in deadly territory."

BETTER LATE THAN NEVER

HON. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1973, a respected newspaper in my district, the Progress-Index of Petersburg, Va., printed the following comments as its lead editorial. I commend to the Members of the House of Representatives this articulate and objective discussion of the injustice of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in the hope of broadening the acceptance of the principle that, as the editor writes—

Good voting rights medicine for selected states should be good voting rights medicine for the entire United States.

The newspaper editorial follows:

BETTER LATE THAN NEVER

Carrying out the will of the General Assembly as expressed in resolution, Attorney General Miller has filed a petition in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia seeking to have Virginia relieved of the restrictions imposed upon it by the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

That the effect of the law is something more than academic is illustrated by the fact it is the reason for Petersburg's special election on Tuesday in which members of the governing body will be chosen by the ward system rather than the at-large method which had prevailed since adoption of the city manager form of government half a century ago. Discovery that there was a connection between annexation and the Voting Rights Act came as a rather general surprise. That makes another reason for reading proposed laws while they are under consideration.

The petition asks for the convening of a three-judge court to hear a complaint for a declaratory judgment on the ground that conditions no longer exist to justify application of the law to Virginia. They did not exist when the law was enacted, but facts did not carry much weight when this bit of the Johnson Great Society was created.

The law has won some support from civil rights and black leaders, presumably because of its symbolism, but Virginia's inclusion came as a surprise eight years ago. There are no documented complaints of abuses justifying the state's inclusion, and even talk of difficulty of finding registrars in Southside Virginia sounds pretty hollow. It has been a very long time since would-be voters had to chase registrars around or track them down.

The act is an unjust, ill-advised thing which has serious consequences, as is demonstrated by Petersburg's forced shift to a regressive feature of local government. A quick or desired decision on Virginia's effort should not be expected. Months are expected to pass for filing briefs and counterbriefs with the court. A decision earlier than 1974 is regarded as improbable.

Virginia, conscious of its righteousness in the matter, should have sought relief when the law went into effect. Even now, it is the first state to go on the defensive-offensive. We assume that all of the states affected, like Virginia, chose inaction on the basis of advice that the political climate of opinion, regardless of the facts, the merits and the demerits, was not favorable.

Whether or not the same punitive, anti-Southern spirit of which the act is an expression is still operative remains to be seen. Judging from the failure of attempts to amend the law at the time of its extension

in order to give it nationwide application, the outlook is not encouraging. The fact at present is that, regardless of registration and voting percentages in the test year of 1964, such possible deterrents to voting as literacy tests and registration hurdles are much more likely to be found in the non-South than in the South. The best civil rights hunting is in the non-South.

All over the United States there are cities in which successful annexation proceedings affect the racial composition of their electorates. If the merits and demerits of individual states cannot be considered factually and objectively, certainly the law should be applied to the entire country. The logic of the proposition ought to be beyond debate.

Good voting rights medicine for selected states should be good voting rights medicine for the entire United States. All that is needed is to sell the idea in that great center and source of public morals, the nation's capital.

MISCONCEPTIONS IN CHANGED ECONOMY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these days of continuing and sometimes befuddling economic problems, we are all interested in sound economic analysis.

I have come across an article which I believe makes some worthwhile comments on the economy. It is the May 28 Charles W. Steadman Letter, a newsletter published monthly by Steadman Security Corp. of Washington, D.C.

Although the entire letter is too long for inclusion here, I would recommend that my colleagues obtain it and read it. I would like to include the following excerpts in the RECORD:

INFLATION AND MONETARY MISCONCEPTIONS IN A CHANGED ECONOMY

Fighting inflation with high interest rates and tight money is something like fighting fire with gasoline. Nothing is quite as counterproductive—and we have by way of reference some prior results: 1966 and 1969–70 in which these measures were applied.

The persistent use of tight money as an inflation antidote is rooted in early economic theory that received almost unchallenged acceptance for a period long enough to entrench it—or enthrone it if you will—as "classic." Bluntly stated, the high interest-money squeeze gambit was intended to reduce demand by throwing people out of work and by dampening the spending enthusiasm of those who could still find employment. Business organizations—merchants and manufacturers—would then be left with unwanted quantities of goods on hand which then could only be moved in the market by price reductions. Such business organizations would then find themselves induced to spend less for wages, seek lower prices for raw material and would scrap plans for plant expansion or renewal.

Such conditions were sometimes known as depressions. One such occasion which occurred in the presence of acute illiquidity in the early 1930's became known as the "Great Depression." The political upheaval following this paved the way for a national resolve to banish depressions which had never been popular anyway.

The nation found a way for expressing its distaste for such economic events in the Employment Act of 1946 in which unemployment was to be eschewed (as a means of combating inflation or otherwise) and full employment as a national goal was embraced to be implemented by measures suitable to this accomplishment.

Somehow or other a contradiction between full employment and use of the high interest-money squeeze gambit was hardly recognized in official quarters. As a result of this blind spot the money squeeze gambit has been retained in the arsenal as an inflation fighter. And the results have been consistent: A fizzle in reducing inflation. Often effective in aggravating unemployment. Always effective in depressing securities prices.

Whatever effect these monetary measures may have had respecting the restraint of inflation in times past it is very clear that high interest and tight money do not and cannot cure inflation—but they may create unemployment and business failures, and they will depress securities prices.

THE ECONOMY HAS CHANGED STRUCTURALLY SINCE 1900

Restrictive monetary measures do not in today's context reduce prices. In the near term they raise prices by higher interest costs. In the long term they stultify capital spending programs which will expand the nation's productive facilities to provide more goods at home and make the U.S. more competitive abroad.

That the money squeeze gambit does not squelch inflation results from some structural changes both economic and political.

Wages have become insensitive to deflationary measures. Union labor wage scales tend to provide a broad underpinning for wages generally which have become resistant to any downward pressures. Further immunity to deflationary endeavors is provided by social security payments which are maintaining disposable income at high levels. The recent increase in social security benefits was certainly inflationary, adding vast sums to the economy convertible into consumer demand.

The trend away from an industrially dominated to a predominantly service type of economy also bears upon this. Fifty-five percent of the U.S. Gross National Product (GNP) is now generated by service organizations. This makes the economy less responsive to monetary measures than was the case when the industrial component was dominant. Service organizations are less dependent upon bank credit for their operations. They do not stock inventory nor are they in need of financing for new plant and equipment or its maintenance in the measure required by manufacturers of goods.

HOW NOW?

Interest rates: Prime rate is now at 7¼% and our forecast is for a further rise to 8% or 8½% by mid-summer.

Inflation: Has also continued to rise and during the past three months (February, March and April) has been going up at a rate of over 9.2%. This is the highest level in 22 years—since the Korean War in 1951.

Money supply: (Total private demand deposits plus currency in the hands of the public). Earlier this year and until just recently the nation's money supply appeared to be contracting. But the report just issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis for the week ending May 23, 1973 shows that the money supply grew at an annual rate of 6.1% during the past three months, at 5.6% for the most recent six months and 6.5% during the past 12 months. By comparison, the average growth rate was 6.3% from 1967 to early 1972. But it was only 2.9% from 1957–1967.

A tightening of the money supply is no precursor of economic ebullience. But there is no evidence of any credit crunch—a syno-

nym for severe illiquidity—such as existed in 1966 and in 1969-70.

In each instance severely tight money conditions were found in the presence of unusually high interest rates. And it is quite likely that the current presence of high interest rates rising toward the even higher levels which obtained in 1969-70 has excited apprehension that another credit crunch is at hand. But the fact is to the contrary as some other (and more indicative than the money supply itself) monetary measures show. I refer to Federal Reserve credit and the monetary base in which the growth of the money supply is rooted. Changes in the growth rate of these components foretell changes which can be expected in the money supply.

During the past six months Federal Reserve credit has expanded rapidly and shows a rise of 18%. But in the past three months it grew at a rate of nearly 20% (19.8%). By contrast Federal Reserve credit grew at a 10.8% rate from April 1972 to April 1973. From Qtr. I 1967 to Qtr. II 1972 the growth rate was 8.4%, not too far different from the period 1957-1967 during which the growth of Federal Reserve Credit was 7.7%.

Looking at the monetary base (defined as the net monetary liabilities of the U.S. Treasury and the Federal Reserve System held by commercial banks and the nonbank public—these monetary liabilities are member bank reserves and currency in the hands of the public) we find a continued growth at about the 9% rate which prevailed during January to April 1973. For the six months (October-April 1973) it was also at this rate (9.1%). For the year April 1972-April 1973 it was 8.3%. (It was during this period that the GNP began to grow at an unparalleled rate.) But for the period Qtr. I 1967 to Qtr. I 1972 the monetary base expansion rate was only 5.9% by comparison, and only 3.3% for the decade 1957 to 1967.

WHAT NEXT?

What does this add up to? Well, in my book it signifies that the Federal Reserve is not on a restrictive course. The banking system is not lacking for funds and conditions today are far removed from anything even implying the emergence of a "credit crunch."

Some recent developments seem to indicate that the Federal Reserve has turned the emphasis of its activities away from attempting to directly suppress inflation but rather to restraining the present industrial expansion at a rate which would level out some of the cyclical aspects of the nation's economic growth. We see some signs that the Federal Reserve may have embarked upon an allocation of credit program. Bankers are being urged by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve to examine more closely the quality of credit being sought and to exercise restraint and "discipline" in making loans. An effort to restrain loan expansion is also apparent in the increase of reserve requirements which banks must maintain particularly respecting large CD's. This is intended to discourage lending by making it most expensive for banks to acquire lendable funds.

The higher interest rates which the Federal Reserve has sanctioned by increases in the discount rate and that for Fed funds is aimed at discouraging borrowing. It is not having much effect in this regard but will end up in higher prices.

But if the Federal Reserve has forewarned the attempt to use tight money as a weapon to kill inflation this is good—very good news. It may be a bit too early to tell but present evidence is encouraging.

In summary: The monetary outlook is good and conditions which should be the forerunner of stability in interest rates at lower levels than those prevailing seem to be in the making.

HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently, a distinguished gentleman from the State of Georgia, Howard H. "Bo" Callaway, was appointed to fill the position of Secretary of the Army by President Nixon.

Bo Callaway is the highest ranking Republican from the State of Georgia and we are proud to have him here in Washington serving as Secretary of the Army.

Last summer, Mr. Hubert F. Lee, editor and founder of Dixie Business, wrote an article on "Bo" Callaway when he was elected president and chief administrative officer of Atlanta based Interfinancial, Inc. At this time, I would like to insert this article in the RECORD:

"BO" CALLAWAY HEADS INTERFINANCIAL, INC.

(By Hubert F. Lee)

"A Great man makes his decisions on the basis of what is right and not on what people think," Howard H. "Bo" Callaway told a civic club on Oct. 9, 1962.

"Bo" Callaway is a man of many talents, as was his father the late Cason Callaway and his grandfather Fuller Callaway, Sr.

"Bo" Callaway in 20-years built Callaway Gardens into, what Cason dreamed he would do, a show place of beauty and one of the world's greatest tourist attractions.

Howard H. "Bo" Callaway was elected president and chief administrative officer of Atlanta based Interfinancial, Inc., on May 31, 1972.

He succeeds Charles V. Parham, who was named vice chairman of the board.

Announcement was made by O. Ray Moore, chairman and chief executive officer.

Callaway was also elected chairman of the following subsidiaries: Coordinated Capital Consultants; Intercapital Investors, Inc.; International Securities Corp.; United Family Life Insurance Company; and Universal Reserve Life Insurance Company.

Interfinancial, Inc. has more than \$150 million in assets.

Net income for 1971 was \$2 million or 80 cents per common share, double that of 1970. Shareholders number 17,000, making it among the top five most widely held Georgia-based corporations.

Interfinancial was formed in 1969 with the merger of United Family Life Insurance and American Securities Insurance Companies. Insurance in force today is more than \$1.3 billion.

Interfinancial, since the beginning of 1971, has acquired Security Mutual Finance Corp., American Finance Corp., Service Discount Co., General Furniture Leasing, and Furniture, Inc.

Other subsidiaries include American Security Insurance, United Family Life, Coordinated Capital Consultants, Intercapital Consultants, Intercapital Securities Corp., Paco, Inc., Standard Guaranty Insurance Co., and Union Security Insurance Company.

Callaway became executive vice-president of Interfinancial last January.

He was born in LaGrange, Ga., April 2, 1927.

He attended Episcopal High School in Alexandria, Va., Georgia Tech and graduated from West Point in 1949.

After serving with the 17th Infantry Regiment, 7th Div., in Korea, "BO" was an instructor in tactics at Fort Benning while Gen. Alvin Gillem, Jr. was CG of the Third Army.

He resigned his commission in 1952 to help his father launch Callaway Gardens. Cason had heart trouble and had need of his son to put muscle to his dreams. It was Cason's great hope that one of his sons would carry on his plans for Callaway Gardens after he passed on.

He was a director of the Georgia Power Company from 1961 until he ran for Congress and was elected to 89th Cong. He also resigned as a director of the Trust Co. of Ga.

He received a plurality of the vote for Governor of Georgia in 1966.

He was President Nixon's campaign manager in the southern states in 1968.

He was president of the Young Presidents Organization in 1967.

When his father resigned from the Georgia Board of Regents after serving from Jan. 1, 1932, Governor, now Senator, Herman Talmadge appointed "Bo" to fill the unexpired term until Jan. 1, 1958. Bo served for 11½ years, the youngest ever to serve. 1953 until 1964.

"Bo" also succeeded his father on the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living," the honor group limited to 200 living leaders, from which the "Man of the South" is named each year.

Bo is Chairman, Board of Trustees, Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, succeeding General Eisenhower.

THE RESTRUCTURE OF OEO

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in the March 7, 1973, edition of the Contra Costa Times of Walnut Creek, Calif.

This editorial gives a very good background on the restructuring of OEO, and I feel it is imperative reading for every lawmaker who is concerned with the elimination of poverty from American society.

I insert the following editorial in the RECORD.

POVERTY WAR NEEDS A NEW APPROACH

Instead of decrying President Richard M. Nixon's move to scrap many of the so-called "war on poverty" programs of the "Great Society," Congress would better serve the people by attempting to trace failures of these programs.

Perhaps our Representatives and Senators haven't noticed, but under the poverty banner, the number of Americans living in poverty, as defined by the government, has increased from 24.1 million in 1969 to 25.5 million in 1971.

Going back to 1964, in eight years since this "Great Society" program began, it has cost government almost \$15 billion, and yet poverty is on the increase.

It would appear on the surface, at least, that as the President observes, "Too much money has been going to those who were supposed to help the needy and too little to the needy themselves."

There have been instances, for example, where Community Action Agency grants for federal money have been used to provide "patronage for local cadres of political ac-

tivists" rather than to relieve the plight of the poor. Community Action agencies have even been in frequent conflict with elected local governments.

Another example is the Legal Services program which employs 2,300 lawyers to represent poor people with legal problems not involving crimes. Yet we see Legal Services going well beyond this purpose and spending much of its resources on attacking the very system that is attempting to help their clients.

The acting head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Howard J. Phillips, reports:

"Some of these lawyers who are paid with federal funds have taken the view that their mission is to change the fabric of society through law reform. They have brought class action suits, challenges to constitutionality of laws, suits to put more people on welfare.

"They have organized rent strikes, done lobbying, aided political action groups. They have organized prison inmates, helped peace organizations and the gay liberation movement, and have represented ineligible clients.

"All this is not helping the poor—it is purely political."

And, he might have added, with all this political activity, when do Legal Services attorneys have time to help the poor, originally set up as their prime goal.

Congress should investigate, for instance:

Why some of the projects funded by OEO have done little but to keep people comfortable in their poverty, and has done so

little in many areas to lift people out of poverty?

Why some grants tend to foster the welfare ethic rather than the work ethic?

Why some programs are pursued on the premise that the problems of poverty are political rather than economic?

As Phillips observes:

"Too much of the anti-poverty money has gone into setting up an administrative bureaucracy rather than into the hands of the poor."

This is another reason why it is questionable whether the agency system approach really helps those truly in need.

This is perhaps the reason why the majority of Americans today are impatient with OEO and a number of its programs—not all, but enough to jeopardize even worthwhile programs, and there are a number of these.

This is also why many of the programs will be transferred to other agencies and continued, in some form. A few will even be given increases in funds.

In defending his approach, President Nixon pointed out that "it has been charged that our budget cuts show a lack of compassion for the disadvantaged. The best answer to this is to look at the facts.

"We are budgeting 66 percent more to help the poor next year than was the case four Americans, and 242 percent more to help the hungry and undernourished. Altogether, our human resources budget is nearly double that of four years ago when I came into office.

"We have already shifted our spending priorities from defense programs to human resources programs. Now we must also switch our spending priorities from programs which give us a poor return on the dollar to programs that pay off. That is how to show we truly care about the needy.

"The question is not whether we help, but how we help. By eliminating programs that are wasteful, we can concentrate on programs that work."

And this is precisely what Congress should be doing, attempting to work with the President to make certain this goal is realized, not attacking him for proposing to dump programs that are, at best, of questionable value.

It is estimated this round of budget cuts can save \$11 billion in this fiscal year, \$19 billion next fiscal year, and \$24 billion the year after.

This would mean, it is estimated, an average saving of \$700 over the next three years for each of America's 75 million taxpayers.

Congress should seek ways and means of eliminating the high administrative and bureaucratic costs of Office of Economic Opportunity programs by working with the poor and needy directly through existing departments in both federal and state government.

Only then is it likely that poor, needy and impoverished Americans will be helped where they need help the most, without some bureaucrat or bureaucracy taking his cut of the poverty war right off the top.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 13, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.—Psalms 51: 10.

Almighty God, we lift our hearts unto Thee in the midst of a culture where a person is often judged not by what he really is but by what he seems to be. In our daily lives we have submerged the virtues of integrity, kindness, and hard work beneath our cushioned greed, our soft indulgences, or selfish ambitions, and our lack of faith in the goodness of every human life.

Forgive what we have been, help us to amend our wearied, our worried, our wicked ways, and by Thy spirit direct us that henceforth we may live lives motivated by a devotion to honesty, truthfulness, and good will—to the glory of Thy holy name and for the good of our human family. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5293) entitled "An act authorizing additional appropriations for the Peace Corps."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5610) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1938. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1974.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-351, as amended by Public Law 91-644, appointed Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ABUREZK, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. TAFT, on the part of the Senate, to the National Commission for the Review of Federal and State Laws Relating to Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance.

EULOGIES TO THE LATE HONORABLE HALE BOGGS, OF LOUISIANA, AND HON. NICK BEGICH, OF ALASKA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this announcement is to advise the membership

that the closing date for printing the eulogies and encomiums to the late Representative Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, and Representative Nick Begich, of Alaska, has been set for Friday, June 29, 1973. All copy for insertion must be submitted before this cutoff date so as to be included in the final publication of their compendiums of eulogies.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1974.

Mr. SCHERLE reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., NOTES THAT COURTS HAVE RULED OVERWHELMINGLY AGAINST IMPOUNDMENTS

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the courts have ruled against the Nixon administration in eight consecutive cases involving impoundment of appropriated funds.

Most recently, a Federal court in Baltimore held that the administration had