

H.R. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship on certain Vietnamese children and to provide for the adoption of such children by American families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ADAMSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. REES, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 8964. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship on certain Vietnamese children and to provide for the adoption of such children by American families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 8966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an itemized deduction for amounts paid for planting, raising, and harvesting a vegetable garden; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 8967. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to provide that Army and Air Force National Guard technicians shall not be required to wear the military uniform while performing their duties in a civilian status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 8968. A bill making appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.J. Res. 637. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent forced busing and to prevent federally required job quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating October 14, 1973, as "German Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. REES, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H. Res. 465. Resolution to provide the House of Representatives with pertinent information with respect to the possible grounds for impeachment of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 8969. A bill for the relief of Jung Sup Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 8970. A bill for the relief of William T. Owens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

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

264. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Federal assistance to aid the low- and moderate-income people to obtain adequate housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

265. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida relative to accounting for servicemen missing in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

244. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the 24th Saipan Legislature, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to amending the Micronesian Claims Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

245. Also, petition of Frank T. Richardson, chairman, Research and Development Committee, Board of Public Transportation of Morris County, N.J., relative to recommendations for the railroad passenger service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

246. Also, petition of Girard Luck and others, San Francisco, Calif., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENERGY SAVING TIPS

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the developing shortage of gasoline, heating oil, and electricity poses a serious problem to the constituents of New York and to the citizens of the United States as a whole. The possibility that the supply of energy may be curtailed has created a deep feeling of anxiety among the American people. As an individual, the citizen believes there is little he can do to alleviate the energy crisis.

I do not believe that the American citizen is powerless. If we make a concerted effort—as individuals and as a society—I believe we can have a positive effect on the effort to conserve energy.

With this goal in mind, Concern Inc., a public service organization, has published a pamphlet containing energy saving tips for the consumer. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this pamphlet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAYS TO CONSERVE ENERGY TRANSPORTATION

Moving people and freight accounts for about 25% of the energy consumed in the United States. Half of this amount is used by automobiles.

Larger cars with more powerful engines

consume more fuel than small ones. For example, a car weighing 5,000 lbs. uses over twice as much fuel as one weighing 2,000 lbs. Other features such as air conditioning and automatic transmission contribute to fuel consumption.

Buy a car no larger or more powerful than you need, without unnecessary features.

Walk and ride bikes. Half of all automobile trips now cover less than 5 miles.

Ride public transportation where available. Organize car pools.

Encourage the building of better public transportation systems in your community.

Have your car periodically maintained and keep it tuned up.

Good driving habits can cut your fuel consumption in half.

Speeding is a costly consumer of fuel. The average car driven between 75 and 80 miles per hour will consume almost twice as much fuel per mile as the same car driven at 50 miles per hour.

On the road, accelerate smoothly and ease into stops.

Do not race the engine.

Instead of idling the engine to warm it up in winter, drive slowly for the first quarter mile.

Do not leave your engine running longer than 3 minutes while waiting.

HEATING AND COOLING

To conserve energy in heating

Consider making changes and improvements in your own home. If you follow these recommendations you can save 50% on your fuel bill.

Install or increase insulation.

1. Where winters are moderate use:

3½" ceiling and wall insulation for gas heat.

6" ceiling and 3½" wall insulation for electric heat.

2. Where winters are severe use:

6" ceiling and 3½" wall insulation for gas heat.

9" ceiling and 3½" wall insulation for electric heat.

3. Check attic floor insulation. 6" is adequate.

Weatherstrip and caulk windows and doors. Install storm windows and doors. Check for other air leakage, particularly in the attic.

Where glass area is large, install double pane or insulating glass.

Have furnace checked once a year and change filters frequently.

To Cut Use of Energy in Heating:

Close damper in fireplace when not in use. Lower thermostat for sleeping. We suggest 60°.

By lowering the daytime setting of your thermostat by 1° you use 3% to 4% less fuel. By lowering it 5° you use 15% to 20% less fuel.

Insulate your body—wear a sweater.

Discourage over-heating of public buildings, particularly schools and libraries. Pressure managers of public buildings to conserve energy.

To conserve energy in cooling

Insistence on good architectural design in your own community can substantially reduce energy needs for cooling.

All buildings should have windows that open.

Encourage the design of buildings with less glass.

Shade windows from direct sunlight. Preferably shade them from the outside with trees, window vines, shutters that close, awnings or roof overhangs.

Close light-colored draperies to the sunlight. This can reduce heat gain by 50%.

Follow tips in Heating Sections on insulation and air leakage.

To Cut Use of Energy in Cooling:
Illuminate less.

1. Light fixtures give off most of their consumed energy in heat. This pushes the need for air conditioning sales. The main function of office air conditioning is to remove heat from excessive interior lighting.

2. Cut out all non-essential night lighting at home and encourage less nighttime illumination of public buildings.

3. Large areas should be served by more than one switch.

Discourage open refrigerator units in supermarkets to display frozen vegetables and dairy products.

Complain about over-cooling in public places; particularly theatres, restaurants and supermarkets.

Avoid using air conditioner unless whether is intolerable.

HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES

Currently 20% of our total energy and 30% of our electric energy output is consumed in the home. Efficiency of our appliances is the key to saving in this area.

The process used to generate electricity is very inefficient now. For every three units of energy produced two are discharged into the atmosphere as waste heat and one is changed into electricity. Up to 10% of the electricity generated at the plant may be lost during its transmission to your home. Gas appliances are 2 to 3½ times more efficient than electric ones in their overall energy use.

Water Heating

Heating water for your home can, literally get you into hot water—financially! Your water heater, be it electric, gas or oil fed, is the most expensive appliance to operate after the furnace and the air-conditioning unit. It accounts for about 15% of your utility bill. It feeds the ever-active washing machine and dishwasher. Therefore . . .

Whenever possible run washing machine on cold water.

Do not wash dishes under hot running water.

Air Conditioner Units

Installing the correct size and most efficiently designed unit can cut your power consumption for this appliance in half.

To determine the efficiency, check the numbers on the back of the machine. Divide the BTU per hour rating by the number of Watts input. You will get a number ranging from 4.7 to 12.2. The higher the number the more efficient the machine. This efficiency check can also be made for clothes dryers.

The most efficient unit of the correct size will guarantee the lowest overall cost and least pollution.

Refrigeration

The frost-free refrigerator requires 50% more energy to operate than a standard model. The standard model costs between \$2 and \$4 per month to operate, the frost-free model costs \$3 to \$6.

The side-by-side refrigerator freezer uses up to 45% more energy than the conventional model.

The average size food freezer costs approximately \$4 per month for energy.

If you really need one (most families do not), be aware that a well-stocked freezer requires less energy to operate than a partially full one.

Cooking

The stove accounts for 5% to 7% of your utility bill. Self-cleaning ovens are large consumers of energy.

Use self-cleaning feature sparingly.

Use proper size pans for burners to avoid waste heat.

Lighting

Fluorescent lights are about 4 times as efficient as incandescent lights, and last 7 to 10 times as long. Twenty percent of the

electricity received by a fluorescent tube is converted to light, whereas 5% is converted to light when the incandescent bulb is used.

Use lights in specific work areas, instead of lighting the entire room.

Turn off lights when room is not in use.

Television

Color television sets consume more energy than the same type black and white model. Solid state sets (both color and black and white) consume less energy than filament (tube) sets. Larger screens consume more energy than smaller screens.

Sets that have the instant turn-on feature are consuming electricity 24 hours a day. This feature costs more for the initial purchase and more to operate and maintain.

If you have a television set with the instant turn-on feature, unplug set when not in use.

Small appliances

Electric energy consumed by small appliances constitutes nearly 10% of all residential demand which is more than 3% of our total electric energy demand. This 3% becomes significant when compared to the AEC's use of 5%, the aluminum industry's use of 7% and the steel industry's use of 5% of our electric output.

Eliminate use of unnecessary appliances.

General tips for household appliances

For all gas appliances a switch-operated electric starter can be substituted for continuous burning pilot lights. (At least 10% of the natural gas consumed goes to keep pilot lights burning.)

Optional extras on all appliances use extra energy. Remember that you have the option not to buy them.

Demand improved appliance design. Increased insulation would lower energy requirements.

Try to avoid using your appliances during peak periods of energy use.

INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICE FOR AUTISTIC CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I indicated that during this week—National Autistic Children's Week—I would be including in the Record pertinent articles and information regarding autism and the effect on its victims. Today, I would like to discuss the Information and Referral Service for the Mentally Ill of the National Society for Autistic Children. This service is an invaluable aid for parents of children who show the signs of autism.

Although I described the symptoms last Friday, it would be helpful to briefly describe them here. The first symptom of childhood autism is a severely handicapped speech. This can be coupled with an impaired lack of social relatedness and/or an extreme distress for no discernable reason due to minor changes in environment. Other symptoms include: An unusual reaction to perceptual stimuli such as "looking through" objects or poor eye contact; hyperactivity; an insensitivity to pain; and a deterioration in functioning after normal development.

Parents who are concerned that their child may be autistic should contact the Information and Referral Service of the National Society for Autistic Children. This agency, which is headed by the past president of NSAC, Mrs. Ruth C. Sullivan, provides more than 20 services for parents and other interested persons in the care and treatment of mentally ill children. These services include:

First. Names and addresses and other information about day and residential schools, private, and public.

Second. Names and addresses and other information about camps which take mentally ill children.

Third. Names of cities and States where mentally ill children are educated in the public school system.

Fourth. Names of public mental hospitals with good children's unit—almost nonexistent.

Fifth. Names of other parents in general geographical area with same problems.

Sixth. How to effectively organize to get community services for mentally ill children.

Seventh. Diagnostic and evaluation centers.

Eighth. Legislative news and information at national and State levels.

Ninth. Legal rights of mentally ill children.

Tenth. Up-to-date news of new programs.

Eleventh. Sources of funds for mentally ill children, public and private.

Twelfth. News and information of new treatment, education, methods, research, and other data.

Thirteenth. List of colleges and universities which offer training in field of childhood mental illness.

Fourteenth. List of sources of funds for teacher training.

Fifteenth. Library service dissemination of selected articles, reprints, books, and so forth, including bibliographies, and book reviews.

Sixteenth. Health insurance information.

Seventeenth. Trust fund information.

Eighteenth. Income tax information.

Nineteenth. Recreational facilities, plans, news.

Twentieth. News on international scene.

Twenty-first. Lists of contracts with societies for autistic children in other countries.

The Information and Referral Service not only supplies information, but in the interest of having the complete list of services available, also accepts any further information from interested individuals and organizations.

This agency provides invaluable assistance to those agencies and people who need to know more about autism. Mrs. Sullivan may be contacted by writing to her at 101 Richmond Street, Huntington, W. Va. 25702. I hope that my colleagues and other interested persons who wish to know more about this disease and possible forms of care for autistic or mentally ill children will contact this agency.

TRADE WON'T INSURE PEACE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, Paul Greenberg, whose column appears from time to time in the Detroit News recently wrote a very perceptive column in my view entitled "Trade Won't Insure Peace," which I thought was very worthwhile. Therefore, I would like to share it with my colleagues in the House. The article follows:

[From the Detroit News, June 20, 1973]

TRADE WON'T INSURE PEACE

(By Paul Greenberg)

As Leonid Brezhnev negotiates with President Nixon it might be prudent to take a closer look at the advantages of trading with the USSR. Doing business with the Russians hasn't always insured either peace or profit.

The last grain deal with the Soviets is still reflected in the price of meat to the American consumer. Nor is trade invariably a force for peace, as anyone will testify who remembers all the scrap iron that Americans sold to Japan before the Second World War—and the form in which much of it came back.

The military emphasis of the Soviet economy already allows the Soviet bloc a general 3-1 superiority over NATO countries in Europe. The most effective pressure on the Soviet Union's military priorities comes from within: the increasing demand for more consumer goods. If the West supplies those needs on bargain terms, without demanding some relaxation in Soviet attitudes, what incentive will Soviet leaders have to cut back on military expenditures?

Get set for a lot of high-toned generalizations about how increased trade with the Russians is bound to make them more receptive to the free exchange of ideas, too. But the Soviet leadership already is taking steps to counteract such dangerous tendencies. The latest shake-up put representatives of the military and internal security in the Politburo for the first time in years.

This won't be the first time that American capitalism has been given a crack at the Soviet market. Immense projects, from automobile assembly lines to steel factories, were organized and financed in the Soviet Union by Americans in the 1920's and 1930's, which was just when Joseph Stalin was tightening his grip on the country.

Assurances that the Soviet Union is changing slowly for the better are as old as the Soviet Union. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Or Mehdvedev. Or any uncensored, un beholden, writer. The news from the Soviet Union certainly seems as Soviet as ever.

Brezhnev, modest leader of the Soviet Communist Party, has just awarded himself the Lenin Peace Prize. This year Comrade Brezhnev also prevailed on Comrade Brezhnev to give the May Day speech from atop Lenin's Tomb; the television cameras scarcely had time for any other member of the formerly collective leadership.

Isn't it reassuring to be told about the great changes in Russia and the disappearance of the cult of personality?

The lure of the Soviet market is strong but there ought to be some more thought given the strategic consequences of trading with the Soviets on their terms and with our credits. For a President fully aware of the need for some hard bargaining with friends, Mr. Nixon has yet to prove himself a Yankee trader in dealing with the Russians. The results of that last wheat deal alone were enough to defend the President against the old epithet, "Tricky Dick."

Trade alone will not ensure peace. It's the terms of the trade that count and whether this country can win political concessions in return.

It would be a tragedy of diplomacy if trade with the Soviet Union, with all its potential as a discreet lever on Soviet policy, were instead to become the sole goal of American negotiators.

In that case the trade that could have softened the Soviets' policies will only allow them to continue devoting a huge portion of their budget to weaponry and repression. And the mistakes of the wheat deal would be repeated on a calamitous scale.

DEDICATION OF ETHEL ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, February 15, 1973, ceremonies were held to mark the dedication of the Ethel Andrus Gerontology Center. Dr. Nathan Shock, the Director of the National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development's Gerontology Research Center addressed himself to a thoughtful analysis of the role of biomedical science in improving the well-being of the aging.

Last December, I visited Dr. Shock and toured the facilities of the Gerontology Research Center which is located in Baltimore, Md. I was impressed by the work being done by the National Institutes of Health in the field of aging. Dr. Shock is recognized as one of our Nation's leading experts in gerontological research and I believe his remarks will be of interest to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Shock's statement be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

"BIO-MEDICAL SCIENCE: PROSPECTS IN AGING"

(By Dr. Nathan W. Shock)

It is indeed an honor and privilege for me to participate in the dedication of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center. This is an important occasion since it marks the culmination of the joint efforts of a great university, an organization of retired people, and governmental agencies in providing a resource to increase our understanding of aging and to improve the status of aging people. The American Association of Retired Persons is to be congratulated on their foresight in supporting both training and research and in recognizing that research represents an investment in the future. This Center has a unique opportunity. Located within and integrated into the university community, it has available great resources for both training and research. Past performance has demonstrated that these functions can be adequately carried out under the able leadership of Dr. Birren.

I have been asked to review with you some of the prospects for advances in biomedical research which will have an impact on aging. In order to do this I shall outline what I regard as appropriate goals for research on aging and where we stand with respect to a number of aspects of aging research, with an indication of where I think significant advances will be made.

TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE

In my opinion, the ultimate goal of all research on aging is to improve the performance and well-being of older people. The goal is to improve the quality of life in the later years by reducing the incidence of disabilities which now afflict many elderly people. Although we will undoubtedly have an impact on average life span, the extension of life in itself is not a worthy goal for gerontologic research.

It is obvious that improvement of the quality of life involves a broad spectrum of conditions which includes not only health and vigor but also the general social climate, such as a definition of the role of elderly people in our society, and many conditions of living such as income level, housing, and the availability of community resources to elderly people. However, health and physical capabilities serve as a cornerstone to the good life. It is to these aspects of the problem that I shall address my remarks.

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

In order to achieve our goal of maintaining health and vigor to advanced old age, we must first of all assess in quantitative terms the differences between young and old members of the population. These descriptive studies must begin with a detailed evaluation of the functional capacities of individual organ systems, both under resting conditions and, more importantly, to evaluate the capacity of an organ system to adjust to demands imposed by the stresses of daily living. Such descriptive studies will range from the performance of the total animal to the changes that occur in biochemical processes that take place within tissues, cells, and their subunits such as mitochondria and other subcellular elements. Although such studies may not be very exciting, they are essential as a first step in the study of aging.

UNDERLYING MECHANISMS

Once the range of differences attributable to age have been defined the next step in research is to define the underlying mechanisms which induce these changes. Such information on the basic biological mechanisms of aging is essential for the development of rational methods which can ultimately be applied to improve the lot of humans. These experiments on the basic biological mechanisms of aging require studies on animal models. The specific animal chosen will depend upon the questions which are being posed by the investigator. For experiments designed to test hypotheses about the effects of nutrition on aging, the rat or mouse may be the animal of choice. In other experiments designed to test the effects of temperature on aging a cold blooded animal such as the rotifer or fruit fly may be more appropriate. Other studies designed to test hypotheses about the transfer of information in a cellular system will abandon the whole animal and will utilize cells and tissues which are cultured in isolation. All of these models and approaches will derive bits of information and test specific hypotheses which will ultimately lead to an understanding of what aging is all about.

RESEARCH RELEVANCE

With today's emphasis on relevance we may well ask what research is relevant to aging. Obviously the descriptive studies of age differences, both in humans and in other animal species, is relevant to our questions about aging. However, as pointed out previously, such studies are not apt to identify the basic mechanisms of aging. Similarly, studies which attempt to show the effect of some treatment or alteration in living conditions on life span of animals may be regarded as relevant. However, unless the experimental intervention is based on valid assumptions about the nature of aging chances of success are small. Even if successful on an empirical basis, generalization of

the findings to other species and other populations may fail.

Some may demand that studies relevant to gerontology should always compare measurements made at, at least two points in time over the adult life span. However, in my opinion, strict application of any of these criteria would seriously limit the future of research in gerontology because relevance changes with time and circumstances. Often, basic research done at an earlier time with no thought of solving a practical problem has become highly relevant to a practical problem at a later date. For example, the many man hours that went into the detailed classification of various species and strains of mosquitoes had little relevance to any practical problem at the time the work was being done. However, years later this detailed information was of critical importance in showing that one specific strain of mosquito was responsible for the transmission of malaria.

Similarly, the extensive work devoted to working out the detailed chemical structure of hemoglobin proved to be of basic importance in explaining the etiology of sickle cell anemia, which is due simply to the misplacement of one amino acid in the very large hemoglobin molecule. I am sure that the organic chemists studying the formation of polymers were completely unaware that their work would be so important to cardiovascular surgeons in the repair of blood vessels in the human. The development of the oral contraceptives was possible only because of the long history of basic research beginning in 1849 when Berthold first identified the male sex hormone.

Many streams of basic science research ranging from the discovery of the physiological mechanisms of ovulation to the determination of the synthesis of estrogens and progesterone finally culminated in the solution of a very practical problem. In view of the current emphasis on cellular theories of aging, it is apparent that gerontologists must be in the front line of current research on how cells work, repair themselves, and die.

GERONTOLOGY: AN INFANT SCIENCE

As a science, gerontology is still in its infancy. Although sporadic studies of aging appeared in the scientific literature from time to time, it was not until 1939 that any systematic presentation of the field of gerontology was available in the literature. Cowdry's book, "Problems of Aging", prepared under the sponsorship of the Macy Foundation, presented for the first time a summary of the literature on all aspects of aging. It made gerontology visible as a field of scientific study. Formation of the American Geriatrics Society (1942) and the Gerontological Society (1945) gave further visibility to the field and offered opportunities for discussions among investigators interested in specific aspects of aging. Another milestone in advancing gerontology was the publication of the "Classified Bibliography of Gerontology and Geriatrics" in 1951. This bibliography, with supplements in 1957 and 1963 and with quarterly supplements in the Journal of Gerontology since then, has made the widely scattered literature on aging accessible to students and investigators.

The establishment of the International Association of Gerontology in 1950 has also played a key role in the development of gerontology. The first meeting of the IAG, stimulated by Dr. V. Korenchevsky of Great Britain, was held in Liege, Belgium under the leadership of Prof. L. Brull.

The meeting drew only 95 participants from 14 countries. In contrast, the 9th International Congress of Gerontology, held in Kiev, U.S.S.R., in July 1972 under the leadership of Prof. Chebotarev, brought together over 2,000 professionals from 45 different countries. With this rising tide of interest in the problems of gerontology, research in-

stitutes and centers on aging have been established in Switzerland, France, Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Norway. Increased support for aging research through the programs of the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Veterans Administration, and others have led to the establishment of centers for aging research at Duke University, the University of Chicago, Case Western Reserve, Syracuse University, Pennsylvania State University, Philadelphia Geriatric Center, Yeshiva University, the Masonic Research Laboratory in Utica, University of Louisville, West Virginia University, Washington University (St. Louis), the Boston V.A. Hospital, Bay Pines V.A. Hospital (Florida), the University of Miami, the Gerontology Research Center (Baltimore), and, of course, the University of Southern California.

The number of investigators working on problems of aging has greatly increased over the past 10 years. During this relatively short period of time there has also been a significant shift in the direction of research. Up to now, emphasis has been placed on identifying age differences. It is now clear that we must turn to the definition of age changes. This can be done only by making repeated observations on the same individual as he ages. It is now recognized that aging is a process which involves the total developmental sequence including events and conditions occurring early in the lifespan that may have profound effects later on.

Another marked change in the nature of gerontological research which has occurred over the past 4 or 5 years is the shift from descriptive studies to investigations on the mechanisms which produce age changes or age differences. Recent advances in knowledge about cell biology and the development of new methods and techniques now make it possible to investigate the biological mechanisms of aging. Although I do not regard extension of life span as a worthy goal for gerontological research, many do. Some gerontologists are of the opinion that dietary and other manipulations of the environment could readily add 10 to 15 years to the average life span while others have predicted that by the year 2000 it may be possible to double the average human life span. Such predictions have precipitated extensive discussions about the social and economic effects of such a radical change in the composition of the population. I should like to take a moment to present my assessment of the probability that marked changes in the average life span will take place in the foreseeable future.

DEATH AND AGE

One of the basic biological facts of aging is that the probability of death increases logarithmically with age. In humans, after the age of 30 to 40 years death rates double every 8 years. The general relationship between the logarithm of death rate and age is a straight line plot with many different species of animals. In short lived strains such as the rat where the average age of death is about 2 years the slope of this plot is very steep. In the dog, with an average age of death at 12 years, the slope is less steep and in the human, with an average age of death of 69-70 years, the slope is even less. Thus the slope of the Gompertz plot is determined primarily by genetic factors.

When improved social and medical conditions result in a lengthening of life span the curve relating log mortality rate to age simply shifts to the right but the slope is not changed. For example, the curve for mortality in the United States in 1900, when the average life span was approximately 40 years, is some 5 years to the left of the current curve where average age of death in the United States is approximately 69 years. We can expect some further shift in the intercept of the Gompertz plot over the next 10 to 20 years as has occurred in the past. Actually,

there has been no substantial change in the average age of death in males in the United States since 1960, although the average age of death of females continues to increase. It has been estimated that the total elimination of cancer and heart disease as a cause of death would add only 5-6 years to the average life span. Thus continued research on diseases which are currently the primary cause of death among older people can be expected to increase average life span by only a few years. Any doubling of the human life span would certainly require alterations at the genetic level. Although genetic engineering is regarded as a potential goal for the future, it is improbable that alterations in the genetic pattern of aging will be achieved in the foreseeable future.

DISEASE AND ANXIETY

Currently, one of the major problems of older people is the disability associated with disease and the anxiety generated about the loss of freedom and function as well as the economic costs. Research on cardiovascular diseases, especially arteriosclerosis, will have direct effects in improving the quality of life. Reduction of the disability involved in cancer, stroke, and hypertension will undoubtedly result from advances in bio-medical research.

Although the advances in surgery which have made possible transplantation of organs, such as kidneys and hearts, have been spectacular, the associated costs and other problems will severely limit the application of these techniques to elderly people. None of them can be thought of as available to large numbers of the population and hence can hardly have any significant impact on an aging population as such.

Although biomedical research directed toward preventing or curing diseases which kill will have an impact on life span, there are other diseases which produce widespread disability among elderly people. Arthritis and emphysema are diseases which head this list. Research which will lead to a reduction in the incidence of these diseases may have more impact on improving the quality of life of more people than would a cure for cancer. Expanded and intensified research on these crippling diseases will have a major impact on the quality of life for many elderly people.

THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTION

Other biomedical research will undoubtedly be directed toward the development of therapeutic interventions to reduce the impact of aging. At present, few of these interventions are based on sound knowledge about the basic biology of aging. The inclusion of antioxidants in the diet as proposed by Harman is based on the assumption that aging is related to the formation of free radicals which may have a deleterious influence on cellular function. Harman has reported experiments in which the average age of death of rats fed an antioxidant was increased by 25-30%, although the maximum life span of the treated animals was no greater than that of the controls. The results in the animal experiments are promising but more work will need to be done before the method can be applied to human populations.

REJUVENATION

Since 1960 reports have appeared in the literature which claim rejuvenating effects from the administration of procaine. This procedure, first evolved by Dr. Anna Aslan, has a long list of world famous people who claim to have obtained beneficial results. However, no carefully controlled experiments have been carried out which would make it possible to judge the merits of the procedure.

Cellular therapy has also been reported as having beneficial effects. This procedure, publicized primarily through the clinic of the late Dr. Paul Niehans, involves the injection of suspensions of fetal cells. Here again the procedure, which is potentially dangerous,

has not been adequately evaluated. The injection of crude preparations of DNA or RNA has been offered as a means to improve memory and mental function in aging people. This procedure, like the others mentioned above, has little or no scientific rationale and, in fact, there are cogent reasons to believe that they would not be effective. Although we will undoubtedly see additional nostrums proposed to reduce the effects of age, until we have a clear understanding of the cellular mechanisms involved in aging, chances that any of these procedures will be effective are exceedingly slim. The future for gerontology seems to me to lie more in pursuing fundamental questions rather than testing unknown nostrums.

PHYSIOLOGY AND AGING

As a result of descriptive studies carried out over the past 10-15 years we have learned a good deal about the physiological aspects of aging. Time will not permit a detailed review of specific experimental results obtained from tests on normal men aged 20-95.

Instead, I shall try to give you a few generalizations which I believe are valid. First of all, not all physiological functions show changes with age, especially when the measurements are made under basal or resting conditions. Many of the constituents of the blood show little or no change with age. Characteristics such as blood sugar, blood acidity, osmotic pressure, etc. do not change significantly with advancing age. These are, in general, characteristics which must be closely regulated in order to provide the proper environment for the cells of the body to function.

On the other hand, there are many physiological characteristics which show gradual decrements over the entire age span. Characteristics such as the amount of blood pumped by the heart, kidney function, lung function, etc. show a small but continuing decrement over the entire life span. Since measurements made at each decade represent different subjects, these results indicate only age differences or, perhaps better expressed, represent differences between people of different ages. It is obvious that age changes can be recorded only if repeated observations are made on the same subject as he ages. Such longitudinal studies are extremely difficult to organize and to operate. However, one such longitudinal study has been in operation at the Gerontology Research Center since about 1958. A total of some 650 active males living in the community have been tested at 18-month intervals over the intervening years. The subjects range in age from 20 to 96 years. Preliminary analysis of these observations indicate that age changes, at least over the age span of 20 to 60 years, are not as marked in individual subjects as would be predicted from the average cross-sectional curve. In some physiological characteristics, decrements in function proceed at an accelerating rate after age 70. However, it must be remembered that, although 14 years is a long time in the life of the investigator, it is but a short part of the entire life span of the individual. This study is continuing and when data for the next 10 or more years are available on these subjects a more definitive picture of aging and the precursors of disability can be identified.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

All of the observations on physiological characteristics emphasize the marked individual differences in the way people age. For example, some 80-year-old subjects have resting cardiac outputs that are as good as the average 50-year-old. The critical question is whether such individuals were superior to the average person when they were 40 years old or whether they have simply been able to maintain the performance of the average 40-year-old for a much longer period of time. This is a question which can be answered only by the long-term longitudinal study.

It is also clear that there are very marked differences in the average rate of aging among different organ systems. For example, the decrement in nerve conduction velocity between 30-year-olds and 80-year-olds is only about 5-10%, whereas the difference in kidney function is about 50% and the ability to perform manual work is almost 60%.

It is also clear that age differences are most apparent in tests which involve a response to some stressful situation. For example, resting blood sugar levels show no differences between young and old. However, when the blood sugar is increased by the oral administration of glucose or by its intravenous injection the rate at which the blood sugar level returns to normal is much slower in the old than in the young. The amount of physical work and the maximum oxygen uptake is substantially less in the old than in the young.

Furthermore, the rate of recovery of blood pressure, respiration, and heart rate after a standard amount of physical exercise is slower in the old than in the young. This slowing of response seems to be a general characteristic which extends from many behavioral and psychological characteristics to responses at a cellular level. For example, reaction time is slower in the aged and the age decrement is greater in choice and complex reaction tasks than in simple responses. At a cellular level it has been shown that the primary age difference is the rate at which enzymes are formed rather than the total amount. It takes the old cell more time to get started in producing the enzyme after an adequate stimulus, although the final amount of enzyme produced may be the same in the old as in the young.

BREAKDOWN OF CONTROL MECHANISMS

In my opinion, aging in the total animal may be primarily a reflection of the breakdown in control mechanisms. For example, the reduced ability of the older individual to remove excess glucose from his blood cannot be ascribed to the inability of the pancreas to produce insulin or a reduced utilization of glucose in the tissues. The delay in glucose removal is due primarily to a reduction in the sensitivity of the cells of the pancreas to the rise in blood sugar. In other words, the blood sugar must rise to a higher level in the old subject than in the young before insulin is released. Similarly, the decrease in heart rate in response to a rise in blood pressure is significantly greater in the young than in the old. The sensing cells in carotid tissue of the old animal are less sensitive to the rise in blood pressure. Other evidence of the effect of impairment in control mechanisms is shown by the fact that the age decrement in performance of work tested on the bicycle ergometer is substantially greater than the decrement in strength of the muscles which carry out the work. Performance of the coordinated movements involve control mechanisms that are not required in measuring the strength of individual muscles. These are but a few of the examples of the breakdown in control mechanisms with advancing age. The same general concept also applies to cellular mechanisms and represents a fruitful area for future research.

The age decrement in reserve capacities of a number of organ systems results from the loss of cells or functioning units. The loss of nephrons from the kidney, of muscle fibers, and even neurons can be demonstrated by both physiological and histological techniques. It is therefore apparent that the important problem for gerontologists is the question of what factors determine cell loss and cell death. These questions lead to studies related to biological theories of aging.

BIOLOGICAL THEORIES

Over the past 5 to 10 years, great progress has been made in formulating biological theories of aging. This has come about, first of

all, because of the current trend in gerontological research to emphasize investigations on the mechanisms of age changes and from the rapid strides that have been made in the understanding of basic mechanisms of genetic control of cellular processes. During this period some theories of aging highly popular 10 years ago have all but been abandoned. For example, in the 1950s a great deal of effort in the field of aging was based on a presumption that since exposure to radiation reduces life span, radiation mimics aging. We now know that this is not necessarily the case and investigators have turned to other areas.

In 1956 Comfort identified some 30 different theories of aging, few of which were stated in terms appropriate for experimental testing. Today there are only 3 or 4 biological theories of aging which seem to be worthy of consideration. Thanks to advances in modern technology, many of these hypotheses can now be stated in terms which can be tested in the laboratory. It is here that I believe major advances will be made in the foreseeable future.

GENETIC CODE

The observation that each animal species has its own finite life span suggests that the genetic code of any organism carries within it not only a program for developmental sequences of on-going life processes but also for aging and death. Support for theories of pre-programmed aging has been provided by tissue culture studies which indicate that cells are capable of only a limited number of divisions after which they age and die and that cells from young animals can divide more often than those from old ones. The mechanism for this apparent turning off of cell division at a certain point in time is unknown. Research in molecular genetics has shown that in bacteria one portion of the DNA genetic code can turn off the expression of another portion. If similar events occur in higher animals they could constitute an aging mechanism and identification of factors involved at a certain point of the process could lead to the modification of aging at this basic level.

In any cell the information stored in the genetic code as determined by the structure of the DNA molecules must be transcribed and translated in various steps until the final protein or enzyme molecule required or manufactured by the cell is produced. There are many steps in this process and one of the popular theories of aging is that errors occur which result in slight deviations in the form or structure of the protein molecule which renders it incapable of performing its usual function. Errors may occur in the transcription and formation of messenger and other types of RNA or errors may be introduced in translation of the code with the incorporation of a specific amino acid into a protein chain. Studies on the DNA-protein complex represent an area of research which seems to have a high probability of defining causal relationships in aging. Although great advances in technology have been made, the solution of these difficult problems will require further advances. For example, one of the key stumbling blocks to research in this area is the lack of methods to obtain homogeneous cell populations from specific tissues. This is because a tissue or organ contains a variety of cell types. For example, the brain contains not only neurons but a great many glial cells and other supporting structures. It has already been shown that the metabolic processes of the glial cells are quite different from those of neurons. It is obviously inappropriate to study biochemical or enzymatic characteristics of homogenates or even mitochondrial preparations which will arise from an unknown proportion of glial vs. neuronal cells.

Final substantiation of the error hypothesis will require the identification of misformed molecules. At the moment we do not have

technology which will permit identification of small aberrations which may appear in only 5 or less per cent of the total molecular species. In addition, techniques for labeling nucleic acids *in vivo* in non-dividing cells must be devised. With the rapid expansion of new information provided by basically oriented scientists in biology, biochemistry, immunology, and physics, I am confident that these technical problems can be overcome and ultimately we will be able to describe in detail the basic mechanisms of cellular aging.

CROSS-LINKING THEORY

Among the non-genetic hypotheses about the basic biological mechanisms of aging, the cross-linking theory remains viable. It has been shown that with advancing age cross-links form within the molecular structure of connective tissue fibers which results in a loss of elasticity of many tissues, such as the skin, which is characteristic of aging. Although the loss of elasticity of many tissues with age may not be the basic cause of aging, the ability to inhibit or to reverse the formation of cross-links in connective tissue would certainly increase the quality of life for many elderly people. Investigations on this problem have taken two directions: (1) Attempts to inhibit the formation of cross-links, and (2) to break down cross-links once they have formed. Thus far, neither approach has been successful but with the knowledge of the chemical process which needs to be inhibited or reversed success may ultimately be achieved. In fact, it has recently been claimed that low molecular weight enzymes capable of breaking down the cross-links in old collagen have been derived from soil bacteria. The claim that similar cross-linking occurs in intracellular proteins and thus explains decrements in cell function requires extensive exploration.

CELLULAR AGING

Investigations on regulatory processes in cells will undoubtedly tell us a great deal about aging at a cellular level. Slight changes in the chemical composition of cells and the interaction between cellular elements may be of great importance in maintaining the life of a cell. Slight changes in ionic strength or in calcium concentration may be the important point of regulation which slows down the response of the cell to a stimulus. Current work on binding sites, on cell membranes, and the mechanism of the action of hormones on intracellular processes may yield important information about aging.

The role of cyclic AMP in regulating cellular metabolism has been identified only recently. What its role may be in aging is still unexplored. Similarly the discovery of the regulatory effects of prostaglandins offers a new approach to studies of aging at the cellular level. The synthesis of new polymers which are capable of penetrating cell walls offers a potentially exciting method of introducing large molecules into cells for experimental purposes. All of these new developments place new methods and approaches in the hands of experimental gerontologists.

IMMUNOLOGY

Modern advances in immunology offer a fertile field for studies on aging. The importance of maintaining an effective defense against infectious agents is well known. An effective defense depends on the formation of antibodies by the immune system. Production of antibodies reaches a peak during adolescence and then declines. In some animals this decline is so dramatic that senescent animals retain only one-tenth the immune capabilities of younger ones. Studies on this decrease in immune competence show that the defect lies primarily in the cells which produce the antibodies and that this defect is related to the reduced ability to divide. If the senescent animal could be provided with a new supply of young cells of a thymus or spleen this defect might be rectified. This will certainly be a fruitful area for research.

The immune system also protects the animal against the introduction of foreign protein or cells into the body. This is the basis for the rejection phenomenon which occurs when organs or tissues are transplanted from one animal to another. In young animals the immune system is extremely sensitive in distinguishing between cells that are a normal part of the animal and those that are slightly different because they grew in a different animal. Even slight genetic differences can be detected. It is believed that with advancing age some cells of the body may undergo genetic changes or mutations. Under normal circumstances, these mutated cells are recognized as different by the immune system and are destroyed by specific antibodies. With advancing age the immune system may make mistakes in the formation of antibodies so that they destroy some of the normal cells of the body as well as the aberrant ones. This results in the development of so-called auto-immune diseases as well as the loss of normal cells which may contribute to aging. Modern techniques of immunology have opened the door for intensified research on ways of rejuvenating the immune system and maintaining its sensitivity and ability to generate specific antibodies.

IMPORTANT NEW DISCOVERIES

In summary, it seems to me that aging research is on the threshold of important new discoveries that can ultimately lead to an improvement in the quality of life of older people. Rapid advances in the technology of molecular biology offer opportunities for investigating basic biological mechanisms that have never been available before. Increased interest among young scientists gives promise that many of these well trained younger people will see the challenge of research in aging and make valuable contributions. The current trend in research is more and more toward the investigation of mechanisms, although a great deal still remains to be done at the descriptive level. With its commitment to teaching and research in aging the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center will, I am sure, play a major role in bringing to the attention of all scientists in the university community the challenges of aging research. It will, I am sure, serve as an effective catalyst to advance the cause of gerontology.

JOB OUTLOOKS FOR 1970'S

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, every 2 years the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor publishes a handbook detailing occupational perspectives.

The Occupational Outlook Handbook has proven to be a valuable tool for counselors and teachers in assisting students in making career choices. In addition, the handbook may be particularly helpful to Vietnam era veterans who are unfamiliar with the current employment market. For the veteran who wishes to further his education, the handbook can prove extremely helpful in selecting courses of study.

The Occupational Outlook Handbook offers an overview of employment prospects in a wide range of occupations including foresters, aerospace engineers,

teachers, railroad conductors, receptionists, State police officers, and plumbers. Over 250 occupations are listed.

The handbook also contains projections of changes that are expected to occur between 1970 and 1980. For example, during the 1970's professional and technical jobs, which usually require college level training, are expected to increase faster than those in any other occupational group. Nonetheless, 8 out of every 10 jobs open will not require a college degree.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is to be commended for its efforts in compiling the employment information contained in the handbook.

LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when we consider the Labor-HEW appropriation bill I expect to offer a package of amendments that would have the effect of reducing the overall expenditure level in the bill by some \$631 million. The overall bill covers approximately 370 individual line items, but my amendment will touch only 26.

For those unfamiliar with the bill it would be rather difficult to determine precisely what effect our amendment would have by a simple printing of the text of the amendment, so I shall include prepared setting forth the specific items with figures showing the level of expenditure in the current fiscal year 1973, the President's budget figure for the item in fiscal year 1974, what was recommended by the full committee in the bill, the amount of my proposed amendment, and finally what the figure for the item would be if my package of amendments should be adopted. The explanation in the table for each reduction will be reduced to its briefest form, but we will of course have extensive arguments and explanations in support of our position during general debate and when the bill is read for amendment.

I should say further, Mr. Speaker, that the manner in which I shall offer the amendment will be similar to that used by Mr. Joelson and Mr. HATHAWAY in years past when they offered packages of amendments to increase our bill. Members will have an opportunity to accept or reject the package of amendments with a single vote. This does not foreclose Members from offering amendments to my amendment or from offering amendments to any of the other items in the bill as they see fit when the bill is read for amendment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but that in its present form the Labor-HEW bill will surely have to be vetoed, and we went through that exercise two times during fiscal year 1973 and ended up operating the entire year under a continuing resolution. I am sure

the vast majority of Members would agree that we do not want to go that route again this year. We have an oppor-

tunity here to make a significant reduction, and moreover it can be defended in good conscience. I do hope Members will

give serious consideration to what I am proposing and support my amendment. I include the following:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 1974 LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

Appropriation/activity	Fiscal year 1973 operating level	Fiscal year 1974		Proposed amendment	Fiscal year 1974 revised bill
		President's budget	Recommended in bill		
Mental health:					
General mental health:					
Research—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	\$79,349,000	\$80,489,000	\$89,289,000	-\$4,400,000	\$84,889,000
Training—Maintain faculty support; eliminate increased student support.....	81,841,000	71,876,000	110,000,000	-19,540,000	90,460,000
Construction of Centers—Eliminate new construction.....			15,000,000	-15,000,000	
Staffing of centers—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	125,100,000	125,250,000	163,698,000	-19,224,000	144,474,000
Alcoholism:					
Research—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	6,882,000	6,901,000	8,901,000	-1,000,000	7,901,000
Training—Maintain institutional support; eliminate increased student support.....	3,546,000	3,763,000	4,763,000	-1,000,000	3,763,000
Community programs—Retain project grants; eliminate increase in formula grants.....	30,000,000	30,000,000	40,000,000	-10,000,000	30,000,000
Health services planning and development:					
Medical facilities construction—Retain funds for ambulatory care facilities and modernization.....	2,000,000		197,200,000	-87,200,000	110,000,000
National Institutes of Health:					
Research grants—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	587,004,000	582,882,000	700,079,000	-58,597,000	641,482,000
Research training—Hold program to 1973 operating level (excludes amendment for cancer, heart and lung).....	149,842,000	125,994,000	180,292,000	-26,281,000	154,011,000
General research support grants—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	26,124,000	17,000,000	55,000,000	-19,000,000	36,000,000
Health manpower:					
Health professions:					
Capitation grants—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	152,200,000	152,500,000	187,277,000	-17,389,000	169,888,000
Special projects—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	34,400,000	34,000,000	53,000,000	-9,500,000	43,500,000
Construction—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....			100,000,000	-50,000,000	50,000,000
Dental health activities—Eliminate the increase.....	12,979,000	12,991,000	14,979,000	-1,988,000	12,991,000
Educational assistance—Eliminate the increase; adequately covered by the educational initiative awards.....	8,905,000	5,000,000	9,320,000	-4,320,000	5,000,000
Nursing support:					
Construction grants—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....			20,000,000	-10,000,000	10,000,000
Schools of public health—Reduce to operating level for fiscal year 1973.....	15,571,000		22,231,000	-6,660,000	15,571,000
Allied health support—Reduce to operating level for fiscal year 1973.....	22,705,000		38,705,000	-16,000,000	22,705,000
Education:					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Title I—Apply "hold harmless" at both 1972 and 1973 operating level using 1970 census data.....	1,585,185,000	1,585,185,000	1,810,000,000	-97,000,000	1,713,000,000
Bilingual education—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	35,080,000	35,000,000	45,000,000	-5,000,000	40,000,000
Occupational, vocational and adult education—Basic vocational education programs—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	450,827,000	450,827,000	501,341,000	-25,000,000	476,341,000
Higher education:					
Language training and area studies—Reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ of the increase over the budget.....	2,360,000	1,360,000	12,360,000	-5,000,000	7,360,000
Library resources—Reduce to $\frac{1}{2}$ of increase over the operating level for fiscal year 1973.....	137,730,000		176,209,000	-19,240,000	156,970,000
Social and rehabilitation services:					
Developmental disabilities—Reduce to 1973 operating level (the States currently have \$20,000,000 in unexpended formula funds).....	\$21,715,000	\$21,715,000	\$32,500,000	-\$10,785,000	\$21,715,000
Subtotal, amendments for HEW.....				-539,124,000	
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	790,200,000	143,800,000	333,800,000	-82,500,000	241,300,000
Total amendments.....				-631,624,000	

¹ Excludes out-year costs of \$346,750,000.

² Level proposed for inclusion in Better Schools Act.

Amount subcommittee over budget.....

Proposed amendments.....

Budget authority.....

\$1,264,352,000

-631,624,000

Total amount still over budget request.....

+632,728,000

A. TERRY WEATHERS, LEADER IN EDUCATION, RETIRES FROM FARMINGDALE SCHOOL BOARD

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, in a few days Mr. A. Terry Weathers will retire after 15 years of service as a trustee of the Farmingdale, N.Y., School Board. This Wednesday, New Yorkers will recognize his contributions to education at a testimonial dinner at the Four Seasons Country Club in Woodbury, L.I.

I am confident that this dinner will not indicate an end to Mr. Weathers' service to his community, but rather like a graduation, will serve as the commencement of a full and rich retirement.

So that my colleagues will know of the outstanding efforts A. Terry Weathers has undertaken on behalf of our youth, I include at this point in the RECORD my letter to him on the occasion of his retirement.

CONGRESS OF
THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1973.

Mr. A. TERRY WEATHERS,
Farmingdale, N.Y.

DEAR TERRY: It was with considerable dismay that I learned you were retiring at the end of this month after 15 years on the Farmingdale School Board. Your presence will be sadly missed.

During your long and distinguished career you have earned the respect and admiration of your colleagues and the entire community as a real gentleman. As Board President and as Finance Chairman, you have been ever-mindful of the individual homeowner, fighting to keep taxes in line and pressing for a raise in the state-aid ceiling. Through all this, however, you have always insisted that quality education for the children of Farmingdale not be sacrificed.

All of Long Island owes you an even larger debt, for your interests have not been confined to a single community. You were the guiding light in the founding of the Nassau-Suffolk School Boards Association and its first President. Your expertise as a statewide leader in education was recognized when you were chosen to serve as President of the New York State School Boards Association.

I regret that the heavy legislative schedule

of the House of Representatives does not permit me to join with your other friends and well-wishers at the testimonial dinner in your honor on June 27. I sincerely wish I could be present to congratulate you in person. Although you are taking leave of your active role on the Board, I am confident that your retirement years will be as full and creative as the ones you have devoted to the service of your community.

Sincerely,

ANGELO D. RONCALLO,
Member of Congress.

DEDICATION CEREMONY OF THE
ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERON-
TOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS AN-
GELES, CALIF., FEBRUARY 12, 1973

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, I was privileged to participate in the dedication of magnificent new facilities for the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center, at the Uni-

versity of Southern California in Los Angeles.

The Andrus Center, Mr. Speaker, is one of the largest gerontological institutions in the world, and it is dedicated to improving our understanding of the processes of aging, and the problems of the elderly, through support of research in the biological and social sciences as well as graduate training and community service programs.

It seems to me that some words spoken at the dedication ceremony by Dr. John Hubbard, president of the University of Southern California, are of great significance to those of us interested in the elderly and research on their problems.

Said Dr. Hubbard:

The University of Southern California sees the study of aging as an area rich with information for the scientists and laden with promise for his fellow human being. We at USC share with you a particular view of age. Far from being the end of the line, it is a beckoning of opportunity—a time for the fulfillment of great potential.

Mr. Speaker, I include the proceedings of the official dedication ceremony at this point in the RECORD.

ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER
DEDICATION CEREMONY, FEBRUARY 12, 1973

JAMES BIRREN

I am James Birren, the Director of the Center that we are going to dedicate this morning and it is my pleasure to call upon the Rev. Alvin Rudisill, Chaplain of the University, to pronounce the invocation for the dedication of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center. The Reverend Rudisill.

REVEREND RUDISILL

Let us pray. Glorious and mighty and majestic is the name of the Lord. His praise is to be proclaimed by all the peoples. Bless and dedicate thee this Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center. Here may learning and research flourish so that the well-being and comfort of older men and women may be provided for.

Help us all to recognize that our steps are guided constantly by the paths they have already walked and our future brightened by the dreams they have dreamed.

Inspire us this day to live in faith, hope and love in a world at peace. Amen.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

Thank you.

We of the Center are very thrilled that so many distinguished friends and guests are with us this morning, and I would like to welcome old friends and about-to-be friends to participate in this dedication that we have been looking forward to so long.

From 50 states have come representatives of the Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association to be with us.

There are also among you many individual donors that have made this event possible. There are students, faculty, alumni and interested persons from the community.

I feel at the moment that we are really just at the beginning of a new era in our concepts about the nature of the human life span. It is interesting that it developed that this is Lincoln's Birthday, and I think it is so appropriate a choice because on this day that we dedicate the building we are reminded of the fact that Ethel Percy Andrus was also the principal of the Abraham Lincoln High School. I understand that she had the name changed because she admired him so much.

Just as she put her energies into the freeing of retired persons from the limitations that are arbitrarily placed on them, I feel today that in dedicating this building we are

both freeing our concept about the nature of our lives and dedicating our energies to enlarging our prospects for fuller lives through research.

I think those of you that are facing the building and have had the opportunity of going through it, and I hope that many of you will, are pleased with the beauty of this building. A building such as this doesn't happen quickly or casually. It requires talent and experience. The Board of Trustees of the University selected very well when they chose Edward Durrell Stone as the architect for this project. Many of you know him for his design of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C.

On this campus he is known also for two other structures of note: the Waite Phillips Hall and the Von Kleinschmidt Center and related facilities.

May I present to you Mr. Stone.

EDWARD DURRELL STONE

Well, it's a great honor for me to be here and it would be less than fair if I didn't rate the University of Southern California as my favorite client since, as has already been pointed out, we have had an opportunity to work here before.

In designing a building for a campus, of course doing eclectic architecture is a dirty word, but this campus does have time honored traditions in the Romanesque style and I guess this building takes a bow to that heritage, as does Von Kleinschmidt and the other building we have done.

It has been said that great buildings, if they become great, are the result of great clients and that has certainly been my happy experience here. Mr. Firestone, of the Trustees, and Norman Topping I fancy are my friends and it is nice to greet President Hubbard and work for him.

Architecture is not like the work of painters or sculptors—who are one man working in a garret—as we have the client participate as you might suspect, since architecture involves an element of cost. It might be said that architect's work really is reconciling dreams with dollars. Here on the campus is an old friend of mine, Tony Lazzaro. He is in charge of campus development and planning. He, fortunately, makes the architect look good which is very hard for anybody. However, he describes what goes in the buildings and he also knows what they should cost, so we are in a happy position of reconciling dreams to dollars largely thanks to Tony.

I can't help but speak with some pride that this is \$80,000 below the budget. Clients always like to hear that and like for that to happen and that has been the history of past work we have done here. We have always met the budget. I'm not up here putting in a commercial, though it sounds like it. These are the facts though and I am largely attributing this to Tony and his Department.

Some of the money which we spent, I hope judiciously, came from the efforts of many people. The American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association combined their energies to raise the funds for the building. We have had marvelous help from Meyers Brothers, the contractor, who had a Mr. McGalliard and Sons who performed this beautiful brick work.

Incidentally, Norman Topping and I picked this brick out for the Von Kleinschmidt Center, so I hope you recognize it, Norman.

In short, this is a very, very happy occasion for the architect, especially when it is shared by friends. To build a building of this importance and purpose is a very inspired opportunity. And I might say it is very timely as far as far as I am concerned because I made my debut along the turn of the century, and as I reckon that is about 70 years ago but I have a young wife who thinks there is hope for me. I always have to boast about that.

The Stones, my family, have always lived much longer than anybody ever thought they should and that is likely to be the case with me. But it is ensured now that we have a facility of this sort, and I am very happy about it, personally.

In other words, I hope that people who look at this building find it palatable to the eye. I do. And I have to be honestly arrogant and admit that I think it is very beautiful, and I hope serves the University of Southern California and the people of this part of the state well.

I think this attendance here is incredible. You know, I was here at nine this morning and everybody was already in their seats. That speaks well for what happens in Southern California and what will happen more so when this building functions.

Thank you very much.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

Thank you, Mr. Stone, and for what you have done for us here. Mr. Stone mentioned that the construction firm was the Meyer Brothers, and they were responsible for this beautiful brickwork. I was hoping that Mr. Ray Meyer would be here this morning. If he is here this morning, I would like to recognize him. Would you come forward a moment?

MR. RAY MEYER

Well, I don't think after those words by Mr. Stone that I need to say anything about this building, but we are very proud, Meyers Brothers Construction Co., to have built many structures that we have built on the campus. It has been a real pleasure to work with all of the men here. They are a great bunch of fellows. Thank you.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

The Center, and the building of course, fits into the total campus and the man that is responsible for the big and little things about the expanding University of Southern California is the President, Dr. John Hubbard. I would like to introduce him and present him to you at this time.

DR. JOHN HUBBARD, PRESIDENT

Thank you, Jim, ladies and gentlemen. This certainly is a most welcome day for us all. Andrus Center means so much to so many that I can only characterize its significance as universal.

Even to describe the Center's significance to USC alone would certainly take up the rest of this morning. So let me just say that we are enormously pleased and grateful to the thoughtful donors who made this building possible.

The University of Southern California sees the study of aging as an area rich with information for the scientists and laden with promise for his fellow human being. We at USC share with you a particular view of age. Far from being the end of the line, it is a beckoning of opportunity—a time for the fulfillment of great potential.

With these splendid new facilities and the dedicated men and women who will use them, we have the greatest hope for what can be accomplished in the Andrus Center. For the aging, and for men and women of every age.

This magnificent Center precisely exemplifies the future development of the entire University of Southern California. We of the University will be devoting more of our intellectual resources and academic facilities to the challenges confronting society and its individual members. This is the approach of the Gerontology Center. With its challenge-oriented programs, the possibilities for meaningful research and teaching are limitless.

There is no question, of course, about the field of Gerontology. We are proud that USC can lead in this development, thanks to the existence of the Andrus Center.

Our deepest appreciation goes to all of you who put the vital bricks of this building

together with your enlightened concern and superb effort.

Thank you.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

At the time the Center was approved by the Board of Trustees, and Dr. Topping was President, Mr. Leonard K. Firestone was Chairman of the Board of Trustees. I would like now to invite his comments as we are in front of this building that he approved. Mr. Firestone.

LEONARD K. FIRESTONE

Thank you. Honored guest, ladies and gentlemen, I had not intended to include in my short remarks what I am about to say about Mr. Stone. Having been associated with him for 10 or 12 years, and hearing him this morning make his remarks to you, it occurred to me that how anybody as soft-spoken and as low key as he is can develop and create such majestic and beautiful buildings and architecture as he does.

Then I heard just a short time ago that in June he married a very young lady, and when I add to that the dramatic things that he has done architecturally I have just got to come to the conclusion that he has got a lot more on the ball than you just think he has, casually meeting him.

And I wanted to take this opportunity, too, to thank Mr. Stone for all he has done for me and done for this University. He probably exemplifies some of the things that Mr. Davis was talking about just a few moments ago.

It is a particular pleasure for me to be asked to speak on this occasion. When the Gerontology Center was established at USC in the sixties, it was my honor to serve as Chairman of the University's Board of Trustees. We were very proud of the beginning the Center was making then. Today everyone associated with the Center has good reason for continuing pride. The work done by Gerontology faculty and staff over the years has been of the highest quality. They certainly deserve this excellent new building.

It is my privilege to convey, on behalf of the Board of Trustees, the thanks of the University to all those who made possible the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center.

As you know, this beautiful structure is the product of many, many thousands of individuals—dedicated people who worked to fulfill the dreams of a distinguished alumna of the University of Southern California.

My associates and I are confident that her dreams will be fulfilled by those who use the Center. We are confident that there will be new light on human life—that living will be made brighter for all.

For the Board and for myself, please let me specifically thank Mr. Davis, the members of the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association, and all the loyal Trojans who contributed to the Center through the USC Alumni Fund.

My fellow trustees and I are proud to be associated with the Andrus Center and that it is a part of USC. We are proud that all of us together are taking part in a great pioneering effort on behalf of humanity.

Together, we are involved in a noble purpose.

It is a purpose which we see greatly advanced this day.

Thanks to all of you for your help.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

Thank you, Mr. Firestone.

The success of a contemporary University no longer just depends upon the quality of research, its scholarship and its educational programs, but the extent to which it maintains a two-way channel with the community of people that nourish it. You.

Facilitating this communication from the point of view of the retired persons themselves, is a man who effectively represents

the interests of retired persons in this country. Mr. Bernard Nash is the executive director of the American Association of Retired Persons, and the National Retired Teachers Association.

As was mentioned earlier, the membership of these associations now numbers over 5,000,000. That's many more people than some states have in their population. It's over one-quarter of persons over the age of 65. An impressive growth.

Before he assumed this position, Mr. Nash was a deputy commissioner of the Administration on Aging where, among other things, he promoted the Foster Grandparent Program.

As a young man, we feel he is one of our Grandparents. I would like to invite our Grandparent to speak to us.

MR. BERNARD NASH

Now I have a new identity. Thank you, Dr. Birren.

You heard Mr. Davis describe to you the "early family" that worked with Dr. Andrus in identifying the dreams and the goals of our Association. More than 500 leaders assembled here today, of the two associations, represent the extended family of Dr. Andrus. A family that now numbers over 5,000,000. We achieved that mark about two and one-half weeks ago.

While only a few of them knew Dr. Andrus personally, they know well her philosophy of service to others. A knowledge that has been confirmed by countless acts of kindness and self-denial in communities throughout our nation. And confirmed it in a very meaningful way through the role in helping to make possible this Center.

More than 400,000 individual members contributed funds to this memorial to our founder. Millions more contributed their time and their prayers over the past five years since her passing to this great gift for humanity.

A beginning

Dedication of the Center today represents for our Association not an end but a beginning. We shall continue to work with the dedicated staff of the Center, and of this University in pursuit of our mutual goals—to change for all time the very meaning of growing old. To destroy forever the myth and the stereotypes and the prejudices that downgrade and ignore the ability and the potential of older persons as individuals and as members of our society.

Just as this magnificent structure will commemorate, for as long as it stands, the noble goals of dignity, purpose and independence which Dr. Andrus espoused for older citizens, so will our continuing association with the work done here symbolize the validity of that philosophy as we work together to achieve those goals.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

Thank you, Grandfather Nash.

I would hardly need to introduce the next two persons to the Associations themselves for they are their Presidents. And I hope indeed, they will become equally well-known on this campus. I will perhaps present them to you one at a time.

First of all we have Mr. Foster Pratt, the current President of the American Association of Retired Persons.

MR. FOSTER PRATT, PRESIDENT AARP

Dr. Hubbard, this key we know will unlock the doors to this magnificent Center. It is our prayer that this Center will become a key to unlock the secrets of aging and human development.

Accept it with our assurance of continued support and our admonition to the dedicated staff already at work here to carry on.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

To represent the National Retired Teachers Association is the President-Elect, Mr. Raymond Ast.

MR. RAYMOND AST, PRESIDENT-ELECT, NRTA

Dr. Hubbard, ladies and gentlemen, thank you, thank you very much.

We who are old are supposed to dream dreams, and you who are young are supposed to have visions. As I and Foster present to you, on behalf of our members, the keys of this marvelous Center it is our hope that our dreams and your visions will merge so that in the work that we do here together we can make real the vision of Isaiah for future generations; enabling them to renew their strength, to run and not be weary, to walk and faint not.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

Also to participate with us is the immediate Past President of the Retired Teachers Association, Mrs. Katherine Pearce, and Mr. Fred Faassen, the immediate Past President of the American Association of Retired Persons.

I would like them to rise and participate in cutting the ribbon that binds the building.

In this process we are going to have a pair of ceremonial scissors first, but then we are to have a more cutting pair, as well, but the photographers want the ceremony.

MRS. KATHERINE PEARCE

Dr. Birren, Dr. Hubbard, honored guests and friends.

Many of you will recall that less than two years ago we gathered at this site to participate in the groundbreaking ceremony that marked the beginning of the construction of this Center.

As we cut the ribbon today, symbolizing the formal opening of the completed structure, it provides ample evidence of what talented people can accomplish in a short period of time.

As the artist, the craftsmen and the laborers pooled their energies and talents to create this beautiful building, so may those from the disciplines who labor from within the building likewise prove their talents and energies to create a beautiful structure for the human spirit.

MR. FRED FAASSEN

Well Mrs. Pearce, using scissors to cut this ribbon is much easier than breaking ground with a shovel, and it is far more rewarding. For it is evidence that our Associations not only set goals but see them through to completion.

More importantly, it means that Dr. Birren and his staff can now unify and expand their work to achieve more fully the goal of Dr. Andrus which she set of insuring for all older Americans—lives of dignity, independence and purpose.

DR. JAMES BIRREN

I don't think you knew that your two presidents were such cut-ups.

Now you have evidence that those two presidents are sharp as well.

We now have an innovative event for the dedication of the building. The concept developed that we should have a time capsule that would be opened in the year 2000, in which might be placed our predictions about the future of retirement and aging.

To assist us in this event are Miss Cecilia O'Neil, who was President of the National Retired Teachers Association at the time the concept of this Center developed, and joining her will be Mr. George Schludenberg who was President of the American Association of Retired Persons at the onset of the project.

I would be pleased to say that we have two student fellowships named after them the following year, as well for which we are deeply grateful. To receive the time capsule will be Lisa Pomeroy who is the President of the Student Council of the Gerontology Center. It is worthwhile to note that she was one of the recipients of this scholarship that enabled her to continue in her graduate studies.

MISS CECILIA O'NEILL

Dr. Hubbard, Dr. Birren, distinguished guests and fellow members of the American Association of Retired Persons and of the National Retired Teachers Association and friends.

For those of us who knew Dr. Andrus personally, who loved her and worked with her, this dedication event has prompted emotions of cherished and treasured memories.

Every remembrance of the very special joy that Dr. Andrus brought to every human encounter.

But we have also been looking ahead and 25 years from now when the time capsule we place within this Center today is opened, that generation of Americans will read with special appreciation, we trust, of our generations hopes and dreams for the quality of life that will then exist for all Americans.

To describe the contents of the time capsule, I have the pleasure of calling upon my former associate, Past President of the American Association of Retired Persons, Mr. George E. Schluderberg. Mr. Schluderberg.

MR. GEORGE SCHLUDERBERG

Fellow retirees, members of the Staff of the University of Southern California.

Certainly we don't want the future to forget what we have done here today. When this time capsule is opened in the year 2000, officials of this Center then—with interest and with curiosity—will greatly enjoy the contents therein.

THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1968

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in the National Housing Act of 1968, Congress committed the Federal Government to a schedule of housing construction that would adequately provide for projected housing needs. The national housing goals production schedule adopted by the administration in 1970 called for the production of approximately 600,000 low- and moderate-income housing units in each year from 1973 through 1980.

After the careful calculation of what our housing needs will be and the establishment of programs to administer funding, the Nixon administration announced in January of this year that it was cutting off funds for all newly approved projects for subsidized housing, water and sewer grants, open space grants and public facility loans.

Mr. Speaker, I have become greatly concerned with not only the dismantling of the present Federal public housing programs, but with the lack of commitment to the goal of providing adequate housing for all citizens that this action signifies. I have written all the directors of housing authorities in California requesting information as to how the freezing of funds has specifically affected their programs. Their response was one of deep disappointment over the administration's actions and of unanimous support for actions of Congress that would reinstate these appropriations. Statements from some of the letters I have received follow:

In the city of Los Angeles, there are only 14,000 units available for low-income families and the elderly compared with an estimated minimum need of 88,500 units—despite this fact, HUD has cancelled the housing authority's application for new construction.

San Francisco officials have written that the President's "freeze" on public housing funds has halted the planned construction of over 11,000 units in the Bay Area—while there are over 6,000 applicants waiting for available units in San Francisco alone.

In Sacramento, officials estimate that roughly \$87 million will be lost to the Sacramento economy as a result of the President's actions, and that, further, this will represent the loss of nearly 19,000 jobs.

In the city of San Diego, HUD has held up approval of an application for 1,000 leased housing units under section 23 and an application for 500 units of housing for the elderly under the Turnkey development program.

In the city of Santa Barbara, applications for 600 units of Section 23 leased housing have been on file with HUD since 1970. To date, the local housing authority has been successful in obtaining only 250 units of Turnkey conventional bid housing and 330 units of section 23 leased housing.

The Oakland Housing Authority has been unable to initiate planning for 800 units for which construction was expected to begin in 1975.

In Alameda, 2,886 families are on waiting lists for housing and there are only 650 units now under contract to be built.

In Berkeley, the housing authority has been tapping its reserves at the rate of approximately \$10,000 per month, due to administration's failure to provide an adequate operating subsidy.

The housing authority of the city of Long Beach writes that they have faced great financial difficulty due to the cuts in their operating subsidies, and this situation has threatened their ability to properly operate existing units as well as plan for new construction.

In San Bernardino, officials state that the current levels and methods of funding have prohibited their operating a program that even begins to provide adequate housing for low-income families.

The housing authority of Contra Costa County is having "to trade off units now under contract for assistance because of the administration's continuing refusal to consider any increase in subsidy to cover the increase of rentals in the private market."

In Kings County, the housing authority reports that the President's impoundments have "stopped all proposed plans for additional housing."

The director of the housing authority of the city of Madera expressed his frustration well:

As I am sure you are well aware, many efforts have been made on the part of housing authorities and redevelopment agencies toward the release of these impounded funds. All their efforts have been to no avail. We don't know yet from one day to the next where we stand in this particular situation.

From the San Joaquin County Housing Authority, I have learned that "produc-

tion of housing for low-income and the elderly has come to a standstill."

Within the jurisdictions of the Imperial Valley Coordinated Housing Authorities, there are 626 units of public housing currently available and there are 448 families on waiting lists for housing—all additional production has been brought to a halt due to the funding freeze.

In Kern County, the administration has stopped the expenditure of \$6,630,000—\$3,250,000 for new housing construction and \$4,764,000 for modernization of housing built prior to 1954.

The housing authority of Yolo County has had to reduce its operating reserves to what they consider to be a critical level of only \$31,920. Additionally, HUD has informed them that they will not be allowed to exceed operating subsidies of \$25,608 in the next fiscal year, while the authority has determined that an operating subsidy of \$103,000 is needed.

The housing authority of the city of Eureka has applied for \$451,500 to build 250 units which are urgently needed to replace a part of the 430 housing units deleted by the construction of a freeway through Eureka—their application has been denied by HUD. This authority, which also operates housing projects for Humboldt County, has been denied \$271,500 for the construction of 150 units in the county. To put these funding denials in perspective, there are 500 applications for public housing on file with the Eureka Housing Authority.

Officials in the housing authority of Ventura County have written me that their application for 400 units of leased housing has been turned down and that there are over 350 people on lists waiting for housing to become available.

In Inglewood, insufficient operating subsidies and the lack of special subsidy funding have, according to officials, completely undermined the fiscal integrity of the local housing authority.

In Santa Paula, with 580 families and elderly applicants on the waiting list for housing, HUD has disapproved an application for 50 more units under the section 23 leased housing program.

In San Luis Obispo, voters approved the construction of 150 additional units but HUD has failed to make the funds available.

In Pleasanton, the housing authority had actually signed a preliminary loan contract for the construction of 150 units—since January 5, this contract has been rescinded.

In Napa, the authority has had to place tenants in substandard units due to the great disparity between offered rental payments and market value.

The local authority in Fairfield says that they may have to lease substandard homes to meet the needs of the community.

In Cedarville, the Modoc-Lassen Indian Housing Authority made a request for additional funding after having made a mistake in their original funding application due to HUD's invoking an arbitrary deadline for submission of the application.

In San Buenaventura, applications for nearly \$2.5 million in housing funds

have been denied and returned as of May this year.

Mr. Speaker, the widespread ramifications of these actions by the administration are self-evident when we consider that fully 30 million Americans are inadequately housed in unsafe, unhealthy, overcrowded quarters. The administration's actions will make it nearly impossible for many low- and middle-income Americans to find reasonably priced housing in the foreseeable future.

For example, in some metropolitan areas construction costs are so high that it is impossible to build multifamily housing at a cost that would permit rents to be held under \$125 a room per month without Government assistance. But, when Federal subsidies are combined with State and local subsidies, rents can be reduced to approximately \$45 a room per month.

The elimination of these programs will, therefore, retard greatly the level of construction that can be maintained in the future. In HUD's Regional Area No. 9, including Nevada, Arizona, and California, the number of funded applications as of January 5, 1973, the cut-off date, was 38,129 units, while unfunded applications numbered 31,887 units—nearly 46 percent.

Nationally, the estimated reduction in total new subsidized housing starts in calendar year 1973 would be about 72,000 from 1972. In the first half of 1974 an estimated 129,000 units might be started and in the second half of 1974 perhaps enough additional starts might be made to reduce an annual total of roughly 200,000 starts making for another 72,000 decline between 1973 and 1974, or a decline of 144,000 from 1972 to 1974. Most significantly, this policy leads to the expectation of practically no subsidized starts in the latter part of 1974 and in 1975.

The cutback in the Federal Government's funding of housing construction is unfortunately taking place at a time of high prices and low production in the nonsubsidized housing market. My State of California accounts for more than one-half of the new units built in the western region of the country. During the last quarter of 1972, the median price of a house sold in the West was \$28,900, about 13 percent higher than a year previously.

At the same time, mortgage interest rates have been increasing. In San Diego, San Francisco, and San Jose the effective interest rates on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed home loans closed in February of this year averaging close to 7½ percent. As a result, the inventory of unsold homes has been building up, and the rate of building permit issuances has been dropping off. In the early part of this year, the units in structures for which building permits were issued, the units in structures for which building permits were issued in the West were at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 507,000, compared with 609,000 a year earlier. The alternative of renting also has become more expensive as rents have risen about 2.7 percent a year in San Francisco

and slightly over 2 percent a year in San Diego.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the obvious need for the funding of programs to keep housing construction at a level that will produce enough units for the Nation's future needs, what possibly could be the reasons for the administration's reasons for cutting off funds for Federal housing.

When former Secretary Romney announced the administration's actions, he noted that budgetary considerations had contributed to the decision to cut housing funds, but then, most disturbingly, he referred to fraudulence connected with the administration of the program and to the rapes, thefts, and muggings that seem to plague subsidized housing projects as having also contributed to this decision.

In reference to the issue of fraudulence, the Secretary was clearly using an administrative problem, arising from inadequate quality standards and regulation, as a basis for dismissing the value of the entire concept of federally funded and administered subsidized housing programs. Second, with respect to the crime problem, this unfortunate circumstance cannot in any way be logically considered to have resulted from the Federal Government's construction of multifamily housing for such housing will have to be built to meet future needs whether it is built by the Federal, State, or local governments. Instead, our failure to adequately provide community development and supportive social programs for those citizens for which we construct new housing has allowed criminal activity to focus in these housing projects.

Under examination the reasons appear incredibly weak, and yet it is for these reasons that the administration has curtailed housing funding and has so adversely affected the total economy. It is estimated that these actions will cost the economy \$8 billion over the 18-month period. However, just as importantly, it is estimated that 230,000 jobs will be lost over the next 2 years due to the cutoff of funds. With unemployment running at extremely high levels and interest rates and building costs ever increasing, the administration's insensitivity to the problems of the citizens and local communities of this country is revealed in a most disturbing light.

To this point I have been limiting my remarks to the termination of Federal funding for subsidized housing, but the Administration has also cut off funds for sewer and water grants and public facility loans. As long as no new approvals are permitted under these programs, nonsubsidized housing will also be slowed down. In a number of metropolitan areas, a shortage of adequate sewage facilities has caused State and county authorities to place a moratorium on new building permits. Restrictions on the issuance of these funds is expected to reduce nonsubsidized housing production by 11 percent from 1972 to 1973, 10 percent from 1973 to 1974, and 20 percent between 1972 and 1974.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the President through his totally arbitrary exercise of power to frustrate the will of Congress and disregard the needs of the

poor and the inadequately housed of our Nation. The same authority we used to originally fund the Federal housing assistance programs must be exercised to enact "anti-impoundment" legislation which will require the President to spend the appropriations Congress makes.

I urge all Members of Congress to fully weigh the harmful effects of the administration's actions on communities throughout the Nation, when Congress considers anti-impoundment legislation.

LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, TITLE I, ESEA

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Education and Labor Committee has been studying title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act throughout these first 6 months of 1973.

The appropriations for this title in the appropriations bill to be considered tomorrow will cause our committee and this Congress and the States involved some serious difficulties. The problems are these—the bill carries a "hold-harmless" feature that no State shall receive less than it received in fiscal year 1972, but without substantial increases in appropriations some States are just not entitled to that appropriation and should begin the transition to lesser amounts.

In fiscal year 1972, the allocation for title I, ESEA, was based on the 1960 census. The 1970 census has shown that in the Nation as a whole, there are 46-percent fewer children from families with incomes of \$2,000 or less as there were in 1960. Many States lost 15 to 25 percent more than that—the largest drop was practically 70 percent—while others either stayed relatively steady or had net gains—the highest was 23 percent.

To continue to pay those States which have lost 60 and 70 percent of their low-income population the same amount as if they still had those children in attendance is simply ridiculous. The committee bill by holding every State harmless to 1972, when the 1960 census was still being used, continues to pay States on the basis of information that was 14 years old. I think it would be better if we let those States phase into reality. I would suggest that they receive only three-fourths of the difference between the amount they would have received in 1974 without the committee floor and the amount provided for in the committee bill. Since the committee bill is based on 1972 and most of these States did have their grant levels reduced some in fiscal 1973, the effect would still provide most of these States with more money than they had in 1973. For these States it would prevent them from going back up to the 1972 level. In four States it would reduce grants slightly below 1973, representing about a 3-percent aggregate loss for those four States.

The General Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee

seems inclined, at this time, to raise the income level from \$2,000 to at least \$3,000, and some want to go to \$4,000. This would substantially reduce the weighting of AFDC in the formula. Under these circumstances it is foolish to allow those States which benefit greatly from the current formula, but which would not gain as much under various revisions being considered by our committee, from receiving an artificially inflated amount for this 1 year.

When title I was first enacted, AFDC was conceived of as a minor adjustment to the formula. Today in at least two States 70 percent of the children counted for the formula are those on AFDC. This is an incredible story of a tail that has learned to wag the dog. Further, AFDC is not a good indicator of educational need. As witnesses from HEW's Social and Rehabilitation Service pointed out in a hearing before our committee 2 weeks ago, AFDC is a program that is distinctly antirural and there is good evidence that there are certain racial and ethnic groups who simply refuse to go on welfare. In half the States, a family cannot receive aid if the father is present in the home. To base aid to education on such factors, including an incentive in the form of money for the schools if the father is absent from the family, is the height of folly in our social policy. Generally speaking, those States which would gain because their AFDC rolls have increased from 400 to 600 percent in a 10-year period should not receive that amount until our committee determines the future formula later this year.

I think any State should be permitted to receive at least 10 percent more than it did in 1972. Any State gaining more than 10 percent should be held to one-half the gain over the 10-percent growth. In almost all States these adjustments would be rather minor. In four States they would be \$300,000 or less. In only one State would the figure exceed \$2.5 million.

In sum, we should free the authorization committee to come up with a good formula while at the same time permitting the 1970 census to come into effect.

LONG ISLAND AEROSPACE KNOW-HOW PERFORMS FLAWLESSLY IN SKYLAB

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, when nearly everything else was going wrong with the Skylab, one thing was going right. That was the experimental waste management system developed by Fairchild Republic Co. of Farmingdale, Long Island. The following excerpts from Skylab radio transmissions will give you some idea of the high regard the astronauts themselves had for the high quality work turned out in the 3d Congressional District of New York:

Capt. PETE CONRAD, Skylab commander: "The waste management and hygiene equipment turned out to be a fantastically pleasant surprise. I probably was the most adamant against the fact that the collection equipment would work and we have all discovered pleasantly that it works in an absolutely outstanding manner and I have to rate it as excellent."

PAUL J. WEITZ, Skylab pilot: "I . . . have been deliriously happy and surprised with the operation of the . . . waste equipment."

Dr. JOSEPH P. KERWIN, Skylab scientist pilot: "Incidentally, I do not know whether we stated before, but we owe our greatest appreciation in part to the people who designed the waste management system. It has worked much better than anticipated and has been essentially trouble free and not terribly time consuming."

HISTORY OF BROKEN TREATIES RAISES WARNING FLAG OVER CURRENT SOVIET NEGOTIATIONS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly we all wish President Nixon success in the recent negotiations with Soviet Chairman Leonid Brezhnev just concluded.

However, the lessons of history clearly teach that the record of Russia with respect to keeping its word with the United States and others is a negative record of broken treaties and agreements in many areas.

In this connection, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people, I place in the RECORD my recent newsletter, Capitol Comments:

HISTORY OF BROKEN SOVIET TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS RAISES RED WARNING FLAG OVER CURRENT NEGOTIATIONS

This week, President Nixon and Soviet Political Boss Leonid Brezhnev have been engaging in a series of conferences, hopefully towards promoting peace and better understanding.

Certainly all of us wish the President success in his negotiations with the Russian leader—but a word of caution is in order. Based on Russia's long record of broken treaties and agreements, any proposed agreement should be viewed with reservation—especially those relating to disarmament which concern the national security of the United States.

There is speculation that the United States and Russia may make further commitments limiting the amount and type of nuclear weapons each Nation may have in its possession. It is known that the President and the Russian Chairman discussed a new arms control formula as the basis for a further agreement as a part of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)—concerning multiple warhead delivery systems and other complex military issues.

The President during his earlier visit to Russia signed an arms control agreement—SALT I—which many interpret as giving the Soviet Union a clear superiority in intercontinental ballistic missiles—the delivery systems for nuclear bombs. Under this agreement, the United States is limited to 1,054 missiles while the Russians can have 1,618—a superiority of 564 ICBMs for the Russians.

According to respected and reliable authorities, the Russian missiles are larger than

the largest United States ICBMs and can carry a payload four times as heavy as our missiles.

SALT I also limited the United States to 44 nuclear submarines while permitting the Soviet Union to have 62—a superiority of 18.

The current question now is whether the United States will also compromise its current lead in multiple warhead weapons systems. A multiple warhead, as the name indicates, can include a number of nuclear bombs in a single warhead that can be directed to separate targets from a single missile firing. The crucial importance of these weapons is two-fold: The first is that this is the one area in which the United States has a clear superiority, and secondly, multiple warheads (or MIRVs) by their very nature to some extent compensate for the United States inferiority in the number of missiles.

It is reported that those who play deadly theoretical war games in the Department of Defense can conceive of a situation where an overpowering Soviet superiority in nuclear weapons could result in a surprise first strike that would knock out this Nation's land-based missile sites in the United States and Europe. This is all speculation, of course, but this demonstrates the sensitive, crucial and momentous nature of further nuclear arms limitations.

Another important point is that assuming Chairman Brezhnev is sincere and intends to keep agreements which he makes, he will not always be the Chairman. As a matter of fact, the Washington press is speculating that the success or failure of the current talks may have some bearing on how long he holds power because the militaristic group in the Kremlin is known to oppose his efforts to achieve a reconciliation with the United States. This, of course, places further pressure on the President to reach agreements that Brezhnev can point to at home as examples of the success of his policy of detente and reconciliation with the United States.

Premier Stalin once said: "Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

In line with this Stalinist philosophy, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in a report dated September 27, 1961, cited 45 specific Soviet violations of international treaties and agreements—a history of flagrant violations and breaches of faith by the country with which we are currently negotiating.

Someone has said that the United States has never lost a war or won a conference. Our record in the last category makes many observers skeptical. The Russians are such hard bargainers that the United States usually winds up on the short end of the deal—whether in nuclear weapons or commercial items.

The grain deal, for example, was extremely favorable to the Soviet Union. This \$1.2 billion deal with the Soviet Union depleted American wheat and grain reserves, contributed to inflation in the United States, increased the price of food to American consumers and feed to farmers, and resulted in major dislocations of our rail freight system.

On top of this, the Russians, which have the second largest gold reserve in the world, bought the grain on this basis—\$700 million with depreciated dollars which they bought with their gold from Swiss bankers and \$500 million on low interest credit. In other words, if the United States had insisted on payment in gold rather than in devalued dollars, it would have been to our distinct advantage. In the first place, the United States obviously needs to bolster its gold reserves to strengthen the dollar which has now been twice devalued and depleted. As the price of gold is rising steadily while the dollar declines in value abroad, payment in gold would have strengthened the dollar and our gold reserve.

And the Russians desperately wanted the wheat because of a poor harvest so this Nation was bargaining from strength, and yet, the United States subsidized the deal by guaranteeing Russia a certain price for wheat—\$1.63 per bushel. However, when the international grain brokers began purchasing gold to fulfill the United States commitment, the price of wheat rose and the United States paid the difference to these brokers between the guaranteed price and the increased price to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars.

With further arms and commercial agreements pending, let us hope that history will not repeat itself in the current negotiations for—on the record—it is difficult to have faith in any agreement with Russia.

Beware of the Bear, Mr. President.

ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1973

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an address, delivered by Dr. Ruth B. Weg, associate director for training of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center, which describes the need for trained specialists in aging if we are to be successful in our efforts to improve the lives of America's 20 million older Americans.

Dr. Weg's remarks, Mr. Speaker, were delivered during the week of February 12, when the University of Southern California dedicated impressive new facilities for the Andrus Center.

Said Dr. Weg with regard to training in the field of aging:

The decade of the 1970's is the decade in which major plans for training must be put into effect. Crucial to the national effort to provide training at all levels is the development and implementation of programs to train the trainers.

A little more than one-third of a million people are working today, with and for, 21 million older Americans. In 1968 the then-retiring Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, predicted that more than a million workers will be needed in 1980—only 7 short years away.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD Dr. Weg's cogent analysis of the training needs with reference to the elderly, and the efforts of the Andrus Center to help meet those needs:

EDUCATION AND TRAINING AT THE ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER

A couple of months ago I received the 1971 White House Conference on Aging Section Recommendations on Training. I commend it to your careful study. Let me read a brief excerpt from the preamble: "The resolution of these significant human problems requires a large cadre of personnel trained in and committed to the field of aging. What is necessary is the development of innovative and creative programs to provide training for the total range of occupations providing services to older persons, and specifically for professional and scholarly programs preparing people to work in the field of aging. The decade of the 1970's is the decade in which major plans for training must be put into effect. Crucial to the national effort to provide training at all levels is the development

and implementation of programs to train the trainers.

We agree then—a critical shortage exists of trained personnel in the field of aging. A little more than 1/3rd of a million people are working today with and for 21 million older Americans. In 1968 the then-retiring Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, predicted that more than a million workers will be needed in 1980—only 7 short years away.

Not very much has changed that picture since the White House Conference on Aging in December, 1971. On the contrary these are days of great concern indeed—the future of training programs all over the country are faced with uncertainty. The definitive pledge of the Administration at the White House Conference on Aging is in jeopardy by virtue of the Presidential veto of monies and programs. If much of training is set aside as a wasteful frill, services to the elderly, today and tomorrow, will be left to the unknowing, unskilled—undone by what may be classified in the future as the shortsightedness of a budget.

WHAT AND WHOM DO WE NEED?

Specifically, teachers and research in colleges, universities and professional schools with programs in aging and for the aged; federal, state and community personnel in planning and administration; workers in senior centers; management personnel in retirement housing; personnel for convalescent, nursing homes and hospitals; personnel in other direct services to the elderly, as in community and home delivered services; recreation personnel; social workers in one-to-one relationships and finally there are those that are now more than ever desperately needed for action and advocacy. The longer I stay with the concerns of aging and the aged, the more I learn—and our training program is now in its 7th year—the longer grows my list of essential personnel for the field.

LET US LOOK AT HOW WE HAVE TRIED TO FILL THE NEED

The Andrus Center's overall training program has grown from 23 students in 1966 to 56 today—from a doctoral degree program to three different degree awarding patterns today. 1) In environmental studies, which includes architecture and urban and regional planning, the students work toward a master's degree. 2) A doctorate is the ultimate objective of the trainees in biology, psychology, social work and sociology. 3) The Fall of 1973 will find some students enrolled in a new, unique joint degree program—masters in social work and masters in public administration with a specialization in aging. The graduates of this program will move into the field as middle level administrators and planners, so crucial to the purposes of agencies and local programs dealing directly with older persons.

Although our major educational efforts to date have been with the graduate, since 1970 we have developed courses to interest and serve increasing numbers of undergraduate students. The positive response of hundreds of students to these interdisciplinary classes in introductory gerontology and human development gives witness to student concern for the human condition. What we do has been in terms of a particular view of the questions in aging that require answers, in terms of the changing needs of older individuals and society.

The Ethel Percy Andrus Center is committed to an educational philosophy which recognizes the complexity of human development. And since there are many dimensions to "being and growing human" this multidisciplinary training program in adult development and aging includes architecture, biology, social work, sociology, physical edu-

cation, psychology, public administration and urban and regional planning. It is with the insights, information and energies from all these disciplines focusing on aging and the aged that we may better understand the inter-dependence of the emotions and the body in any one individual, the transactions among individuals, and the significant interaction between the individual and the environment. Our instruction philosophy is also expressed in the concept that education and training of future personnel in aging needs to take place through the Center's activities of research and community projects as well as in the classroom.

WHAT GOES INTO THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR GERONTOLOGY AT THE CENTER?

Incoming graduate students must first be accepted into the department of their choice. After identifying gerontology as their interest, they are considered for traineeships by a committee of Preceptors and students. As students in the aging program they fulfill the requirements of their discipline, and of the Center with a variety of courses and seminars. Colloquia bring visiting lecturers who provide different perspectives in gerontology for faculty, staff and students. Another major source of information and stimulation is the Center's unique Summer Institute program, offered for the first time in 1967 with eight courses. This summer, six years later, there will be a greatly expanded Institute offering thirty different classes from architecture to philosophy, and a number of newly organized undergraduate and graduate courses. This is indeed a multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary educational experience. Faculty, students and professionals with different interests are brought from all over the country for an exchange of ideas in research and practice. Our students are encouraged to incorporate a field work assignment, in some community or institutionalized setting with the elderly, to add a real life situation to the books and papers of academy.

Many of the trainees act as discussion leaders and teaching assistants in semester courses, continuing education institutes and the Summer Institute. They also make presentations to a variety of community organizations such as the United Automobile Workers Retirement Group. Part time and summer work projects of great practical importance to the aging population have involved some of our students. This past summer two students were employed by the California Commission on Aging charged with preparing Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties administratively for the federally funded nutrition program for the elderly. Trainees also learn to tackle some basic questions in the study of aging. They are part of ongoing research in the laboratories of the Center; in environmental studies (planning, housing and environmental sociology); in biology, as in the biology of behavior (in the neuro-chemistry of learning); and in the molecular aspects of development and aging, in social gerontology and in psychology. An exciting intercourse with older persons has been developed with the membership of the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association, at times through locally based chapter meetings and also through camperships during vacation holidays. We all perceive these as marvelous opportunities to bridge any generation gap against the inviting back-drop of a holiday perspective and the beauty of nature.

Yet another happy connection from these two organizations to the training program relates to the scholarships already provided in the name of Cecilia O'Neil and George Schluderberg to six of our students, three of whom might not otherwise have been able to continue their studies without this help.

Attendance at scientific meetings for exchange of information and ideas and the defense of research findings are viewed as important steps for students and faculty in the development of critical thinking and the professionalization from student to worker in the field of aging. At the 9th International Congress of Gerontology at Kiev in the Soviet Union, sixteen students and faculty presented their work. This past December at the Gerontological Society Meetings in San Juan, Puerto Rico, nineteen of our students participated.

In October Andrus Center students and faculty hosted a National Conference on "Role of Institutions of Higher Learning in the Study of Aging" which brought together students, faculty and administrators from all levels of higher education, community colleges, four year colleges and universities; regional, state and local commissions on aging, governmental support agencies, congressional leaders and representatives of organizations of older persons and the community. In this effort we had the financial support of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the Administration on Aging, the National Institute of Mental Health and again A.A.R.P./N.R.T.A., a unique cooperative undertaking. There was a sense of a 'first' about this meeting as individuals from many levels of government, community and educational institutions came to confront their concerns about a common focus—aging and the aged.

Yet another aspect of trainee life is important to student professional growth in aging and the healthy development of Center activities—the trainee organization. The students have formalized their involvement with a Graduate Student Council that meets regularly to deal with matters of concern. For example, planning semester student activities, promotion of inter-disciplinary interactions and student grievances. Trainees from each disciplinary area are represented on the Preceptor-Student Committee so that decision and policy making related to trainees, curriculum, colloquia and personnel are in fact joint faculty-student enterprises. We seek out student participation in the evaluation of the Center program and purposes.

Finally—where have all our graduates gone?

They are some measure of our success as an educating force for aging. In the period since 1967 (and not including the many hundreds who have attended the Summer Institutes and the thousands who have participated in the continuing education institutes) 129 people have received education and training in aging through the Andrus Center. Forty-four degrees, both masters and doctorate, have been granted. To enumerate each one would be impossible and not very profitable with the time constraints. Perhaps it would sum up the impact of the program to note that there is great demand for our trainees from all over the country. The demand exceeds the rate at which we are able to graduate our trainees with an appropriate exposure in research, education, training and community projects.

SOME OF THE PLACEMENTS

One of the graduates functions as Director of Architecture and Environment for the Gerontological Society. He is responsible for special symposia at the Society's meetings and also serves as a resource in environment and aging for those people across the country who call on him. Another is Assistant Professor at the University of Arizona at Tucson in the program for training retirement housing administrators. A graduate in biology is now a second-year post-doctoral investigator in the Aging Studies Laboratory

at Oak Ridge National Labs in Tennessee. Still another is at work as Field Instructor in the Gerontology Training program at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. A recent graduate in Urban and Regional Planning is Project Coordinator for the Model Cities Program in Compton, California. The Executive Director of the Governor's Commission on Nursing Homes for the state of Maryland is one of our graduates. An Associate Professor of Sociology in the Aging Studies Program at the University of Southern Florida is one of our recent doctoral graduates in sociology. A June '72 graduate in psychology is at work at the newly organized All University Gerontology Center at Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York. Yet another graduate in psychology is at work with David Arenberg, the Chief of the Section on Human Learning and Problem Solving at the National Institute of Health Gerontology Research Center in Baltimore. A social work graduate is Acting Chief of the Education Section, Office of Long Term Care Services and Mental Health Administration at the office of Health, Education and Welfare.

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR GERONTOLOGY?

What tasks are we committed to? Energy will be needed to maintain and use our leadership role in education for Gerontology so that maximum activity can be achieved in the growth of knowledge, in the translation of that knowledge through the ever-larger numbers of students, in the sharing of information and skills among programs, and in the extension of the educational institution into the community for an exchange of expertise.

A variety of approaches will be identified to provide materials, methods and personnel so that learning becomes a life-long available pursuit of one or a number of careers.

It will be necessary to continue to so spread the word without myths and stereotypes about aging and the aged, that people at all levels from kindergarten through the older years will see human development as a continuum—each age and stage an integrative step to the next. Growth of the human personality and adaptive characteristics can then be anticipated to continue from birth to death. Eric Hoffer's "we can learn" still rings happily in my ears.

Efforts will include programs and support to enlarge the faculty and student numbers in each discipline.

We are committed to extend our multidisciplinary philosophy more actively to those departments and schools that have given evidence of interest. For example, a committee of University departments set up a task force on Humanities and Gerontology. Out of this past year's discussion came the participation of their faculty in classes at the 1972 Summer Institute, attendance at the International Congress of Gerontology in Kiev, and the design and departmental acceptance of three new courses for the 1973 Summer Institute for Study in Gerontology. We are committed to an increase in the variety and depth of activities in curriculum, institutes, colloquia, research opportunities and community experiences for the graduate students. And we plan to increase the number of undergraduates whose concern for human values we seek to satisfy. We hope to create an atmosphere conducive to the optimum interaction among students, faculty and community so that education and training at the Andrus Center may contribute most efficiently to the ultimate concern—a better quality of life for the last half of life. All of this is possible only if more faculty and students in the nation can be supported to carry forward education, training, research and community service. . . .

TRADE WITH THE SOVIETS
CREATES A NEW BREED OF U.S.
BUSINESSMAN, THE "CAP-COM"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly difficult in the Nation's Capital these days to tell the players without a program. An observer may find it perplexing to decide whether the Communists are becoming more capitalistic or the capitalists are becoming more communistic. Perhaps we have discovered a new multinational breed more properly labeled as "CAP-COMS"—that is those corporate giants who seek to make a respectable capitalist profit by exploiting the work of Communist laborers.

A large contingent of American businessmen, with ruble signs in their eyes, this week met with Russian Communist Party boss Brezhnev, and found him much to their liking. With 52 of the Nation's top business leaders looking on, officials from the United States and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union signed agreements which tightened the trading tie that binds the two governments. The groundwork was cemented for a United States-Soviet "chamber of commerce" in the near future.

Ten U.S. corporations were formally "accredited" to do business in the Soviet Union. The CAP-COM status was extended to the following: Pullman, Inc., Occidental Petroleum Corp., Chase Manhattan Bank, General Electric Co., International Harvester Co., Caterpillar Tractor Co., Hewlett-Packard Co., Engelhard Minerals & Chemicals Corp., Bank of America, and the First National City Bank. Several other U.S. firms are reported vying for the CAP-COM title in their pursuits of the almighty ruble.

Undoubtedly, these companies intended to follow the lead already set by other U.S.-based multinational companies doing business with the Soviets. The giant American firms do not risk their capital in risky Russian ventures; they prefer to use the American taxpayer's dollars to finance and insure their investments abroad.

Through the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the CAP-COM businessman can get large sums of tax money in the form of low-interest, decade-long payback period loans that are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

Through the Commodity Credit Corporation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—taxpayer supported—CAP-COM internationalists are able to finance almost unlimited exports of U.S. agricultural products to the Russian dinner tables. It should be remembered that the massive "sale" of 400 million bushels of grain last fall that cost the taxpayers some \$300 million in subsidized arrangements with large U.S. grain trading corporations, and sent the price of meat and

livestock byproducts soaring in this country was financed through the CCC.

Even if the CAP-COM wheeler-dealers should decide to invest some of their stockholder's money in Soviet speculation, they have no real fear of possible loss through Russian takeover of the facilities once they are constructed. The taxpayers in this country pick up the tab for insuring losses for companies that invest in shaky ventures overseas. The full faith and credit of the Federal Government is used to back the full payment and performance of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—OPIC. So, if a company's holdings in the Soviet Union are seized or nationalized, the American firm is guaranteed that their investment will be repaid by OPIC with taxpayers' money.

The CAP-COM business leaders who gathered in Washington this week to hail the Russian chief were all smiles at the possibility of East-West trade arrangements, and for good reason. They have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

It is the American taxpayer and worker who stands to lose through extended heavy trade with the Soviets. It is he who is expected to pick up the tab with his tax money, after the internationalist politicians and CAP-COM businessmen entangle us further in the Soviet trade web.

I include the related newscipping at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1973]

BUSINESSMEN WHO MET BREZHNEV

Following are the U.S. businessmen who met with Soviet leader Brezhnev:

Jerome Komes, president, Bechtel Corp.
James Bere, president, Borg-Warner Corp.
Stephen Keating, president, Honeywell, Inc.

Howard Boyd, chairman of the board, El Paso Natural Gas Co.

D. Brown, chairman of the board, Brown & Root, Inc.

Howard F. Carver, president and chief executive officer, Gleason Works.

Frank Cary, chairman of the board, IBM Corp.

Samuel B. Casey Jr., chairman of the board, Pullman, Inc.

Richard Gerstenberg, chairman of the board, General Motors Corp.

Armand Hammer, chairman of the board, Occidental Petroleum Corp.

Harry Heltzer, chairman, 3 M Co.

William A. Hewitt, chairman of the board, Deere and Co.

E. E. Hood, vice president, General Electric Co.

Donald M. Kendall, chairman of the board, PepsiCo, Inc.

Edgar Kaiser, chairman of the board, Kaiser Industries Corp.

E. Douglas Kenna, National Association of Manufacturers.

George F. Kirby, president, Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.

Donald P. Kircher, chairman, The Singer Co.

William Morton, president, American Express Co.

A. W. Clausen, president, Bank of America.

Ralph E. Cross, president, The Cross Co.

Cyrus S. Eaton Jr., chairman of the board, Tower International Corp.

Cyrus S. Eaton Sr., chairman of the board, Chesapeake and Ohio Railway.

Dwight Eckerman, executive vice president, The Economic Club of New York.

E. C. Chapman, vice president, marketing, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Nelson W. Freeman, chairman, Tenneco.

Michel P. Fribourgh, president, Continental Grain Co.

Emilio G. Collado, executive vice president, Exxon Corp.

Brooks McCormick, president International Harvester Co.

Charles B. McCoy, chairman and president, E. I. duPont de Nemours and Co.

Robert McClellan, vice president, FMC Corp.

D. J. Morfee, president, Swindell Dressler.

James J. Needham, chairman and chief executive officer, The New York Stock Exchange.

William C. Norris, chairman and president, Control Data Corp.

Ara Oztemel, president, Satra Corp.

Peter G. Peterson, vice chairman, Lehman Brothers, Inc.

Willard C. Butcher, president, Chase Manhattan Bank.

Edward B. Rust, president, Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

William Seawell, chairman of the board, Pan American World Airways, Inc.

Fred M. Seed, president, Cargill, Inc.

R. Heath Larry, vice chairman of the board, U.S. Steel Co.

W. P. Tavoulareas, president, Mobil Oil.

Maurice Templesman, president, Leon Templesman and Co, Inc.

C. William Verity, chairman of the board, Armco Steel Corp.

Thornton A. Wilson, chairman of the board The Boeing Co.

W. B. Wriston, chairman of the board, First National City Bank.

O. P. Thomas, chief executive officer, chairman of the board of directors, B F. Goodrich Co.

Jack Valenti, president, Motion Picture Association of America.

Charles Weaver, president, world regions, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Sydney Scheuer, Intertex International.

Milton Rosenthal, president, Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals.

A SUGGESTION FOR GETTING DOCTORS INTO RURAL AREAS

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues, I am certain, are aware that the rural areas of our Nation are experiencing great difficulty in securing medical services. In particular, they are finding it nearly impossible to attract and retain doctors. A newspaper editor in my district, Mr. A. R. Kelly, has come up with a suggestion for dealing with this problem that merits the attention of all Members of Congress and everyone else who has concern about this serious problem. His observations, reproduced below, were printed in the Tyler Star News, Sistersville, W. Va.

The article follows:

PLAN FOR MEDICINE

Americans who reside in rural areas, such as Tyler and Wetzel counties, have long been made aware of a problem which currently is receiving much attention in the daily press and national news media: the alarming shortage of physicians where they live.

It is more than a matter of cranking up medical schools and ordering them to produce a large number of M.D.'s overnight. It is not the way to do things in America to force people to live where they don't want

to—which includes doctors. Yet the problem does exist in rural America, as people such as our neighbors in Pennsboro, who built at their own expense a modern medical clinic building, which has stood empty for two years because no doctor wants to live in Ritchie County community, can well attest.

The Star News has a practical program which would help solve the problem of distribution of physicians in the United States, particularly in rural areas.

There are (in round numbers) 8,500 M.D.'s graduating each year. It is the consensus with respect to the delivery of medical services in the United States that there are enough physicians—but they are concentrated in the more populous areas.

With these figures in mind, the following is presented for study, evaluation and possible implementation:

Medical education and training during the past 10-15 years has improved and progressed to the extent that serious consideration now is being given to the elimination of the one-year internship regulation.

A program which would assure continuity of medical services to each county in the United States each year would be simply to substitute one year of Community Health Practice for the one-year internship requirement. There are 3,072 counties in the United States. This would mean that under such a program there would be 2.7 physicians available per county.

It should be compulsory to have a year of Community Health Practice in order to receive a license or to receive the MD degree. Work could be evaluated, and students pass, as if they were interning in hospitals. Students should be under proctorship of assigned professors of nearby medical school faculties or board members of family practice—and medical school courses should be realigned too, as to enhance the practical execution of the proctorship.

Under this plan, a small Community Health Center should be established in each county—to be financed entirely by some federal agency, similar to Hill-Burton funding for presently established hospitals.

The compulsory aspect of assigning doctors is justified. Medical schools receive federal aid. Students receive federal loans and scholarships. Tax dollars support medical schools. Besides, and perhaps of greatest importance, is the stark fact that the present voluntary program is not working.

Under the plan, three doctors of the 8,500 graduating would be assigned to each county in the country (with the exception of metropolitan areas and counties where there are medical schools.) Assignment could be by computer, with each student listed indicating three choices—which would mean his ultimate assignment may or may not be in his home territory.

Another requirement should be that such doctors take an active part in community affairs, and evaluation of such participation be taken into consideration for obtaining a license.

The Community Health Centers would have all three doctors in attendance—which would mean each doctor could have every third weekend off. This also would give each doctor an opportunity to attend medical seminars, have a vacation, etc.

Naturally, the program could not begin nation-wide immediately. Pilot programs should be tried. West Virginia would serve as a wonderful testing area for the plan.

The Star News believes the program would improve medical education for the fledgling M.D.'s participating, would aid the older local doctors, would help the medical school preceptors by enabling them to leave the ivory towers and get down to where medicine is practiced.

There are, in West Virginia, 11 members of the Medical Licensing Board. Accordingly, six members can vote favorably on the imple-

mentation of such a plan. If other states have 11 members on each licensing board (and the chances are that most have less than 11) this means that some 300 men and women control the future of medicine in this country.

This newspaper believes that these 300 people can make a significant contribution to rural America by studying testing and adopting the Community Health Practice plan.

BUCHWALD ON BREZHNEV'S VISIT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the United States was an historic one. It demonstrates, among other things, the incredible change in attitudes that has occurred with respect to international communism in the past 20 years—particularly the about-face of one Richard Nixon. The irony of it all is exquisitely expressed in a column by Art Buchwald which appeared in the June 21 issue of the New York Post. That column, entitled "They're Playing Our Song," follows:

THEY'RE PLAYING OUR SONG
(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—I was walking down Pennsylvania Av. the other day when I ran into an old man. His hair was white and his beard was gray and he was muttering to himself.

"Oh my God. Oh my God."

"What's the trouble, sir?" I asked.

"I never thought I'd see the day when the hammer and sickle would be flying from the Executive Office Building next to the White House."

"Don't get upset," I said. "It's just to honor Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the United States. He's the Secretary of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union and he's visiting the President. Don't you read the newspapers?"

"I've been asleep for 20 years," the old man said. "Oh my God, Richard Nixon warned us this would happen."

"You don't understand, old man. Nixon is the President and he's the one who is entertaining Leonid Brezhnev."

"It couldn't be the same Nixon," the old man said adamantly. "The Nixon I knew sent Alger Hiss to jail for playing footsy with the Communists. In every political campaign he warned of the Red Menace. He fought the Communists while everyone was being duped by them. Nixon would never entertain one in his home."

"Times have changed, sir."

"The name's Rip," the old man said.

"Well, since you've been asleep a lot of things have happened. The President has even visited the People's Republic of China."

"Oh? How's Chiang Kai-shek?"

"Not that China, Rip. The other one—mainland Communist China."

"The President of the United States went to Communist China?"

"Yes, and then he went to Moscow. And he's sworn friendship to the Socialist People's Republic of the Soviet Union on Russian television."

"Oh my God," Rip said. "Didn't Senator Joe McCarthy try to stop him?"

"McCarthy is dead."

"No wonder Nixon could get away with it," Rip said.

"Listen, Rip, I think I better clue you in on a few things. There is no such thing as a 'Red Menace' anymore. The President of the United States has made his peace with the two major Communist powers in the world. Communism is no longer a threat to the security of the Free World except in Indochina."

"Indochina?"

"Yes, we've been fighting a war in Indochina for 10 years to keep the North Vietnamese Communist's from spreading their insidious ideology over the globe. The President is committed to keeping them from achieving their goals."

Rip seemed confused. "That's the only threat of communism there is in the world?"

"Exactly. All other forms of communism, as far as President Nixon is concerned, are inoperative."

"Can my ears deceive me?" Rip said. "Is that the 'Internationale' being played by the U.S. Marine Band on the White House lawn?"

"Yup," I replied. "They're playing our song."

"Oh my God," Rip said. Why did I ever wake up?"

"Don't worry, Rip, the detente with the Communist countries has been the greatest thing to happen in the last 20 years. It could mean a generation of peace for all mankind, except for those rotten Commies in Cambodia. If it hadn't been for Watergate, President Nixon might have gone down as one of the greatest Presidents in the history of our country."

"What's Watergate?"

"Rip, I think you better sit down. It's a very long story. . . ."

RESPONSE TO DISCRIMINATION CHARGE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1973, I inserted in the RECORD a statement submitted earlier this year by Dr. Irene Tinker of the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Dr. Tinker addressed herself to the need for stronger enforcement of a variety of Federal laws and regulations concerning sex discrimination in educational institutions, and made specific references to what she regards as an unsatisfactory situation at the Brookings Institution here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I have subsequently received a letter from Kermit Gordon, director of the Brookings Institution responding to Dr. Tinker's allegations concerning this organization, and think it only fair that I also insert in the RECORD Dr. Gordon's letter in order that the views of both sides be given a fair hearing:

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1973.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: On June 19, 1973, you introduced into the Congressional Record (page E4223) a statement by Dr. Irene Tinker, Presiding Officer of the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women. The statement constituted testi-

mony given by Dr. Tinker before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on May 21, 1973.

In her statement, Dr. Tinker accuses "The Brookings Institution, surely one of the most prestigious research bodies in Washington and an outspoken supporter of equal rights in the abstract", of practicing discrimination against women.

Dr. Tinker asserts that Brookings is in violation of the law (Executive Order 11246, as amended) for having failed (1) "to appoint an Affirmative Action Officer within its organization", (2) for having failed "to develop a written Affirmative Action Program", and (3) for having failed "to publicize these measures for the benefit of employees and potential employees." These are serious charges. Yet, so far as I can ascertain from extensive inquiries neither Dr. Tinker nor any representative of her organization has ever sought to confirm the truth of these charges by inquiring of any member of our staff with employment responsibilities.

The facts are as follows: (1) Brookings designated an Affirmative Action Officer on April 10, 1970, and so notified the federal government. (2) Brookings submitted its first Affirmative Action Program to the federal government on the same date. In accordance with regulations, it has been revised and resubmitted in 1971, 1972, and 1973. (3) Far from having failed to publicize our nondiscrimination policy, we have since 1962 incorporated an equal employment opportunity declaration in our statement of staff employment policies (a copy of which is given to every employee); the policy has been reaffirmed in memoranda to staff members; equal employment opportunity posters are prominently displayed in our building; recruiting sources such as employment agencies, newspapers and universities are regularly notified of these policies; and an equal employment opportunity clause is printed on all of the Institution's purchase orders.

Dr. Tinker then presents a statistical table showing that a large proportion of our research assistants (the first professional rank) are women, but only a small proportion of the senior fellows and research associates are women. From these simple statistics, she infers a policy of sex discrimination.

In fact, the proportion of women in our senior ranks is about twice the proportion of women in the eligible employment pool.

To understand the composition of our research staff in the two senior ranks, it is necessary to know something about the nature of their duties. A senior fellow is defined as a staff member who "shall have demonstrated ability to carry out major independent studies or to direct major research or educational projects, and who has shown ability to cooperate in organized research or educational activities—equivalent to the rank of full professor in major universities."

A research associate is defined as a staff member who "shall have demonstrated ability to carry out independent research assignments or comparable educational assignments with limited supervision—equivalent to the rank of associate or assistant professor in major universities."

These definitions of rank make clear why senior fellows and research associates in our research programs are typically recruited from among those who hold a doctoral degree in economics or political science (including international relations). In fact, virtually all of the senior fellows and research associates in our Economic Studies Program and our Governmental Studies Program hold doctoral degrees, as do the majority of staff members at these levels in our Foreign Policy Studies Program.

Information available in the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* reveals that of

7610 persons who received doctorates in political science and economics from 1962 to 1970, 554—or about 7 percent of the total—were women. The proportion of women among all persons holding doctorates in these fields is probably somewhat lower than this, since the percentage has been rising in recent years.

Of the 65 senior fellows and research associates at Brookings, 9, or 14 percent, are women. Thus, to repeat, the proportion of women in our senior ranks is just about twice the proportion of women in the eligible employment pool. Having regard to the fact that we are in competition in this employment market with more than 2500 institutions of higher learning, many business corporations, and governments at every level, I am reassured by our success in attracting well more than our share of qualified women.

Brookings is committed to the policy of equal employment opportunity for women. I am confident that any fair-minded review of our performance would conclude that we have sought in good faith and with considerable success to honor this commitment.

Sincerely,

KERMIT GORDON.
President.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION WOMEN "FLY-IN"

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure recently of meeting with Women of the National Farmers' Union when they came on a "fly-in" to Washington. Although my remarks at that time were off-the-cuff, they contain some thoughts I would like to share, especially with the Members from rural areas. If you will pardon the informality of style, I would like to insert this in the RECORD.

REMARKS BY Ms. ABZUG

I am very pleased to meet with women who are battlers from the Middle West. I'm a mother and a family person myself. I have two lovely daughters, aged 21 and 24. Martin Abzug, my husband, has been married to me for 29 years, and I to him. Much of what I stand for, essentially, is what we can get together for our kids and our families and our generations to come.

I am pleased to welcome your "fly-in" to Washington. It reminds me of the myth that women can't be pilots. So they say—but on some suggestive commercials, they can pretend to be airplanes and invite men to fly them. This is the kind of thing we have to get rid of, in portraying women, just as the way I've been portrayed is not exactly accurate, but at least it makes good press. For readers, not for me. So I'm very pleased with the opportunity to speak with you directly. I have been in the Mid-West and have met a number of people in your union over the years. Furthermore, I am happy that you are here because I am very interested in building a rural-urban coalition. Not only among women, but among men and women.

As you know, I represent New York City, which is hardly a farm. When I was growing up in the Bronx, which is right outside New York City, there were some cows and some chickens right next door to me. Most people don't believe that, but my father liked to live in sort of deserted areas.

In this electronic age, I feel our country is really too small to have one area of the country pitted against another. We have many

common problems. You're here to concern yourselves with the school lunch program, the school milk program, food stamps, consumer concerns and the programs that concern farm families all over this country.

There is a tendency on the part of this Administration to divide and conquer, to pit the rural against the urban areas. We can't allow that. We must use every opportunity we have to find a common ground. We are not irreconcilably at odds. Certainly on the issue of inflated prices there's been an effort to pit the farmer against the consumer. But in fact we're all consumers. We're all victims of inflation. The average farm family doesn't benefit from the large profits that consumers feel have been gained from the lack of control on the economy. The top of the corporate ladder gets most of the profit.

It's the agribusiness and the corporate domination that is the problem for us all. On transportation, on water resources and other issues, very often city people are made to feel that rural water supplies and sewage problems are of no concern to them. It is said at times that people on the farms and rural areas are not concerned about whether the cities stifle in their own smog. I think that's nonsense. In today's country as well as in today's world all people are interdependent upon each other. People and supplies move back and forth rapidly. What happens in San Francisco or in Iowa concerns us in New York; what happens in New York is of direct concern to you in Idaho or in Minnesota. And therefore I'm concerned when there are vetoes of bills which affect you directly. I think you deserve help from Congress just as New York City deserves help in securing mass transit. I voted for a lot of programs which affect your areas such as rural electrification. After all, it was rural electrification that gave women on and off the farms the dishwasher which liberated them a little.

I'm not only interested in working women or professional women or women who seek political office, I'm interested in all women. I'm interested in women who work in the home, women who work in the factories and women who work on the farms and in public office. Their history of participation has been a living documentary to change in this country: in the early days, fighting for religious freedom when we first founded this great nation of ours, in the effort to secure decent working conditions after the suffragists got the vote; or to try to eliminate child labor in the factories, or to lead the peace movement, to see that we create a society that is not sending our young men to kill or to be killed in an immoral war; or whether it is in a big consumer movement, or in this lobby movement. Women have been leaders in these movements throughout history.

The problem is we've always allowed the men to run the movements. I hope that some women who will be involved in the leadership of this group will soon be up here on the dais. To our men friends, let me say that we're not seeking to replace you. We just think a little addition would represent more realistically the diversity that is America. Women represent 53 percent of the population. We represent, I think, the bulk of activism in most areas. Now don't get nervous—I feel that I ought to make the point because it's a point worth making. We should have more women in the Congress. You know we only have 15 out of 435 in the House, and no women in the Senate. I have the feeling that if we had had more women all of these years in the Congress we wouldn't have gotten into the mess we're in right now. You don't see any of us around there in those Watergate hearings. You can read the Pentagon Papers from cover to cover, but you won't find the mention of one woman that ever did anything wrong against the interests of the American people. It's not that I feel that women are innately superior, I want to reassure you about that, only that we've had so

little opportunity to be corrupted by power. So give us a little opportunity, and we'll see how we will do.

Seriously, I think that the greatness of America is its diversity; not only the fact that we are women and men, but that we are farmer and city-dweller, many different national groups and religions and races. A lot more of that has to be reflected in Congress, in all institutions, in the trade unions, in corporations, in our community organizations and our farm organizations. Because that has not happened, particularly in the power structure where decisions are made, like the White House and Congress and State Legislatures, we've gone off the track a bit. There's nothing so leveling as the diversity of America, whether it's the economic levels or the farming and rural levels, or the sexes, or the young people and older people, the different races—if we had more of that going in the political arena, I think we'd have much more of the realization of what this American democracy and country and its original revolution are all about.

So I am suggesting that if we could put together urban members with rural members in the Congress on a common program of support, we would be able to have a shifting situation in the Congress where people were being represented and not special interests. People. And unfortunately, we have been the victim of special interests. Not only the White House, but the Congress and members of Congress are the subjects of vicious lobbies from all kinds of special interests. Therefore I view with a great deal of encouragement a shifting mood of the Congress. Whether you agree with it or not, you must recognize that our continual involvement in Indochina and certainly in Cambodia is totally unauthorized, unconstitutional and without basis—without any authorization from the people or their representatives in Congress. At long last the Congress of the United States, represented first by the House and now by some Senate committees, and hopefully the Senate itself, said to the President and to the Secretary of Defense and to the Defense Department and to the Appropriations Committee, "We will not have this. We do not belong there, and we the Congress are going to stand up and we're going to put together the power of people through our votes." And they voted against continuing to use funds illegally to conduct the war in Cambodia. The mood was reflective of change and it was a coalition of urban and rural people who voted against continued bombing. It's important to recognize the meaning of that, because it brings us together not only on our local concerns, but on the concerns that affect every single human being in this country. It was the assertion of Congressional authority that has long not been asserted. Obviously the Watergate scandals had much to do with this. The House and the Senate are beginning to come to their senses as a nation, and I think the people had a great deal to do with that. So your being here is very important.

There is enough money to go around—we can find it. There is plenty to care for the needs of our people. This is one of the wealthiest countries in the world. It's not true that we don't have enough money to pay for the programs that you're interested in and the programs that I'm interested in: education, the school lunch program, food stamps, electricity, small loans to farmers, child care and all the things that you and I are all interested in together. We do have the money. If we were to have some tax reform which would benefit the majority of the American people and plug-up some of the tax loopholes, there would be billions of dollars available to us. We have not been able to get a tax program adequately put across in the Congress of the United States. Therefore when the President, or Members of Congress say you can't

have these programs because it would require a tax increase, it's not true. There has been testimony from members of unions and leading economists, and Members of Congress who pointed out that we can save as much as \$27 billion, if we were to eliminate these tax loopholes and various other allowances which benefit the very top of the economic ladder and not the majority of the people. Furthermore, we do have a bloated military budget, and many cost overruns. We have twice as much hardware as we need to defend this great country of ours. We've got to take the money from the area it can be taken from. Not from the hearts and souls and hopes of young kids and their need for milk, their need for education; not from elderly people and their need for proper social security and full Medicare. Not from the programs of mental health and research, not from the programs of loans and electrification of farms, not from the programs of mass transit that we need in the city. The funding must be more equitable in this democracy so that all people share appropriately.

We must stop giving tax benefits to those who happen to be at the top of the corporate ladder. You and I as women, as consumers, as family people, and others like us all over this country have really the hidden missile. We really have the major strength if we do what you are here doing: bringing pressure to bear on Congressmen and Senators, making the conditions for continuance in office a commitment to the programs that will heal this country. We must see that all of the people can participate politically, but also can participate economically, and can deal with the various crises that we have on the farm and in the city, in a meaningful way. Our role is changing a little, but we are still concerned with the fabric of society, the fabric of homes, the new generations. After all, we have created the children of this society. We have produced the sons, we have cemented the homes, we have serviced the men essentially. It seems to me that we have a responsibility now to move on ahead, beyond that, and make our commitment to life and human concerns the agenda of America. We are in a stage of great confrontation. There is a question as to whether Constitutional Democracy even exists in this country. I say it does. It does because we are seeing it challenged now. We are saying that we will not have an utter abuse of power by anybody, whoever it may be; that we insist that in our democracy, the people are sovereign. And that they are to be represented in the Congresses and the State Legislatures and the City Councils by people they freely choose. And we have a right to be heard in the press and other places as to what we stand for and what we believe in. When there has been a tampering with this great democratic process we have to remedy it. And we are remedying it.

Your being here at this time is most critical, because it shows that you're not cynical, not saddened, not set back, but that you are determined to fight for economic well-being, and in so doing you're fighting for yourselves and for others. As we approach the 200th anniversary of this great nation of ours, women can really be the pivot and the leaders of the Renaissance of Democracy on every level. Speaking to you from the farms, I am reminded that it was farmers that put our great country together. Now many of us are living in urban areas but we know that we want to be nurtured from your areas as well as our own. We know that we want to nurture those who hunger, those who are confronted by disease and by pollution. Disease and hunger and the desire for a decent life know no boundaries. The consumer movement and the women's movement really have a great opportunity to repair and renew our society, and no longer allow it to be divided or conquered or dominated. This is the chance for

all of us to realize democracy in its true sense and complete our American Revolution before the 200th anniversary in 1976.

IMPACT ON NINE BAY AREA COUNTIES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received information from the League of Women Voters in the Richmond, Calif., area identifying the economic impact of the President's moratorium on housing funds in nine bay area counties.

According to their information, a total of 26,557 jobs will be lost over a 12-month period in this area alone. In view of the current high unemployment rate the loss of these jobs is extremely critical.

As legislators, who have the responsibility for determining appropriation levels, we must now enact "Anti-impoundment" legislation which would allow us to restore these funds.

Mr. Speaker, the full statement of the League of Women Voters follows:

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF HOUSING MORATORIUM AND OTHER HOUSING INFORMATION IMPACT ON NINE BAY AREA COUNTIES

The moratorium on federally subsidized low and middle income housing, public housing, college housing, open space grants, and basic water and sewer grants, represents a loss of over \$355 million dollars to the Bay Area economy within the next twelve months. (Locality Status Report—HUD S.F. office 12/31/72.)

It is estimated that, for federally subsidized housing, the loss in employment from the moratorium within a 12-month period in the Bay Area will be:

	Man- years	Man- hours
Onsite construction		
labor	13,509	18,230,734
Offsite labor	13,048	27,760,424
Unemployment impact	26,557	45,991,158

(This estimate is based on U.S. Dept. of Labor studies.)

IMPACT ON CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Mortgage value (D of A)* \$787,350.
Market value (D of A)* \$905,452.
Mortgage value (HUD), \$75,420,000.
Market value (HUD), \$86,733,000.
(Dollar figures are from "Federal Outlays in California 1972".)
Housing units, 3,894.
Consumers affected, 13,879.
Man-years of labor (jobs), 5,772.

IMPACT ON WEST CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

(As represented in the League of Women Voters of the Richmond Area)

In Richmond some of the housing programs under Model Cities are continuing. The Greater Richmond Community Development Corporation is building 179 units (down from a planned 199) under Section 236 for moderate-income families. (These will have a 20% rent supplement.) The Home and Neighborhood Improvement Center was denied one demonstration program of 12-15

*Dept. of Agriculture.

single-family homes under Section 235. Other programs previously accepted are continuing.

The 200 units of public housing for the elderly that Richmond citizens voted for in 1969 are being built. The city had hoped for modernization of 200 units in Nystrom Village and Triangle Court by using annual arrangements. It was believed it would be more feasible to rebuild these units (that are nearly paid for) than to rehabilitate; the legal steps had not been worked out. Now no funds are available. Both the Richmond and Contra Costa Housing Authorities were adversely affected by the impoundment of funds. There is not sufficient money for maintenance, services, modernization, or rehabilitation.

In San Pablo, the moratorium has not affected the Public Housing Authority. In the city of San Pablo a plan for 72 units of Section 236 housing for senior citizens, including some for low income, was "held up". In the redevelopment area a single family subdivision of 30 units, of which 2-5 units were to be 235 housing was "held up." The community needs quality housing and the moratorium has stopped any proposals for building or development.

El Cerrito and Pinole are not effected by the housing moratorium as neither city has any subsidized housing. (William T. Leonard, executive vice president of the Associated Home Builders of the Greater East Bay, Inc., filed suit against El Cerrito charging a "no growth" policy in low-cost housing development that adversely affects modest and low-income residents. El Cerrito is a residential community of little vacant land and residents have objected to high density development that was not designed to meet the needs of low income families.)

Among the officers of the banks and saving and loan institutions of the area, four expressed concern as to the detrimental effect the moratorium would have on the community and its economy; one noted the need for attractive moderate-priced housing near the downtown. The downtown has been cleared by redevelopment and no longer serves as a shopping community. Financing for Section 236 housing has come from the big insurance companies and not from banks and saving and loan companies.

Richmond's problem is not only the moratorium and impoundment of funds. There is need for much rehabilitation and different procedures, better management procedures and controls in housing.

ADVICE FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Akio Morita, president of the Sony Corp., recently delivered a speech at the Foreign Correspondents Club of Japan in which he offered some timely advice for American businessmen trying to do business overseas.

Mr. Morita criticized Americans for being too arrogant, impatient, ill-prepared and parochial to succeed in competition with Japanese firms. Basically, he feels that American businessmen too often fail to offer products designed to satisfy the demands of consumers in the foreign markets, that they are too prone to complain about unfair trade rather than working to sell their products despite the discriminatory policies, and that

they are too impatient about their profit position. In short, their attitude is negative as far as the greatest export opportunities are concerned, and Mr. Morita suggests that the challenge before them is to go out and take advantage of the very real opportunities that exist.

In light of our continuing balance of payments and balance of trade difficulties, and in light of the continued weakness of the dollar in European money exchanges, such advice bears close examination. Mr. Morita's remarks were reported in the *Boston Globe* on June 18 in an article by Crocker Snow, Jr., entitled, "Sony President Says U.S. Businessmen Complain Too Much." I would like to insert that article in the *RECORD* at this time:

SONY PRESIDENT SAYS U.S. BUSINESSMEN
COMPLAIN TOO MUCH
(By Crocker Snow, Jr.)

TOKYO.—One of Japan's most prominent, most successful and most individual businessmen has criticized Americans for being too arrogant, impatient, ill-prepared and parochial to succeed in competition with Japanese firms.

Akio Morita, president of the Sony Corp., in a blunt and well received speech at the Foreign Correspondents Club of Japan declared: "American enterprises need to take more time to study the market situation in Japan and manufacture products the Japanese people will want to buy, instead of expecting too quick results."

Morita said U.S. businessmen complain too much about their trade problems and doing business in Japan, and don't work at it hard enough.

A trim and dashing successful figure in Japan's business meritocracy, the 52-year-old Morita has shown great courage and adaptability himself since he helped found Japan's tape recorder and television manufacturing firm as Tokyo Tsushin Kogyo on a shoestring in 1946.

Recognizing the vital importance of foreign sales, the company changes its name to Sony (after the Latin sonus for sound) as a concession to the Western tongue and ear a decade later.

Sony is now one of the world's leading producers of high quality sound and video equipment with gross sales for its last fiscal year of \$778 million.

The company opened a 300-man assembly plant in San Diego last year, and is building one in Britain.

"When we announced we would start production of Sony products in California, the response from our American dealers was the question whether Sony products made in California would have the same quality as products made in Japan," he confided.

In blunt words which strike at the heart of the economic dynamism and paternal business practices which helped Japan build a \$4-billion-plus trade surplus with the United States last year, Morita added:

"Of course, Sony products must be of the same high quality regardless of where they are manufactured. To maintain this standard, our worker, regardless of his nationality, must use our know-how with the same attention to quality that our Japanese worker devotes to the product." And Morita adds that he is pleased with the California results.

Commenting on American business practices and aspirations, Morita had this to say:

"I get the impression that there have been so many things to do and demands to be met inside the broad expanse of the United States, that American manufacturers have assumed all they had to do was to make something new, and it would be bought up by the customers. It seems they have become so

accustomed to this condition that they have forgotten how to find out what really satisfies the customer."

"American companies are constantly concerned with figures, and if rapid returns are not produced, the rating of the company drops. Except for very large corporations, I wonder whether American companies are willing to embark on world-wide marketing ventures that require long-term investments."

"Americans often assume their philosophy is always right any place in the world and that anyone who does not understand their philosophy is wrong. Sometimes Americans assume their laws should be valid throughout the world . . . we must not assume that all peoples in the world are the same as Americans."

"We always hear Americans telling us to be fair. Of course, fair play is absolutely necessary. But being fair does not mean all nations should do things the American way. Being fair means that if I go to another country, I must understand the way things are done in that country and abide by the pattern of local behavior."

Morita issued these statements in support of his general thesis that Americans have been complaining too much about Japan's trading successes, and not working hard enough or adapting their own products sufficiently to meet the challenge.

He denied the still widely held contention in the West that low wages remains a key to Japanese success, pointing out that the wage level is rising at a rate of 15 percent a year and that Sony now pays its Japanese workers as much as it will pay British workers in its new plant.

"We have a people of one race, speaking one language, accustomed to working hard, and having the management ability to coordinate these qualities," he said. "Through these factors, we thoroughly revised our industrial structure to build Japan as she is today."

Sony's ocean-hopping president, who has traveled to the United States seven times already this year, credited several specific factors for Japan's recent trading success, including internal competition, a lifetime system, reliance on trading companies and a tendency to work with the rules.

"The Japanese export trader, when he faces restrictions in a country, will first exert efforts to sell his products in accordance with those restrictions, instead of complaining and trying to get them changed," Morita said, apparently in reference to recent heavy-handed pressure from US businessmen and government officials on Japan to lift some of her 33 remaining restrictions on the sale of such American products as computers, integrated circuits, leather goods and agricultural products here.

U.N. VOTES TO ADMIT TWO
GERMANY'S

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations General Assembly has now voted unanimously to admit to membership two Germanys. Many will recall that the two-China policy was fully unacceptable to U.N. members. The two-Germany policy unanimously approved is an apparent attempt to increase the tax revenues to the one-world body.

After all, no one in the U.N. can fear a two-Germany policy. On all issues ex-

cept the reunification of Germany they can expect the East to nullify the West or the West to cancel the East's vote, but the interesting aspect of the German admission is that West Germany will have to pay 6 percent of the U.N. budget while East or Communist Germany will only be asked to pay 2 percent.

The two Germanys must be considered as a classic example of the inadequacies of a people denied their individual initiatives under communism. Both East and West Germany are completely occupied by Germanic peoples with a similar background and in a land area almost uniformly destroyed during World War II. Yet, as the U.N. assessment based on production would indicate, no one can say in the 29 years following World War II were East German standards on an equal footing of prosperity and progress for its people with those of West Germany. The difference can only be attributed to communist economic failure.

The West Germans under a profit-free enterprise system of economy and greater self-determination and individual liberty under a constitutional republic form of government have far excelled their cousins behind the Iron Curtain. The United Nations unequal assessment confirms this fact.

I include related newsclippings:

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1973]

THE GERMANS APPLY AT THE U.N.

Groucho Marx once said he wouldn't want to join any club that would have him for a member but fewer and fewer nations take that approach to membership in international organizations. On the contrary, from the general organization, the United Nations, to the smaller specialized agencies dealing in health, weather and the like, the tendency is to make membership representative of all political elements on the world scene. The United States contributes to some 70-odd groups, down to (up to?) the "International Agreement Regarding the Maintenance of Certain Lights in the Red Sea." Membership in this and better known organizations is generally deemed essential to the prestige and other specific interests of their members—to the limit of their budgetary and bureaucratic capacities.

The United Nations, of course, has been the chief beneficiary, if that is the correct word, of the urge for "universality." For 25 years the United States enforced the arbitrary standard that good behavior, as defined by the United States, was a requisite for membership, but that standard went by the boards when the People's Republic of China was admitted two autumns ago. It then became only a matter of time and maneuver to bring in governments of the three other states left divided by World War II. One such pair, West and East Germany, filed their formal applications last week, having composed their sharpest differences to their own satisfaction. If only because they will pay about eight percent of the U.N.'s budget when they are voted in next fall, they are especially welcome. The two Koreas and the two Vietnams offer special problems but not insoluble ones. Of the four, only North Vietnam does not yet belong to at least one of the U.N. halfway houses, the specialized agencies. U.N. membership remains the best available access to the benefits of belonging to the international community, and sooner or later, one can confidently predict, the Koreans and the Vietnamese will be there.

Over the last quarter century, many—perhaps too many—of the energies of international organizations have been spent on issues of membership. What with the pro-

lification of nations and organizations since World War II, the trade has been very brisk. At the beginning of that period, there was a certain tendency to hope that mere membership would answer or ease the questions that had led the organization to be formed in the first place. It would be difficult to prove this is so but it would be more difficult to prove that things would be made better by disbanding the organization. As it is, the simple existence of an organization like the U.N. creates pressures on nations to justify their national policies in terms of their professed ideals. The United States, for instance, is regularly called on to demonstrate that it is not abandoning the goals or the procedures of the U.N. No one pretends that such pressures are stronger than other factors which feed national policy or that they uniformly should be, but on balance it is good to have those pressures applied. If the U.N. did not exist, it would have to be invented. West Germany's and East Germany's eagerness to join proves the point again.

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1973]

U.N. COUNCIL VOTES TO ADMIT TWO GERMANY'S

UNITED NATIONS, June 22.—The Security Council unanimously recommended today that the General Assembly admit East and West Germany to the United Nations. The action came 32 years to the day after the German invasion of Russia in World War II.

The General Assembly is expected to vote both Germany's and the Bahamas into the organization on Sept. 18, opening day of the fall session, and bring U.N. membership to 135 countries.

The council approved membership for the two Germany's by unanimous consent without a vote. The resolution recommending their membership had been unanimously approved by the council's Committee on Admissions.

The timetable for accepting the two Germany's was arranged by agreement between the countries and stems directly from the treaty normalizing relations between the two states which went into effect this month. The treaty was one of the major results of West German Chancellor Willy Brandt's policy seeking better relations with East European nations.

West Germany will be among the biggest contributors to the U.N. budget. Its assessment is expected to be about 6.8 per cent, higher than the assessments of a large majority of U.N. members.

East Germany's assessment is expected to be about 1.5 per cent, also higher than most of the member states.

The assessments of both countries will more than compensate for the scheduled reduction of the U.S. share from 31.52 to 25 percent.

Both West German Chancellor Willy Brandt and East German Premier Willie Stoph will come to New York in September to address the General Assembly after formal admission.

In East Germany's case admission may not be unanimous. Israel has served notice it will oppose East German entry on the grounds that state has declined to accept any obligation to compensate for the millions of Jews murdered during the Nazi period and has become the most outspoken anti-Israeli member of the Soviet bloc.

In another U.N. matter, Kenya, one of the three African members of the Security Council, proposed today that the resumed debate on the Middle East crisis next month be held in Geneva rather than in New York.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1973]

U.N. ASSESSMENTS

UNITED NATIONS.—A U.N. committee has decided to ask West Germany to pay about 6 per cent and East Germany about 2 per cent of the U.N. budget when the two Ger-

manys are admitted to the world organization. The two German states asked for U.N. membership last week and it is expected to be granted this fall.

The 13-member committee also is understood to have agreed that China's assessment should rise from 4 to 5½ per cent. . . .

NEW YORK LEGISLATURE ASKS ANTIBUSING AMENDMENT

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New York State senate and assembly have concurred in a resolution memorializing Congress to call a Constitutional Convention to amend the Constitution to prohibit the assignment of public school pupils on the basis of race, religion, color or national origin.

Busing, especially across school district or municipal lines not drawn to deliberately separate students according to the above criteria, is not the way to solve the problems of segregation. We cannot legislate away the long-standing ills of society. Busing only adds to the problem by weakening the fabric of family life in further alienating the disadvantaged from the processes of government which they can otherwise enjoy through participation in their local schools.

I sincerely hope that the Judiciary Committee will respond to this call from the State of New York, hold prompt hearings and report out House Joint Resolution 191 which I cosponsored in January. This bill would amend the Constitution as requested in the memorial and keep neighborhood schools as the cornerstone of our public educational process.

The text of the memorial follows:

Concurrent Resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the assignment of public school pupils on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin

Whereas, Many school and governmental officials and many courts have issued orders requiring the assignment of pupils on the basis of race, color and national origin; and

Whereas, Such assignments have been for the purpose of establishing racial balance in schools and classrooms; and

Whereas, Such assignments have required pupils to be assigned to schools outside of their home neighborhoods and communities; and

Whereas, This has caused great concern on the part of their parents and guardians for their safety and welfare; and

Whereas, It has necessitated the expenditure of large sums of money by state and local governments; and

Whereas, Many citizens have therefore been distressed and angered by state and local governments; and

Whereas, Many citizens have therefore been distressed and angered by such orders; now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is requested, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United

States, to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing the following amendment to the constitution of the United States:

No student shall be assigned to nor compelled to attend any particular public school on account of race, religion, color or national origin; and be it further

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states have made similar applications pursuant to Article V. If Congress proposes an amendment to the constitution identical with that contained in this resolution before January first, nineteen hundred seventy-four, this application for a state application shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That since this method of proposing amendments to the constitution has never been completed to the point of calling a convention and no interpretation of the power of the states in the exercise of this right has ever been made by any court or any qualified tribunal, if there be such, and since the exercise of the power is a matter of basic sovereign rights and the interpretation thereof is primarily in the sovereign government making such exercise and since the power to use such right in full also carries the power to use such right in part the legislature of the state of New York interprets Article V to mean that if two-thirds of the states make application for a convention to propose an identical amendment to the constitution for ratification with a limitation that such amendment be the only matter before it, that such convention would have power only to propose the specified amendment and would be limited to such proposal and would not have power to vary the text thereof nor would it have power to propose other amendments on the same of different propositions; and be it further

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

RESPONSIBILITY OF PRESS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared last Wednesday in the Alexandria Gazette, America's oldest daily newspaper, published continuously since February 5, 1784, which I would like to call to the attention of all who read this RECORD. I am sure many of my colleagues will agree with the wisdom of the Gazette editor's comments on the responsibility of the press to its readers:

RESPONSIBILITY OF PRESS

The responsibility of a newspaper to the public is awesome. It is not easily discharged for it has many facets which apply in different ways to different conditions. Basically, though, it consists of two elements:

First, a general responsibility to the public to keep it informed of the activities of pub-

lic officials and to act as "watchdog" for the people. Second, a responsibility to the individual not to publicly expose him to scorn or attack or ridicule unless the public interest demands it and the known facts are such as to justify it.

These make up the newspaper's "accountability" to its readers.

The power and influence of a newspaper are so great that it must make every effort to use that power for the public good and not to misuse it. Newspapers are the guardians of the public's "right to know."

The newspaper has the further duty to be certain of its facts before permitting the use of its columns for articles that will damage reputations. This is the reason a good newsman waits until he has either a formal charge or provable evidence before publishing derogatory information about an individual. Rumor or innuendo or the word of some minor official is not enough.

To do otherwise would be to break faith with the public and with the individual citizen.

QUESTION OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, possible Presidential impeachment raises many difficult questions, not the least of which is who in the House might best take the initiative in pressing consideration of impeachment. Americans for Democratic Action has recently approved a resolution calling for the President's resignation. Furthermore, the organization has taken the position that any initiatives for impeachment "will have to come from Republicans and conservative Democrats, so that Watergate does not become a partisan fight." The following are excerpts from a recent ADA legislative newsletter raised by talk of impeachment:

WATERGATE: CONGRESS VERSUS THE PRESIDENT

As the Ervin Committee hearings resume and new disclosures about Watergate are made almost every day, a few Members of Congress are beginning to speak out on the most unspeakable question of all—whether or not President Nixon should be removed from office. Most Members are choosing to remain silent on this subject, but a handful, notably in the House of Representatives, have brought the question to the floor to discuss in public what is being said privately in many a living room.

IMPEACHMENT

During the first impeachment discussion on the House floor, none of the half dozen liberals who spoke called for impeachment of the President. Some, like Reps. Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.), Pete Stark (D-Calif.), and Yvonne Burke (D-Calif.), said the House should set up a panel of inquiry, either through a special select committee or through the Judiciary Committee, to determine whether there are grounds for impeaching the President. Rep. Abzug said the House action was necessary since "no other body is conducting a direct investigation into the conduct of the President, because no other body has the authority to do so."

Rep. Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.) asked his colleagues to keep the possibility of impeachment "seriously in mind." Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.) called on the House

leadership to file a resolution urging Mr. Nixon to appear before the Ervin Committee.

This discussion followed an unsuccessful attempt a week earlier by Rep. Paul McCloskey (R-Calif.) to discuss impeachment. McCloskey had obtained a one hour special order for debate, but was prevented from speaking when a quorum failed to appear. He inserted his remarks in the Congressional Record anyway, stressing that he was not calling for the President's impeachment but only for a discussion of the impeachment process.

Section 4 of Article II of the U.S. Constitution states that "the President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors." "Treason" and "bribery," as constitutionally designated impeachable crimes, have raised little debate, for treason is defined elsewhere in the Constitution and bribery is a well-defined act.

What constitutes "high crimes and misdemeanors," however, remains uncertain. Endless debate has surrounded the phrase. Broad constructionists, including former Attorney General Richard Kleindienst, have viewed impeachment as a political weapon and an appropriate remedy if Congress disagrees strongly enough with what a President is doing. Rep. Gerald Ford (R-Mich.) subscribed to the same interpretation in 1970, when he was leading the unsuccessful effort to impeach Associate Justice William O. Douglas. He said that "an impeachable offense is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers it to be at a given moment in history; conviction results from whatever offense or offenses two-thirds of the other body considers to be sufficiently serious to require removal of the accused from office."

At the other end of the spectrum stand the narrow constructionists who see impeachment as limited to offenses indictable at common law.

The Constitution gives the House the duty of deciding, by simple majority, whether to impeach a President. The impeachment resolution must specify the high crimes and misdemeanors charged. The charges are investigated by the House committee to which the resolution is referred, before the resolution is brought to the floor for a vote. If the House decides on impeachment, amounting to an indictment, the case then goes to the Senate for trial. The House selects several managers from its membership to present the articles of impeachment to the Senate and to serve as prosecutors during the Senate trial proceedings. Senate rules, adopted in 1868, allow both sides to present witnesses and evidence, and permit the defendant to have benefit of counsel and the right of cross-examination. Conviction by the Senate requires a two-thirds majority of those present.

Impeachment proceedings have been initiated more than fifty times in the House since 1789, but only twelve of those cases reached the Senate. Of these twelve cases, the only one relevant to the current situation was that of President Andrew Johnson, whose highly political trial was decided by one vote.

Although resolutions to impeach or investigate the possibility of impeaching a President have been introduced in the House during the terms of four other Presidents (Harry Truman, Herbert Hoover, Grover Cleveland and John Tyler), Mr. Nixon is the only President since Andrew Johnson to become the subject of serious talk about impeachment.

To date, most Members consider talk of impeachment premature. The Democratic "establishment" position was presented by

Rep. James O'Hara (D-Mich.), when he also inserted a statement in the Record on the same day McCloskey inserted his, calling for "prudence in our speech and action" and asking his colleagues to reserve judgment in the matter until all of the facts are available. O'Hara concluded that he was convinced "that, at this juncture, we are still a long way from knowing all of the facts."

The central question, of course, is whether President Nixon will be "implicated" in any part of the Watergate scandal. And, if he is, what should Congress do about it?

The initiatives, if any, probably will come only if Mr. Nixon is clearly implicated, and the initiatives will have to come from Republicans and conservative Democrats, so that Watergate does not become a partisan fight.

After the legal arguments are debated, the real decisions no doubt will be based on political considerations: How will an impeachment proceeding affect the country? How will failure to impeach affect the country? Do the Democrats really want to make Spiro Agnew a re-electable incumbent President before the 1976 election?

HOME VEGETABLE GARDENS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill with a slightly different flavor than the vast majority of the nearly 9,000 bills heretofore placed before our Chamber of Congress. My bill is expressly designed to promote the growing of home vegetable gardens.

Recognizing that such an idea may lack the tinsel and glitter necessary for a prominent place in today's headlines, I nevertheless feel that its adoption would serve two very important ends.

The most obvious benefit derived from an increase in the number of private vegetable gardens would be the accompanying increase in the supply of vegetables. During these times of food shortages and astronomically high food prices there would appear to be no further need to obviate this point.

A second, and somewhat more subtle consideration, would be the fact that individual Americans could be taking their own steps to diminish a genuine national problem. During World War II, the scarcity of food prompted the American public to grow "victory gardens" in both a practical and patriotic response to that critical situation. Planting one's own garden is no less practical today than it was 25 years ago, and even the unpatriotic should be able to spot the savings to the family budget when fewer trips to the supermarket are required.

As a stimulus for this gardening activity, my bill would allow a tax deduction of up to \$50 for the cost of the planting, raising, and harvesting of vegetables to be consumed in a taxpayer's own home. Whether this dangling carrot will induce latent gardeners to swing into production, I do not know. I do believe, however, that such minor recompense to those who are willing to make the effort to grow food in a time of food shortage amounts to a more sagacious approach than our present Federal practice of paying cash to some individuals

to insure that they will not grow any food.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Congress give consideration to this bill. I further urge that each of my colleagues be mindful of this one small solution when asked by constituents how they might be of some help in meeting our national concerns.

ORPHANS AND REFUGEES OF VIETNAM NEED OUR HELP NOW

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) in sponsoring two bills to assist the victims of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

Despite the diversity of national opinion on the conflict in Vietnam and the American military presence there, we all feel a deep sympathy and concern for the unfortunate orphans. It is important, now that our involvement has ended, that we not forget about those whose lives have been deeply affected by the Vietnam conflict. There are millions of children and refugees whose needs must be attended to, and it is unrealistic to expect the Vietnamese to do this job alone after the war. We have a particular moral obligation to the children of American-Vietnamese parentage, fattered by our now departed troops.

After their withdrawal from the Indo-China conflict, the French offered citizenship and educational assistance to the Vietnamese children of French soldiers. The legislation we are sponsoring today provides that Vietnamese-American children be granted immediate U.S. citizenship once adoptive parents have been approved through a U.S. adoption agency. There are thousands of prospective parents in the United States who have indicated their interest in adopting an orphan of the Vietnamese conflict, but they have encountered interminable redtape and delay in pursuing this goal. I am confident that thousands of American families would open their homes and their hearts to these children, once the adoption conduits have been opened. We have always been magnanimous to our defeated enemies and there is no reason to believe that we would be less so to our friends and allies.

By bestowing U.S. citizenship on these children, we will clearly indicate to the South Vietnamese that we are willing to accept our responsibilities and that we want to provide these South Vietnamese-American children all the rights and privileges of American citizens. Such a guarantee would encourage the South Vietnamese to allow these children to leave their country. Their unwillingness to permit this departure has been a key obstacle to adoption, but it has been the result of a genuine concern for the children's welfare. To grant citi-

zenship and to assure that the adoptive parents are approved by licensed adoption agencies in the United States are necessary safeguards contained in this legislation which would demonstrate to the Vietnamese our commitment to these children.

This bill would make eligible for citizenship any Vietnamese-American child born in the Republic of Vietnam before January 1, 1974, of an age such that not more than 12 years have passed from the date of the child's birth to the date of enactment of this legislation. The President and the Secretary of State would be authorized to negotiate and make necessary arrangements with the South Vietnamese Government to put the act's provisions into effect. Responsibility for certifying eligible children, working through and with properly accredited adoption agencies, and making arrangements to transport qualified children to their adoptive parents would be taken by the Department of State.

The second bill would establish a new branch of the Peace Corps—the Vietnam Assistance Volunteers. This new volunteer program would have a mandate to provide refugee relocation assistance; medical assistance to war victims; and medical, educational, and material assistance to orphans. South Vietnam faces staggering problems in trying to recoup the losses to its civilian population from the continued warfare and the assaults on the civilian population by the enemy. Whatever our own feelings on the proper U.S. role in this war-torn nation, I think that many of our citizens, particularly our young people, would readily volunteer for such a program.

I am pleased to join in sponsoring these two proposals and hope that the Congress will give favorable consideration to this program of peacetime assistance to the Vietnamese on a very personal basis. The spirit of volunteerism held by Americans can be applied effectively in helping those in greatest need and those to whom we feel a special obligation.

GERMAN TREATY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the Watergate flap dominating the attention of the American people, few are aware of the vote-buying scandal in West Germany.

Mr. Brandt seems to have run into additional troubles as a result of a recent court decision that the Bonn-Moscow Treaty, surrendering historical German territories, is unconstitutional.

I include a related newsclipping: [From the Washington Post, June 18, 1973]

GERMAN TREATY

BONN.—The federal constitutional court in Karlsruhe decided that there is a reasonable suspicion of bias on the part of a judge, making him ineligible to participate in considering a petition by the State of Bavaria to halt

implementation of the East-West German basic treaty.

The court's decision tipped the scales from a deadlock to a 4 to 3 majority for judges sympathetic to the Bavarian request. This could mean that Chancellor Willy Brandt will be faced with the decision of whether to put the treaty into effect with the court having ruled it unconstitutional.

REMARKS OF SECRETARY BRENNAN AND UNDER SECRETARY SCHUBERT, JUNE 4, 1973

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this administration has been criticized unfairly for what the critics say is a lack of compassion for the needs of people. On June 4 Secretary of Labor Peter J. Brennan and his new Under Secretary Richard Schubert made known their deep concern for the equal treatment of all Americans who work for a living—regardless of their race or sex. I submit these speeches by Messrs. Brennan and Schubert delivered to the employees of the Department of Labor on June 4 for the information of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY BRENNAN, BEFORE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES, DOL AUDITORIUM, JUNE 4, 1973

To all of you here in the Department auditorium and in each of the department's ten regions—thanks, good morning and some apologies. The apologies are mainly for Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle where it's a little after eight in the morning—a little early for listening to anyone—including your Secretary of Labor.

Today is an unusual day. The swearing in of Dick Schubert as Under Secretary marks the beginning of a new drive. With Dick lending his considerable talents and energy to all of us already on board the Department of Labor has nowhere to go but forward and up. And it will. The transition period, which took a little longer than we expected, is now nearly over and each of us can now direct our full time and energy to our basic job: Continuing to see that the working men and women of our great country get all the protection and help they're entitled to.

John Stender, Assistant Secretary for O.S.H.A.; Paul Fasser, Assistant Secretary for Labor Management Relations; Bernie DeLury, Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards; Fred Clark, Assistant Secretary for Administration; Bill Kolberg, Assistant Secretary for Manpower; Bill Kilberg, the department's solicitor, Carmen Maymi, nominated as Director of the Women's Bureau—all of these very capable executives will be leading one of the most experienced and dedicated teams in the Federal Government. And when I say "team" I mean just that. Because without your experience, the dedication to your jobs—and your determination to work together—we would be unable to move. Incidentally, the last two remaining nominations—Commissioner of Labor Statistics and Assistant Secretary for Policy, Evaluation, and Research—will be made very shortly—thus completing the team.

In these past five months of transition I've spent much of my time studying the past record of the department and charting our future course. I've probably read the equivalent of 500 books and held more conferences than the United Nations. That's a lot of reading, a lot of listening and a lot of talk-

ing. But it's been worth it. Now is the time for stepping up our pace. I'm proud of the way the Department functioned during those five months. Ways were found to end or head off crippling strikes. OSHA worked diligently and justly to protect the working men and women of America at their workplaces, veterans found a helping hand when they came home from Vietnam. All of these things were done—by and through you. And I mean all of you from the bottom of the GS ladder to the top.

Now that the transition is nearing an end and my transition work done, we're going to move into high gear. You're going to see more of me—not only here in Washington but in the ten regions, too. Because being directly involved with each other is the only way we'll succeed in making the department a huge success. And furthermore, we're going to make sure that the American workforce—and American management—are part of that success story. Because you can't have one without the other. We're going to make sure that all of America knows what our department does—and how well it does the job. Because the more the American people are made aware of our accomplishments and our goals for the working men and women of our country the more support we'll receive at the grass roots level and the more support will come from Congress.

This will be an open administration because the strength of America lies in telling it the way it is.

America will hear about the speed with which OSHA moved in on the Staten Island storage tank explosion where 40 men lost their lives. The Department's action will be finalized very shortly.

It is heard how the Department cracked down in another disaster—at Bailey's Crossroads, Virginia—where 14 died in a construction collapse.

It will hear continuing stories like the AT&T agreement in January of this year when the biggest employer in the nation agreed to restore \$15 million to 15 thousand employees who had been underpaid.

It will hear again of the great labor settlements—made without strike action—in steel, railroads and elsewhere. That's part of this administration's story—to persuade labor and management to get together as Americans instead of antagonists and come to just peaceful agreements.

It will continue to hear how the Department worked on behalf of labor, organized or not, in many fields—from employment standards to physical protection of the American working man and woman.

The farm workers have already heard of our new regulations to protect them from the hazards of 21 pesticides. Other workers can be grateful for the new limitations we ordered on the use of dangerous, cancer-producing agents in certain industries.

And we will make sure that America continues to hear of action instead of just words on equal employment rights for minorities, including women.

All of these progressive, positive stories will be emphasized to the media by me and Dick Schubert, who speaks for me in my absence, and the Assistant Secretaries. We not only have nothing to hide—but we have much to tell—with pride.

We're not going to attack old friends who have been critical of us. That's destructive. But we'll show them that, although we may have honest differences of opinion in some areas, we're fighting for the same goals—the betterment of the American workers' place in our great country. Our timetables may differ—but our targets are the same.

Our Public Affairs Department, somewhat hampered during the drudgery of transition period, is now free to carry the ball—to tell a story that we can all be proud of—to tell the press, radio and television that *this* is

what we have done and what we *will* do. The department has done much and, with your help, we'll do even better.

We won't be deterred from reaching our goals by rumor or gossip or glaring headlines. We can't ignore the Watergates, but they won't stop us from moving ahead to make this a better America—an America we can continue to love. If wrong has been done—let the guilty be found and punished. But let's not slow down our own drive to a better future.

Again—my thanks to all of you for what you've accomplished in the past—what you continue to do—and what you will accomplish in the future. And my thanks to you for showing me that the word "bureaucrat" has no meaning in this Department of Labor. The words "dedicated men and women" will henceforth be used instead.

Thank you and have a good day.

REMARKS OF UNDER SECRETARY SCHUBERT, BEFORE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

The bottom line of the job description of Under Secretary is to try to pull things together and then send people to work and I'm going to try a little bit of that this morning.

Some, in commenting about my recent career development have noted that I don't seem to be able to hold a job. Others a little less—charitably, comment that my career can be characterized at best as checkered and perhaps there is a symptomatic pattern here of shiftlessness.

And really there isn't any defense. The planning has left something to be desired, as my wife will attest to. An inductee at an affair like this after he has been sworn-in is torn by conflicting desires. One, he'd like to thank people like wife, parents, children, personal staff like executive assistant and secretary, personal friends and former associates like Jim and Larry, and associates in the private enterprise like John and George, all of whom have played a part in the past or perhaps are continuing to play a part in the present.

And then of course there's the strong motivation to pledge support to a forthright, direct, candid, leader and boss who is going to do his best to be the best Secretary of Labor yet. And to this team that he has assembled together from the work places across the nation.

And then of course you like to say something about the confidence you have in the people who make all of this work. You who are my friends and my co-laborers.

But I'd like to do all of that and one other thing this morning and just for about two and a half minutes, personally philosophize on what I think it's all about. That which we are involved in, government for the people.

The decision to leave Bethlehem, for me, was the hardest one of my life. And that which finally put it into perspective was the realization of a compelling challenge to try to get it all together under Secretary Brennan and with you to do the kind of job that we have to do as a Department of Labor.

Our Department is the smallest one and yet it has the largest mission, bigger than life, overwhelmingly frustrating, and complicated. King Solomon said it one time in the Old Testament Book of Proverbs, "Where there is no vision the people perish."

And we in the Department will perish unless our vision is greater than eight hours work for eight hours pay as good as a starter as that might be. We perish if we simply are satisfied with producing technically competent work. And the great vast majority of you are certainly equipped to do that.

We perish even if we are loyal, supportive, ethical, responsible, as important as those virtues are, particularly now. To meet the challenge of our mission, our vision must be the—to change our world, the world at the end of our fingertips individually and at the

end of our fingertips institutionally as a Department of Labor.

We are peculiarly charged, as Secretary Brennan has indicated this morning, with being the caring edge of society. Not in a do-good frothing sentimental kind of sense, rewarding indolence and neglect, but always realistic, measured, particularly compassionate response to the needs of the American people.

Like Dr. King, I too have a dream for all of us. A dream that you, Secretary Brennan, this team that he has assembled here can make a difference in the society in which we live and breathe and have our being. A difference in homes and families and people's lives because we, in the Department of Labor, care and we do our best to provide a safer, fairer, healthier, freer kind of work place for all Americans.

Changing our world, making a difference, is it an idealistic abstraction? I really don't think so. If I did, I wouldn't be here and many of you wouldn't be here. But this is the kind of vision for men and women of all seasons, old and young, black, brown, white, grade 2 to level one. A commitment that I gladly take this morning. So Help me, God. And a commitment that I ask you to make to yourselves and to your children and your grandchildren. Thank you very much.

SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE COMMENTS ON NIXON'S PRICE FREEZE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the text of an editorial from the South Bend, Ind., Tribune of June 15, 1973, commenting on President Nixon's recent announcement of a 60-day freeze of prices.

As the editorial points out,

Carefully omitted by Mr. Nixon was the confession he should have made: that inflation is at the present critical level because he dropped the compulsory controls of Phase II early this year and replaced them with an essentially voluntary system. This has been a conspicuous failure.

A DOSE OF STRONG MEDICINE

President Nixon's speech announcing a 60-day freeze of prices reminded the listener of a watered-down replay of his original freeze order speech in August 1971. Like all sequels, it lacked the full impact of the original.

The 60-day price freeze is strong medicine, nevertheless.

It should keep the patient, the inflation-plagued American family, from feeling any worse for a two-month period. Whether it does anything to cure the illness is something else again.

Psychologically, it should help. But psychology is not enough. More steps with a prolonged effect will be needed before the situation can be brought properly under control. Those steps are what the President and his economic advisors will seek to devise during the 60-day grace period he has bought.

The President admittedly was seeking shock effect with his price freeze order. This time the shock is less drastic than his original surprise Phase I 90-day freeze on prices, wages and rents, because only prices are affected. Wages and rents aren't included,

he explained, because they have been rising at acceptable levels.

Carefully omitted by Mr. Nixon was the confession he should have made: that inflation is at the present critical level because he dropped the compulsory controls of Phase II early this year and replaced them with an essentially voluntary system. This has been a conspicuous failure.

The moment Phase II controls went off, prices zoomed. Consumer prices from January through April rose by 9.2 per cent. Food prices alone went up 25.4 per cent during the same period. Wholesale prices rose by 2 per cent in May.

So by imposing the 60-day price freeze, Mr. Nixon is trying to put out the fire he himself let get started. The widely expressed misgivings expressed when he dropped Phase II that such action was premature have proven all too true.

By exempting wages from controls this time, he keeps organized labor happy. By continuing to exempt unprocessed agricultural products at the farm level he keeps farm interests happy.

Mr. Nixon accompanied his new imposition of mandatory controls by a disclaimer that he does not believe in a permanently controlled economy. In that, he probably has the support of a majority of Americans. Nevertheless it has been painfully established that with the pressures of world trade and economics affecting this country so heavily, it cannot have a stable economy at this time without some mandatory restrictions.

The degree to which Mr. Nixon can fashion a set of effective controls to go into operation as Phase IV, once the 60-day freeze ends, will determine whether his new effort is good enough.

MAINE CHIEFS OF POLICE ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in the past, I have spoken on behalf of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and pointed out the tremendous importance of the Maine Law Enforcement Planning and Assistance Agency.

This past week, the Maine Chiefs of Police Association adopted a resolution with regard to MLEPAA. I believe this resolution is worthy of our consideration and include it in the RECORD:

MAINE CHIEFS OF POLICE ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Maine Law Enforcement Planning and Assistance Agency has provided professional technical assistance and planning services to the police community of Maine, and

Whereas the MLEPAA has provided direct financial assistance in the upgrading of law enforcement personnel through the Criminal Justice Academy, academic, and other training and education programs, and

Whereas the MLEPAA has assisted the Maine police community in upgrading police services through the funding of basic material and staffing with which to perform their mission, and

Whereas the MLEPAA has been instrumental in planning for, funding of, and establishing a total statutory communications and information system which will ultimately foster a closer and more effective working relationship among all criminal justice agencies, and

Whereas, the MLEPAA since its inception in 1968, has served a vital role in coordinating and promulgating a more effective criminal justice system in Maine,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that we the Maine Chiefs of Police Association here assembled in Greenville, Maine on June 22, 1973 do hereby urge the Maine Delegation of the Congress of the United States to support the continuation and further expansion of the MLEPAA and the federal legislation under which it so effectively operates, and

Further, we extend our gratitude to the Governor and to the Legislature of the State of Maine for their continued support of the MLEPAA, including the necessary appropriation to meet the requirements of the Safe Streets Act.

VEYSEY INTRODUCES QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, this week I am sending to my congressional district, some 180,000 public opinion survey cards—one for each household within the district. It is imperative, in my estimation, for a Member of Congress to keep in close touch with his constituents, and to understand how they feel as well as why.

Within several weeks, when the results of this survey have been tabulated, I intend to make them public and make them available in detail to each of my colleagues in the Congress.

I enclose for the RECORD, the full text of my questionnaire, with the questions preceded by a short analysis and a status report on each issue raised in the questions.

CURRENT LEGISLATIVE STATUS OF ISSUES LISTED IN QUESTIONS 1-10 BELOW

No. 1. No legislation yet introduced to finance reconstruction of North Vietnam, though much talk continues.

No. 2. President given authority to control wages and prices for another year.

No. 3. President cutting back on spending . . . Congress generally complaining, but is going along with many cutbacks.

No. 4. Farm program expires this year . . . Congress will consider a new one. Most agree that the mood is to cut back on both controls and subsidies.

No. 5. Over \$300,000 allocated for geothermal exploration . . . and more for other energy sources, but government is generally balking at major efforts to finance new energy development.

No. 6. Numerous bills introduced in Congress to restrict or outlaw handguns . . . other bills introduced to loosen regulations. None has been passed this year.

No. 7. Experiments are underway with a "voucher system," and there is talk in Congress about using a tax credit system to provide financial help for private schools. However, efforts to pass such legislation have stalled in Congress.

No. 8. Congress just blocked funds for U.S. air action in Cambodia. The President wants to maintain authority for such efforts.

No. 9. Legislation to increase minimum wage to \$2.20 gradually over next several years is making substantial progress in the House.

No. 10. Numerous bills to provide government financed health care have been intro-

duced. Some would give total care to all, and some would strictly limit care to needy . . . or for catastrophic illness.

QUESTIONNAIRE

(NOTE.—Questions provided with yes and no answers in "his," "hers," and "youth" categories.)

1. Should the U.S. help finance reconstruction of North Vietnam?

2. Should we tighten wage and price controls?

3. Should the President reduce federal programs to hold down the budget?

4. Should we phase out federal farm controls and subsidies?

5. Should the Federal Government take the lead in developing new energy sources?

6. Should the Federal Government stiffen regulations of handguns?

7. Should the Federal Government provide more aid for non-public schools?

8. Should we use air power in Southeast Asia to enforce the peace treaty?

9. Should the minimum wage be increased to \$2.20?

10. Should we increase taxes to pay for more Federal medical care?

What do we need the most? Using number 1 as the most important, please rate the following:

Strong National Defense
Help for Older Americans
Environment Improvement
Lower Welfare Costs
Better Education
Lower Food Costs
Reduction in Taxes
Balance the Budget
Additional Social Services
Solving of Farm Labor Problems
Diminish Size of Government
More Housing Programs

GREATER - PRIVILEGE—GREATER RESPONSIBILITY: A MESSAGE FOR ALL

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to attend commencement exercises Sunday, June 24, at my high school alma mater, Babylon High School, where the senior class had selected Mr. John Sykora, one of their highly regarded teachers, to make the main address.

The message in the address, with its caution that an equal measure of responsibility must be shared with privilege, is one that all of us should read. It is my pleasure to submit it for the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY JOHN SYKORA

Ladies and gentlemen and graduating Class of 1973.

Upon hearing of this honor, I was in a quandary regarding the content of my address. I wondered what format I would use. Would I be humorous or serious—what message would I leave with you? After a while I even pondered punishing you by reviewing the 900 plus schedule changes I made for you over the past three years.

Finally, after regaining my composure, I decided to be as personal as possible. This decision was really not a difficult one since over the past three years we have been just that. I've reprimanded you at times, laughed with you, and we even cried a little. Graduation day is a natural day of pride. Your parents, relatives, teachers, and friends are here to honor you. There are many things to

be proud of. Your class has distinguished itself academically, athletically and socially. You have won a remarkable number of scholarships. The Wilson Tech graduates have gained recognition by receiving 14 individual VICA awards over the past two years. These awards are given in competition in each subject area by the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America.

You must be commended for your college placement and the wonderful manner in which you conducted yourself at Employment Day. These are things we are all proud of.

However, I feel that there are some accomplishments that are more important. I remember two years ago when your class developed the idea for BHS Presents which produced over \$1700 for the Babylon Community Scholarship Fund. I've wondered at the zeal in which you have donated your time to collecting food, clothes and toys for the needy in the community and the time you spent at the local nursing home for the aged bringing Christmas cheer to some lonely people. I remember when I asked your class to help out for Employment Day last year at our high school and 35 of you volunteered your time when you could have been at the beach. And who can forget Santa and his helpers at the grade school! It is these accomplishments that are most important. It is your commitment to worthwhile causes that will strengthen society. It is a society that you will reshape. At this time of your life you have a rare opportunity to look at your past and leave behind all your mistakes and plan a better you for the future.

We have talked many times about the rights and the privileges of students. These rights and privileges have been uppermost in your minds. May I again caution you. Remember—for every right and privilege there is a corresponding duty and responsibility. You cannot benefit from one without the other.

Over the past three years I have heard many of you say why should I? It is my life. It is my decision. It concerns only me. Our complex society of today channels you into this way of thinking. However, this thought is erroneous. Every decision that you make in your life will, of course, affect you. But more importantly it affects the lives of all those around you.

Yes, we have rights and privileges. We have the right to determine our own lives. But we also have a responsibility to our families, friends, teachers, employers, and society in general.

Remember, you do not live in a vacuum. You live with human beings who also have rights, responsibilities, and more importantly—feelings. A significant attribute to always carry with you is respect: respect for yourself, and respect for your fellow human beings.

Congratulations, Class of 1973. Best wishes, good luck. Again—thank you for this honor.

NATIONAL AUTISTIC CHILDREN'S WEEK

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, President Nixon signed into law House Joint Resolution 296, legislation proclaiming this last week of June 1973, as National Autistic Children's Week.

Autism is a mental illness character-

ized by an absorption in fantasy as an escape from reality. Children afflicted by this disease are too often misunderstood and their treatment overlooked. Many States cannot provide educational and correctional facilities for autistic children, often resulting in severe financial burdens and social hardships for the families of these children.

The designation of this week as National Autistic Children's Week should bring long-needed attention to not only the problems of autism and the need for research in this area, but also the very nature of the problem itself. The need for this recognition was emphasized in the House of Representatives debate preceding the passage of House Joint Resolution 296. The suggestion of a national week for autistic children was met with curiosity by some Members who wondered why "autistic" children were being honored, and others who questioned what strange disease was being discussed.

That so few people are even aware of the meaning of the word "autistic," let alone the problems of the disease, is indicative of the need to create an awareness and spirit of concern for the children afflicted by this disease.

Let us hope that during this week such awareness and concern will be brought about.

CRIME

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Mr. Matthew Klein, a student from my district. Mr. Klein and his school's newspaper, the Schreiber Times of the Paul D. Schreiber High School in Port Washington, are one of five winners of Bryn Mawr College's 1976 studies editorial contest for secondary school student newspapers. Mr. Klein's article speaks eloquently about a problem, that, to one degree or another, plagues every school in the Nation. The problem is crime, and Mr. Klein has perceptive remarks to make about crime and how it violates the rights of others.

I am pleased to insert the following article, and I only hope that it might serve as an inspiration to other students of the country:

CRIME

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

To secure these rights, rules have been established for all of us to follow. However, some of us disregard these rules with the rationalization that we are only infringing upon one other person's rights, and that it doesn't matter very much. This carelessness toward others' rights is evident when one looks closely at the many crimes that take place in Schreiber in the period of just one week.

This week several lockers have been broken into, and had their contents stolen. The robber assumed that he was only taking

from the one person who owned the locker. This is not true. Many students have been affected by these robbers in that they now carry most of their belongings with them because of their fear of having them stolen. The robber steals their faith and trust in other human beings.

This week many books from various resource centers have been stolen by students who feel they're really not hurting anyone because the books probably aren't being read. This is not true. Now, because so many books that have been needed by both teachers and students have been stolen, trust is diminishing between students and teachers.

Many pocketbooks are being stolen at Schreiber. Both teachers and students now must carefully watch their pocketbooks and worry when they are not in sight. Because one person thought he was only affecting one woman by stealing a pocketbook, many students and teachers are extremely suspicious and wary about their belongings.

Vandalism is becoming an increasing concern among all of us in Schreiber. The vandal who thinks he is only hurting a large building, not its inhabitants, is fooling himself. Nor is he hurting some distant "administration" by his destructive act. The effects of every example of vandalism, whether it be a broken window, a smashed light or a broken chair, desk, wall, pipe, or ceiling, affects the welfare of all 1600 of us.

When students carry weapons to school, like a knife or a can of Mace, or use a steel pipe to harm another student in a personal dispute they do far more than infringe on each other's rights. They unfortunately set an example of how to "take care" of a situation to other students and further the idea of taking the law into one's own hands and forming one's own vigilante groups. The fear this brings about in many of us is certainly not needed.

Whenever an individual feels he can take away one of the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, he not only deprives that one person of his rights, but all of us. No action by one of us is not felt by all of us.

ALLEGHENY COUNTY, THE NATION'S FIFTH LARGEST CITY?

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Gilbert Love, a columnist for the Pittsburgh Press, has written a thoughtful article on the subject of the size and importance of Allegheny County, Pa.

Mr. Love has gladdened the hearts of thousands of readers with his delightful columns about the wonders of western Pennsylvania. He is a walking, writing bureau of tourism for our area.

I would like to introduce Mr. Love's article into the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

COUNTY AS ONE CITY FIFTH IN UNITED STATES IN POPULATION

(By Gilbert Love)

How would you like to be living in the nation's fifth city?

If you're a resident of Allegheny County, you might achieve that distinction without moving a foot.

I got into this subject very briefly in a column in March. Leaving through population

figures in the World Almanac I had discovered that if the population of Allegheny County could be counted as one municipality, it would be the fifth in the country.

There would be New York with a whopping 7,894,862 residents . . . Chicago with 3,369,359 . . . Los Angeles with 2,809,596 . . . Philadelphia with 1,950,098 . . . then Pittsburgh with Allegheny County's 1,605,133 population.

CONSOLIDATION REVIEWED

At the time I dismissed the idea with the remark that local pride and the natural interest of local officials in their jobs would make consolidation virtually impossible, at least for the present.

I've been thinking, however, and I'm now wondering if total consolidation is necessary or even desirable.

Toronto, Canada, has an extra level of government, called metro, that has attracted worldwide interest. I can see no reason why it wouldn't work here.

This upper level government takes care of services that can be done best on a communitywide basis—police, water, waste disposal, major roads and parks.

(Actually, through force of circumstances, Allegheny County has had to get into many such activities, or form authority boards to run them.)

Under the Toronto plan the suburbs maintain their own town halls and councils and continue to be responsible for such local activities as zoning, fire protection, garbage collection, local roads and streets.

CONFEDERATION COUNT

The suburbs send representatives to the big city hall in downtown Toronto, so it's more a confederation of communities than a single big municipality, but it's recognized as such for census purposes.

It gives Toronto an official population of 2,086,017 instead of 712,786, which is the population of the core city alone.

Size isn't everything, but I would guess the mere suggestion of great size and power has had something to do with Toronto's economic boom.

Those who locate plants and businesses in a community are human beings, and they like to be associated with a winner.

I would also be willing to bet that Pittsburgh's elevation to fifth place in the population list could kick off a renewal of the renaissance which attracted so much attention in the 1950s and '60s.

There could be a fine renewal of civic pride, not only in present Pittsburgh but throughout the county.

After all, Allegheny County comes close to being one community now. Almost the entire county is urban, with municipalities so close together that you can hardly tell when you leave one and enter another.

When folks from Upper St. Clair and Lower Burrell are away from home they SAY they're from Pittsburgh.

FIGURES UNFAIR

The present population figures are unfair. The City of Pittsburgh is 24th in the nation but its metropolitan area, as set up by the Census Bureau, ranks ninth.

A population of 1,605,133 would more nearly reflect the size of the community.

It can't be achieved by the County Government Study Commission, which is now preparing to write a new home-rule charter for Allegheny County.

Because metropolitan is a dirty word in political circles, the legislation setting up the commission specifically says it can't combine municipalities.

It can be done in other ways, however. Years ago Philadelphia went all the way in combining city and county.

Surely, with enough civic spirit, we could go part-way and get into the municipal big league, where we belong.

JACK LUSKIN GUEST OF HONOR AT ISRAEL BOND TRIBUTE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Baltimoreans and distinguished visitors will gather on June 26 to honor Mr. Jack Luskin for his contributions to the State of Israel bonds program and to witness the presentation of the Israel Prime Minister's Medal to Mr. Luskin in tribute to his service in the cause of Israel's development.

The Israel bonds program has received widespread support in the United States, due to efforts of citizens like Mr. Luskin. His interest in the continued growth and development of Israel is only one of his many community activities. He is a worthy recipient of the Prime Minister's Medal, which will be presented on June 26 by Israel's consul in New York, Ziedan Atashi, on behalf of Prime Minister Meir. I include a statement which details Mr. Luskin's numerous contributions to the welfare of his community and of the State of Israel.

The statement follows:

JACK LUSKIN GUEST OF HONOR AT ISRAEL BOND TRIBUTE TO BE HELD JUNE 26 IN BALTIMORE

Jack Luskin, president of Luskin's, Inc., a chain of six discount appliance stores in metropolitan Baltimore, will be the guest of honor at a State of Israel Tribute Dinner to be held Tuesday, June 26 commencing at six-thirty p.m. in Blue Crest North, Baltimore, Maryland.

This black-tie event will be the first corporate dinner ever to be held in Baltimore under the auspices of the Maryland Committee for Israel Bonds.

Hon. Ziedan Atashi, Consul of Israel in New York, will formally present the Israel Prime Minister's Medal to Mr. Luskin.

The inscription on the medal to be awarded to Mr. Luskin reads as follows:

"State of Israel Bonds, Presented to Jack Luskin, For service in the Cause of Israel's development, Golda Meir, Prime Minister."

The name Jack Luskin is synonymous with leadership in the field of retail appliance sales. For twenty-five years, Luskin's has been an integral part and, today, is a front-runner in the business world of Maryland.

Mr. Luskin, a native of Baltimore, is a graduate of Baltimore City College and the University of Baltimore. He served in the U.S. Army during World War II. Three years after the war's conclusion, the first Luskin's opened in Baltimore.

As president and owner of Luskin's, Inc., Mr. Luskin has been the recipient of many business awards, twice winner of the National Brand Names Foundation Award, and many others for distinguished merchandising.

Very active in civic endeavors, most notably as Chairman of the Maryland Division, American Cancer Society, he is a member of the Mayor's Committee for the restoration of Babe Ruth's birthplace. He was named by Channel 67, Baltimore's educational television station, as a member of the Maryland Public Broadcasting Commission. Recently, Mr. Luskin was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Chesapeake National Bank.

Mr. Luskin is a member of the Board of Governors, Maryland Committee for Israel Bonds. He has participated in several fact-finding tours of Israel. Earlier this year, he was a member of the Associated Jewish

Charities and Welfare Fund Leadership Mission to Israel.

The Maryland Committee for Israel Bonds deems it most fitting to honor Jack Luskin because by a happy coincidence both his firm and the State of Israel are celebrating their silver anniversary in 1973.

VETERANS' PENSION RIGHTS MUST BE PROTECTED: A MATTER OF JUSTICE AND NATIONAL HONOR

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress are aware of the tragic miscarriage of justice that has been perpetrated on our veterans by the social security and railroad retirement increases that were approved during the 92d Congress because of the ceiling placed on veterans' pension rights against increased earnings or retirement annuities from other sources. This inequity, I am sure, is not the intent of Congress and does indeed require priority attention. I was particularly pleased to have the opportunity to submit a statement of need to the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension of our Committee on Veterans Affairs in support of legislation I have sponsored with some of my colleagues to remedy this serious situation that has been placing severe hardships on many of our veterans, their widows, and their families—not only reducing their veteran's pension and compensation benefits but in some instances halting these benefits entirely.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby present to you and our colleagues a copy of my statement in support of veterans' pension legislation which reads as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT A. ROE OF NEW JERSEY

I, Robert A. Roe, Member of the House of Representatives, Eighth District of the State of New Jersey, am privileged and honored to have the opportunity to submit this statement of need in support of the legislation I have sponsored with many of my colleagues here in The Congress to protect the compensation and pensions of veterans and their families from being denigrated and curtailed by other increased compensation benefits that have or may accrue to them from earnings and investments they have made throughout their lifetime in other retirement programs, and particularly the veterans' pensions that have been eliminated or reduced by increased Social Security and Railroad Retirement annuities that Congress authorized in 1972 for our senior citizens and retirees to help them to meet today's inflationary pressures and ever-spiraling cost-of-living.

There are approximately 29 million men and women in our country who served in our nation's armed forces during periods of national emergency. Among them, there are approximately 1,075,171 veterans and 1,284,065 survivors who receive pension income. We are, therefore, not talking about a limited number of dedicated people but a significant and substantial number of our country's finest citizens who are in need of the support we are discussing here today. Millions of

veterans and their dependents have had their V.A. pension checks reduced or stopped because of the 20% Social Security increase approved by the Congress for 1972 and for similar increases in other retirement income sources.

What has happened to America's dream for each and every member of our society where the door of opportunity should always be wide open for our people to continue to achieve increased earnings and improved standards of living for themselves and their families.

Yes, fulfilling our country's obligation to our veterans is a matter of justice and national honor and what a tragedy and fraud on the people of America—to serve our nation, all the while believing that one has certain pension rights to help you live comfortably in your retirement years—to work a lifetime continuously investing your earnings in Social Security or the Railroad Retirement Fund—only to find at the end of the rainbow when your life's work is done that the rules have been switched on you at the last minute in such a legislative surreptitious manner that you cannot receive the benefits from all of your retirement investment sources that you paid for because someone decided to change the law. This miserable treatment of our retirees and senior citizens surely shatters the fulfillment of promise of full pension-retirement security from these self-help retirement investment programs.

We should never tolerate a straitjacket being placed on our veteran's income sources. Not in America where the wealth and destiny of our nation are reflected in the standards of living of our society. Retirees or pensioners who are on fixed incomes should not be relegated to having ceilings placed on their income sources through limitations on their pension or annuity rights by making one dependent upon the other instead of maximum benefits to which they would be entitled based on their investment in each of the benefits programs in which they are enrolled.

In 1972 Congress initiated and passed a 20% increase in Social Security benefits to help bring Social Security pension payments more in line with the cost of living and help, at least in part, to begin alleviating the severe inflationary pressures on our senior citizens and retirees. For some of our veterans and their widows, however, these benefits meant nothing; in some cases they resulted in a loss of income; and for approximately 70,000 pensioners these increased benefits resulted in the termination of their veteran's pension income because of the income limitations established by the Veterans Administration; whereas, as we all know, the purpose of Public Law 92-336, which provided the 20% increase in Social Security benefits, was to effect a necessary and essential across-the-board cost-of-living increase for all recipients.

Today, as your committee meets to seek out remedial legislation to erase this discrimination against the veteran's pension program, administrative measures are being proposed that threaten to place additional hardships on the veteran's pension program. In submitting this year's budget, the administration has made a formal legislative recommendation that the provision of law exempting \$1200 of the wife's income and exempting earned income by working wives be repealed. Based on this recommendation, the administration has projected an annual savings of \$223 million—but in view of projected savings, the budget, regrettably, contained no request for a cost-of-living increase for this group of low-income veterans and widows.

It is disturbing that unlike Social Security recipients, veteran pensioners have not, as yet, received the full 20% cost-of-living increase mandated by the Congress

through Public Law 92-336 but, in fact, have lost income. Now, with inflation squeezing the dollar tighter every month, further cutbacks and budgetary obstacles have been proposed for the same group of pensioners.

I would like to call your attention to the following excerpt from one of many letters that I have received from our veterans and their families who have suffered hardships instead of benefits from the increased Social Security benefits program, which, as you can readily see, reaches right into the heart of the problem:

"I am a veteran's widow with three minor children living on Social Security and a veteran's widow pension. Recently, as you know, an increase in the Social Security resulted in the loss of some of the veteran's pension. In my opinion Social Security should be excluded in computing income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension. To give more money with one hand and to take away with the other does not make sense."

In view of the Congressionally mandated cost-of-living increase, this widow is correct—"it does not make sense." And as the cost-of-living continues to rise, the situation will and, in fact, has become even more critical for those persons who receive pension income that unnecessarily fluctuates downward at any point when outside income increases. Mr. Chairman, without remedial legislation, we are locking these people in a vicious, unfair and arbitrary economic trap that has no rational purpose or reason given the present economic exigencies of this country.

Mr. Chairman. Today your committee is particularly concerned with the effect that the Social Security and Retirement Annuity increases authorized by the 92nd Congress are having on the veteran's and widow's pensions and I wholeheartedly endorse and commend to you the following legislation that I have cosponsored for remedial action in this area of concern:

H.R. 1038: To provide that monthly social security benefits and annuity and pension payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension.

H.R. 1493: To amend Title 38 of the U.S. Code to make certain that recipients of veteran's pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly Social Security benefits.

H.R. 2688: To amend Title 38 of the U.S. Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pensions. The bill will increase the pension base for all veterans and increase maximum income limits in all earnings categories by \$600. This means that veterans who were either forced off the end of the earnings scale or were placed in a lower benefit category will be able to continue receiving the level of pension benefits received prior to the 1972 Social Security increase.

Mr. Chairman. In view of the fact that the cutback in pension rights to the veterans was effective in January 1973, I sincerely trust that you will move with dispatch in correcting this inequity to our veterans. It is most important that they be permitted to benefit fully from the 20% increase in Social Security payments and increased Railroad Retirement annuities and maintain their standards of living at least commensurate with other members of our society. Our veterans have offered life itself to our country when our nation needed them. We cannot and must not let our veterans down now when they need us to help them to achieve the respect, dignity and security in their golden years that they so richly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the committee on Veterans' Affairs held public hearings on this

critically important veterans' pension legislation last week and I sincerely trust that they will move with dispatch in promulgating remedial legislation for presentation to the Congress for action and vote as quickly as possible.

May I also add that I am pleased to note the quickening of the pace here in the House and the Senate on the priority issue of protecting, strengthening and improving our Nation's pension systems—both public and private—to safeguard the valuable investment retirement funds of our people. The time is long overdue for a substantive priority commitment of our Nation to insure opportunity to our senior citizens and retirees to achieve increased earnings and improved standards of living without jeopardizing their earned retirement income that they have spent a lifetime of investment in accumulating for themselves and their families.

ON BEING OLD

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, during the dedication ceremonies, in the week of February 12, of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center at the University of Southern California, a most provocative address was presented by the distinguished longshoreman-turned-philosopher, Eric Hoffer.

I should like to share Mr. Hoffer's remarks, "On Being Old," with my colleagues.

For, as he reminds those of us concerned with the problems of the elderly, older Americans have a great store of expertise and knowledge to offer our society.

Indeed, says Mr. Hoffer:

... it seems that a great man's greatest good luck is to live past seventy to get a chance. Had Churchill and de Gaulle died at 65 they would have figured as picturesque failures.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Hoffer's address in the RECORD at this time:

ON BEING OLD

(By Eric Hoffer)

It seems to be generally assumed that the old feel out of place in the present world—a world of ceaseless change, dominated by the fashions and fantasies of the young. Least of all would one expect such a world to offer the old opportunities for greatness, a chance for the full unfolding of their destinies. Yet at no time in history have people in their seventies and eighties played such fateful roles as they did in recent decades. Everybody knows their names: Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Min, Gandhi, Stalin, Adenauer, de Gaulle, Churchill, Dulles, Pope John XXIII, Ben Gurion, Golda Meir. I used to think that a great man's greatest good luck is to die at the right time—not to live too long. Now it seems that a great man's greatest good luck is to live past seventy to get a chance. Had Churchill and de Gaulle died at 65 they would have figured as picturesque failures. Even a fraud like Herbert

Marcuse had to live past seventy to come into his own.

The question is whether these aged history makers were really old. They all had a juvenile element in their make up. The zest and grandeur of history making stretched their souls, but more so the formal dedication to a cause which was at the center of their existence.

HOW LITTLE WE LEARN

The surprising thing is how little we can learn from these great old men. Is there anything in their lives to show us how to grow old zestfully? It would be nonsensical to think of history making as a mass cure of aging, and to recommend fanaticism as an antidote would be to prescribe a cure that is worse than the disease. We must look for other ways of stretching souls.

It seems to be true that people who are occupied in doing what their society values highly are likely to retain their vigor in old age. In this country it is still true that businessmen, technologists, and politicians do not markedly decline with age. In pre-Hitlerian Germany generals and professors remained active and brilliant to the end. In classical Greece, where writers were at the top of the social ladder, Aeschylus produced his *Orestia* at 67, Sophocles his *Cedipus Colonus* at near 90, and Euripides his *Bacchae* at near 80. So, too, in France where noted writers rank above leading businessmen and politicians, writers go on creating to the end. In neither classical Greece nor in France is there anything to match the tragic decay of first-rank writers like Fitzgerald, Sinclair Lewis, Faulkner and Hemingway.

OLD AGE AND DEFERENCE

What these examples suggest is that the old are likely to retain their vigor when they are treated with deference. The predicament of the old is that in order to go on functioning well they need the kind of treatment the creative person needs to go on creating. It is well to keep in mind that to grow old is to grow common. Old age equalizes—we are aware that what is happening to us has happened to untold numbers from the beginning of time. When we are young we act as if we were the first young people in the world. Hence a feeling of distinction must in some degree counteract aging.

There are of course societies in which old age confers distinction—where the old are treated as elders. I am thinking of Japan, pre-Communist China, India, the Arab world, and Rabbinical Judaism. In such societies the old are beautiful. We are told that among the several thousand Hindus residing in New York there is a tendency to return to India in late middle age. They dread living in this country as old people. They will be neglected and forgotten, whereas in India age is venerated.

There is little chance in this country for a cult of the old. There is still a widespread feeling that to retire is to become, in the words of Herbert Hoover, "a nuisance to all mankind." In labor unions at present young workers resent seniority and fat pensions for the old—they seem to think that the decent thing for the old is to curl up and die.

Clearly, in this country, the problem of aging cannot be solved by changing the attitudes of the non-old. If the retired old are to live satisfactory lives, they must acquire a sense of worth by their own efforts.

THE YOUTH CRISIS

It would be most fitting if in solving their problems the old also helped solve problems which face other segments of the population—particularly the young. To show how this may come to pass I have to say a few words about the youth crisis.

Some time ago, while writing a chapter on the young, I was surprised by the discovery that the young at present do not constitute a higher percentage of the population than they did in the past. The percentage of the young has remained remarkably constant

through several decades. What has changed is the percentage of teenagers. We used to count as teenagers those between the ages of thirteen and nineteen. Now the teenage group includes those between the ages of ten and thirty. Television is giving ten year olds the style of life of juveniles, while the post-Sputnik education explosion has been keeping students in their late twenties on campuses in a state of delayed manhood. There are no children any more. Our public schools are packed with minimen hungering for the prerogatives and probably the responsibilities of adults. The poet Auden said that what America needs is puberty rites and a council of elders—which are probably beyond our reach. What this country needs and can have is child labor. The minimen, bored by meaningless book learning, are hungry for action, hungry to acquire all kinds of skills, and I cannot think of anything more fitting than that the old in retirement should transmit their skills and know-how to the young.

BOOK LEARNING AND THE ILLITERATE

Book learning in public schools should take up half a day, and should consist of reading and writing, elementary mathematics, a familiarization with the geography of the planet, and a bird's eye view of history. There is evidence that a student in his early twenties, when he is eager to learn, can master in less than a year all the book learning that teachers try to force into unwilling, bored minds all through grammar and high school. There is also evidence that forced book learning in public school rather than prepare students for a fuller mastery of subjects later in college often makes them unfit for it. When the English physicist Sir Joseph Thompson was asked why England produced great scientists he answered: "Because we hardly teach science at all in our schools. Over here the minds that come to physics arrive in the laboratory with a freshness untarnished by any routine." Reading and writing is a different matter—if not thoroughly mastered early in life you'll have what we have now, a mass of illiterati; college students who can neither read nor write.

THE ELDERLY AND SKILLS

Half of the school day, then, will be given to limited book learning, and the other half to the mastery of skills. Retired skilled carpenters, bricklayers, stonemasons, electricians, plumbers, mechanics, gardeners, architects, city planners etc. will teach the young how to build houses, roads, small bridges; how to landscape, plan, garden; how to operate all sorts of machines. Retired bankers, manufacturers, inventors, merchants, politicians will familiarize the young with finance and management.

The small towns, where there is only one school it would be easy to have a hundred acres or so on which generations of students would build a model neighborhood, plant gardens, raise crops. In large cities the work will have to be done in the outskirts or, better still, on land made available by slum clearance. By the time they graduate from high school the young should be well equipped not only to earn a living but to run the world.

The difficulty is of course that not all the retired are skilled craftsmen. Nevertheless, most people acquire some special knowledge during a long life which they could transmit to the young. My experience has been that, in this country, almost every person is good at something. Moreover, considering the negligence and poor workmanship which are just now becoming widespread in this country, it would be of great benefit for the young to work side by side with people who take pride in their work and strive for excellence. Thus any arrangement which brings the old and the young together in a common task is bound to be fruitful.

TEACHING NOT WHOLLY SATISFACTORY

Still, I have misgivings about teaching as an antidote to aging, even if it were possible

to turn every retired person into a teacher. Teachers, on the whole, are not a happy lot. It is remarkable how many teachers there were among the early recruits of the Communist and, even more so, of the Nazi Revolution. One must have a special talent for teaching to find it satisfactory. And even if teaching could give the retired a sense of usefulness, it is not enough. What the retired old need above all is a feeling of growth, and this they can acquire not by teaching but by learning.

A tree needs roots in order to grow, but with man it is the other way around: only when he grows does he have roots and feels at home in the world. And we grow not by teaching but by learning. The moment we stop learning we are as good as dead. Learning is a more mature activity than teaching. It always struck me how eager children are to teach, and how reluctant to learn. It is part of our present trouble that the young are so busy teaching us that they have no time left to learn.

THE LEARNING SOCIETY

To me the good society is a learning society. It is a society in which most people have elbowroom and the desire to learn and grow. It is a society in which people have neither the time nor the inclination to exploit and oppress, and cannot be tempted to pursue substitutes for growth such as wealth and power. It is a society in which people learn not only from books but also from each other, and no human relationship is so wholesome as the camaraderie of people who learn from each other. In such a society the schools produce not learned but learning people.

The first instance of a learning society that comes to mind is the Agora in Periclean Athens. But your enthusiasm is dampened when you remember that in that society only ten percent of the people could avail themselves of learning opportunities, the other ninety percent were slaves.

The other learning society I can think of is that of Rabbinical Judaism. It flourished through many centuries in various countries, and its last example, in Eastern Europe, was erosion of Jews, young and old, rich and poor, pored over the pages of the Talmud in Synagogues and Jeshiva, swaying, chanting, debating and hair splitting. It is worth noting that quite a number of the scientists involved in splitting the atom were the descendants of generations of Talmudic hair splitters.

THE CENTRAL BOOK

The Jews of course had a book—the Talmud. I wonder whether you can have a learning society without a central book. The Athenians had such a book in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Could we create such a book? A vast book composed by a synod of the most brilliant minds and the most lucid writers. A book on man from his earliest beginning—his struggles, achievements and failures; his sublime gestures and monstrous follies; his hopes and fears, his gods and devils. The pages would be like the pages of the Talmud: a square of text in large print in the center, and around it, in smaller print, a sea of commentaries, controversies, guesses and gossip. A vast book in many volumes that would need a lifetime to study. It all sounds farfetched, but it is beyond dispute that an affluent, leisure society can remain stable and orderly only when its people feel that they are growing, and with the discipline induced by scarcity and hard work. We have to become a learning society in order to survive.

THE OLD AND LEARNING

The question is: Do the old have a capacity for learning? We go on associating learning with youth despite the evidence of our eyes that the young nowadays resist learning and are hostile towards those who want to teach them, and we naturally assume that an old man's mind is too flabby to hold on to a

subject, and that the old find it hard to concentrate and remember. Actually there are many instances of old men who, after a lifetime of achievement, keep on learning. A day before his death, at 76, Renoir painted anemones with a brush strapped to his stiffened finger. In the evening he said as he looked at what was to be his last painting: "I think I am beginning to understand something about it." Pablo Casals when asked why he still practices so many hours a day playing the cello answered: "Because I think I am making progress." Theophrastus complained at 85 that one came to the end of existence just as one was at last gaining insights into it. We also come across a recurring lamentation of people past seventy that, in the words of Louis XIV, "One must leave life just as one begins to learn how to live."

No one will maintain that teaching the old will be more difficult than teaching the present day young. It is becoming more and more dangerous to keep the young cooped up in schools. We are also discovering that a student's learning capacity depends more on what he brings with him than on what the school has to offer. By this test, the old, charged with the experience of a lifetime should make ideal learners. Finally, there is the forecast that, due to a declining birth-rate, the student population is likely to shrink considerably in coming decades so that there will be plenty of room for the new type of student. Thus four hours a day of schooling for the old is an attainable goal.

TO IMPROVE THE SORRY LOT OF THE OLD

To sum up, a chief stain on the quality of life in America has been the sorry lot of the old. All cannot be well with a society in which lives do not end well. And we cannot remove this stain by cherishing and pampering the old. There is little chance for a cult of the old to develop in this country. It is my conviction that by returning to school the old will not only acquire a sense of worth and a feeling of growth, but will also take a hand in shaping a desirable future for the whole society. The post-industrial society with its increased affluence and leisure must become a learning society if it is to survive. Count the retired, the temporary unemployed, and the unemployable. We already have a large non-working population. If the age of retirement is lowered we shall soon have a good third of the people sitting around doing nothing. It will seem more and more absurd to go on seeing retirement as an end rather than a beginning. Moreover the rising restlessness of the young will force us to reverse the accepted sequence of learning years followed by years of action. In the post-industrial society the first half of a person's life will be dedicated to strenuous, useful action, and the second half to book learning and reflection. Old age will be something to look forward to. It will be a time for leisurely study, for good conversation, for savoring and cultivating friendship; a time for the discovery of new interests, and for the transmutation of experience and knowledge into wisdom.

MASS TRANSIT

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. M. A. Wright, chairman of Exxon, in a speech at Los Angeles on May 7, made some interesting remarks on mass transit. Perhaps his ideas might inspire our

conference committee on the highway bill.

Mr. Wright's transit statement follows. It is my understanding that his fine speech has been sent to each Member.

EXCERPT FROM MR. WRIGHT'S SPEECH

New means of mass transportation, including mass transit, may be needed to supplement our existing systems.

The petroleum industry has long been known for its commitment to highways as a primary means of transportation, and an excellent highway system should continue to be a major national goal. But my company supports the view that the time has come for changes at both the federal and state levels in transportation funding. Specifically, we support the creation of transportation trust funds rather than the existing highway trust funds, with monies from these funds being used for the travel systems—including mass transit—that state or local governments choose to install as best meeting their needs. We believe this policy would lead eventually toward a more efficient use of energy and a better transportation balance.

OEO HAS SPENT MORE THAN \$35,000,000 TO EVALUATE ITS PROGRAMS AND WORK

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, as we near the moment of truth for OEO—the time for deciding what to do about the programs now under OEO—my colleagues may find this January 1973 article from the Detroit Sunday News of special value since it critiques the whole operation of the agency, providing a long-range review coupled with a look at its modus operandi. The article particularly looks into the use of OEO funds for outside consultants, evaluators, and technical advisors. According to the article, the agency has doled out more than \$35 million of the taxpayers' dollars for study of its programs—including 35 different, costly, and often-repetitious evaluations of the program for pre-school children.

The full text of the article follows:

CRITICS LABEL U.S. AID A COSTLY FAILURE—THE POVERTY INDUSTRY—IT COSTS \$31.5 BILLION

(By Seth Kantor)

WASHINGTON.—It's called the poverty program, and it does everything from hunting rats to paying pensions.

Poverty programs administered by the federal government will total \$31.5 billion this year, making this governmental activity a major industry.

Its critics accuse it of failing to reduce the number of "poor" and failing to give the taxpayer his dollar's worth.

Example: At the end of the Johnson administration four years ago, there were 25.4 million people classified by the federal government as "poor." At present there are 25.5 million "poor"—an increase of 100,000. (A "poor" person, according to federal guidelines has an income of no more than \$4,000 in a family of four.)

Example: In Providence, R.I., it was found that a hoodlum with a 20-year record of arrests had been given a job at \$3 an hour as a youth counselor in a neighborhood Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) program.

OEO regional director Robert E. Fulton said the Providence anti-poverty agency had "no apparent planning capacity." It was shaken up, its budget slashed in half by regional headquarters.

Afterward, Fulton reported: "The agency there is doing a lot more with \$800,000 than it had been able to do with \$1.8 million."

The bigness of the poverty program is fantastic.

When many Americans think of industrial or financial giants, they think of General Motors, Howard Hughes or the DuPonts.

Yet poverty is one of the biggest domestic financial complexes—a \$31.5 billion, tax-supported industry headquartered in Washington.

It's a booming industry of 166 different programs, administered by 12 different federal agencies, paying salaries to thousands of employees and providing profits to dozens of outside contractors.

It is, in essence, a service industry.

Yet, although spending on the program has doubled since the last full year of the Johnson administration, its critics insist that it still is plagued by poor management, inadequate coordination and overlapping services.

And, as the old saying goes, "the poor are still with us."

Lyndon Johnson, during his five years in the White House, wanted nothing to succeed more than his plans for a Great Society, highlighted by a "war on poverty."

The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was set up late in 1964 as the anti-poverty agency and Mr. Johnson picked as its director E. Sargent Shriver, former head of the Peace Corps.

The OEO, thus, became corporate headquarters for the poverty industry while the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) served as its chief factory outlet.

Shriver generated experiments and studies at the rate of nearly \$2 billion a year in his shop. Some were packaged as programs to be distributed through HEW, which already was top-heavy with programs.

"I am the first to admit that I placed too much emphasis on poverty programs when I was HEW secretary under President Kennedy," said Sen. Abraham A. Ribicoff, D-Conn.

Ribicoff believes that many of the present 166 poverty programs could be dropped and that "the only complaints voiced would come not from the poor but from bureaucrats running the programs."

Today's OEO Director Phillip V. Sanchez, who is on his way out, estimates there is an army of nearly 200,000 anti-poverty workers—not federal employees but hired through OEO funds. This army conducts programs for the poor, who despite the effort to eliminate poverty, number 25 million for this sixth year in a row.

In addition to the thousands of workers, there are the outside merchants.

"I have no illusions," one of these merchants hired to evaluate OEO programs confided to Ribicoff. "I'm in poverty for the money."

The money OEO is paying in contracts to outside consultants, evaluators and technical advisers is on the increase.

At midpoint in the first Nixon administration there were 126 of these contracts. They were worth \$56.7 million. Now, at the start of the second Nixon administration there are 136 contracts, valued at \$62.1 million.

New England, where the OEO is doing away with big, costly contracts to outside technical experts, is an example. The last of these contracts—\$126,000 to Technical Data Systems—runs out next month. Replacing the big contracts are 45 small grants to aid 37 different OEO community action and legal services programs in the six-state area. But these diversified grants total \$550,000.

Since the OEO was begun, the agency has

doled out \$35.5 million to outside contractors for evaluations of its programs—including 35 costly, often-repetitious evaluations of the Headstart program for preschool children.

"It has been so bad that before a new program got going there would be evaluations of it," said William W. Allison, executive administrator of the OEO's community action program in Atlanta.

"One of the things about evaluations is timeliness," commented Orville J. Anderson, a regional chief for plans, budget and evaluation. "Too often, they come out too late to do any good."

Many outside contractors are former OEO officials who have quit the government and are now with firms getting fat OEO contracts.

Leo Kramer was an associate director of an OEO program. A year after he resigned from the agency, he opened an operations research firm. OEO records show that Kramer collected \$1.8 million in eight anti-poverty contracts over the ensuing four years.

Six of those eight contracts involved the program that Kramer had helped to control at OEO.

Late in the Johnson administration, when Kramer was setting up his flourishing business two blocks from OEO headquarters, Bertrand Harding came into the OEO as deputy director.

"I was immediately struck by the number of OEO contracts going to private companies which employed former OEO staff people," said Harding, who remembers this as having "the appearance of impropriety."

William P. Kelly was in charge of the administration of contracts at OEO a few years ago. Now he is a top executive with Volt Information Sciences Inc., which has offices a block from the OEO.

Kelly can recall "a number of contracts with OEO" for Volt since he has made the one-block move.

Kramer and Kelly insist that their inside knowledge of OEO had nothing to do with the contracts their firms have won, since the bidding was done in open competition.

Nonetheless, nearly three years ago OEO toughened its contract-awarding rules, guarding against deals with firms that hire former OEO officials—leading Kramer to complain that OEO is operating these days with "a rather outmoded view of government."

Still, during the past three years, OEO has continued to spend heavy amounts of its budget on outside advisers and experts. At the start of 1973 there were 65 outside firms holding contracts that range in value from \$100,000 to more than \$1 million each. Many of these firms have working offices in the Washington metropolitan area, within walking distance of OEO headquarters.

The poverty business is "still seen as a growth industry," said Roy Littlejohn, who started out as a contractor almost five years ago when he said, "there still was a great deal of confidence in social programs."

Contractors who don't diversify enough drop out of business as the moods of government change. Littlejohn has spread his expertise from the CED to the Defense Department, for instance. But even when one contractor goes out of business here, two more seem to spring up.

Meanwhile, the CEC continues to struggle for control over programs it is operating on a \$790.2 million budget for 1973. It is often dogged with sloppy management problems that keep it from getting what it's paying for.

For instance, local investigators discovered recently in Atlanta that an outside contractor—being paid \$80,995 to supply CEC services to the elderly in poor neighborhoods—was running a "pilot project" in two high-rise apartment houses where white people

live, while ignoring the surrounding black community.

But one of the OEO's most flagrant managerial blunders in 1972 involved a relatively small amount of money—an outlay of \$60,000 in Monmouth County, N.J.—which, as unused funds, was supposed to be returned to Washington.

It was there that anti-poverty officials decided to send 67 teenagers on trips to Europe, South America and Africa, to give them "cultural enrichment" for two months last summer.

When OEO authorities in Washington learned of the trips (arranged through Youth for Understanding, an international exchange group with national offices in Ann Arbor), an investigation was begun.

It was learned that 23 of the youngsters came from homes that did not even meet poverty guidelines. The trips already were under way when the OEO decided not to pay for them.

Quietly, the OEO has referred the matter to the Justice Department for further investigations, and federal probes are looking into criminal fraud charges at this point.

What happened in Monmouth County was that local OEO board members closed their eyes to a managerial decision to send the high-school students on an international joy ride at tax-payer expense.

"This kind of thing is the chink in our armor," said OEO Director Sanchez. "This kind of thing could happen to us again."

Monday: Overlapping and duplication of services plague the poverty industry.

How funds are spent on poor:
Here's a breakdown on the leading spenders in Washington in the poverty industry and what they're spending in 1973:

[Amount in billions]

Department:	
Health, Education, and Welfare-----	\$22.1
Agriculture-----	3.1
Labor-----	2.5
Veterans' Administration-----	1.6
Housing and Urban Development---	0.8
OEO-----	0.8
All others-----	0.6
Total-----	31.5

And here's what the poverty industry was spending in 1968, in the last full year of the Johnson administration:

[Amount in billions]

Department:	
Health, Education, and Welfare ----	\$11.7
Agriculture-----	0.3
Labor-----	0.6
Veterans' Administration-----	1.0
Housing and Urban Development--	0.2
OEO-----	0.8
All others-----	0.3
Total-----	15.9

NATIONAL SECURITY IS AN ISSUE OF THE TIMES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days of national trauma over the Watergate, it is important that we not lose sight of the President's responsibilities in the area of national security. I would like to share with my House colleagues an article entitled "National Security Is an Issue of the Times," by

Raymond J. McHugh, the former chief of the Washington Bureau of Copley News Service, which appeared in the June 3 San Diego Union. He has prepared an incisive study of the "loneliness of power" with particular reference to national security. This is not a white-wash of malfeasance on the part of overzealous executors, but a thoughtful analysis of the implications of security breaches on the full spectrum of U.S. foreign and domestic policy. I commend Mr. McHugh's comments to the attention of my colleagues and include his article at the conclusion of my remarks:

NATIONAL SECURITY IS AN ISSUE OF THE TIMES

WASHINGTON.—"National security."

What does it mean?

Is it a convenient cover-all phrase under which presidents hide sins and mistakes?

Or is it a grim fact of life that comes hand in hand with the oath of office, a fact that only a president can fully appreciate because in final analysis only he can interpret it?

In the shambles of the Watergate affair, only President Richard Nixon can really answer. If he believes national security as he saw it was involved he faces a cruel dilemma.

His lonely position is emphasized by the deaths earlier this year of Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson, the last two living former presidents who might have stepped forward and tried to explain the loneliness and responsibility of the White House.

The partisan taunts of erstwhile Democratic presidential hopefuls and the acid words of some columnists and commentators do not answer the question.

It is attempting to sweep aside the unrest and assassinations of a decade, to ignore the now-muted threats of radical anti-Vietnam groups and to conclude that President Nixon injected national security into the Watergate atmosphere only to confuse the issue and defend himself.

But Nixon was not the first president to worry about the antiwar movement, its origins, some of its leaders and their possible effect on national policy. Nor was he the first president to worry about security leaks from dissident or frustrated bureaucrats.

The late John F. Kennedy ordered his brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, to undertake a sweeping wiretap campaign to plug leaks about U.S. intentions toward Castro Cuba, about U.S. views of the Cuban missile problem and about U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union and France.

One of Robert Kennedy's wiretap targets was even the late Dr. Martin Luther King and there were men in the Kennedy camp seriously concerned about allegations that King might have secret contacts with foreign sources. These allegations were never substantiated, but they were investigated by the Justice Department.

It was President Johnson who set up a small unit known as the Interdivisional Intelligence Unit in 1965 to coordinate investigations of radical domestic groups.

The unit was technically headed by Attorney General Ramsey Clark, but it included the FBI, the CIA, the various Defense Department intelligence operations, the Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Service and the Secret Service.

One could hardly fault President Johnson. He had come to office on the assassination of President Kennedy. He had seen Dr. King and then Sen. Robert Kennedy assassinated. He had seen the radical riots in Detroit, Newark, Los Angeles, and dozens of other cities.

As the 1968 presidential campaign neared, Johnson ordered this unit to redouble its efforts. He also ordered that all would-be

presidential candidates get Secret Service protection.

(Sen. Kennedy refused such protection and security men still argue whether a routine Secret Service check of the Ambassador Hotel kitchen in Los Angeles would not have uncovered Sirhan Sirhan before he could kill Kennedy. The situation was not the same in 1972 when Alabama Gov. George Wallace was shot at a Maryland parking lot rally. Wallace did have Secret Service protection, but agents had no chance to check everyone in the parking lot. They would have been able to check everyone in a hotel kitchen that Kennedy planned to use as a departure route.)

The Johnson unit had grown to major proportions by the time of the Democratic national convention in 1968. Clark has claimed that he was not aware of how widespread the military intelligence operations had become, but he technically was in charge. Those over-ambitious military activities in domestic political areas eventually exploded into scandal proportions early in the first Nixon administration.

This was the climate in which Richard M. Nixon campaigned for the presidency in 1968. He was under constant guard. This reporter can attest to the tight security and the personal searches one endured before reaching Nixon at his Broad Street law office or his Fifth Avenue apartment.

President Nixon also is peculiarly a product of other domestic unrest and dissidence that was always linked to basic national security issues—the Cold War, Korea, Red China, Cuba, Vietnam, etc.

It was Nixon who sent Alger Hiss to jail for his role in a Soviet espionage case that President Truman had dismissed as a red herring. Nixon matured politically during the years of the Rosenberg trial that ended in the execution of the couple accused of giving the secret of the atomic bomb to the Soviets. He also well remembers the passionate outcry of left-wing protesters who demanded that the Rosenbergs be spared.

President Nixon was aware of the four tense years in which U-2 spy planes crisscrossed the Soviet Union, bringing back photo evidence on Russian military progress. This was a national security secret of the highest order.

He was aware, too, of the surreptitious buildup in 1960-61 for a Cuban exile invasion of their homeland. When John F. Kennedy ordered the invasion, but withheld vitally needed U.S. air cover, Nixon railed privately at friends, but he did not attack President Kennedy publicly. Again in 1962, Nixon believed Kennedy should have taken direct military action against Russian missile sites in Cuba and against the Castro regime, but again he did not attack Kennedy's compromise solution.

Today critics who ridicule his national security arguments ignore not only the Nixon career, but the day-to-day facts that dominated his first term in office.

It would have been shocking if Nixon had not studied and approached the anti-Vietnam movement from a national security standpoint. Although pious politicians and cynical writers chose to see the movement as a clean-cut revulsion by idealistic Americans against an ill-defined conflict 10,000 miles away, any president had also to guard against the possibility that honest idealists were being deliberately misled against the national interest.

From 1969 to 1972 Washington was the scene of a bitter below-the-surface intelligence battle. Intercepted messages from Communist China to some antiwar personalities heightened White House apprehensions. Leaks of classified information to the press added to an administration conviction that there were men in government who did not want Nixon to achieve "peace with honor."

The disclosure of the Pentagon Papers by Dr. Daniel Ellsberg could only confirm suspicions for some in high places that there was a group in the bureaucracy, allied with political and media elements, who were dedicated not only to frustrate the Nixon presidency, but to frustrate what Nixon held to be the legitimate and essential goals of the nation.

Richard Holbrooke, managing editor of the prestigious magazine *Foreign Affairs*, draws this picture of Nixon's state of mind:

1969: the world we live in, he believes, is threatened by a subversive conspiracy at every level. In the words of columnist Stewart Alsop, summarizing the views of the inner Nixon team, the administration believed that "the left-wing opposition had infiltrated the secret vitals of the Nixon foreign policy."

1970: then a sudden threat "of critical proportions": a wave of violence sweeping across the nation, with "some of the disruptive activities receiving foreign support."

1971: a theft of 47 volumes of studies and comments "from the most sensitive files," a "security leak of unprecedented proportions," creating "a threat so grave as to require extraordinary actions."

"And so, viewing the world outside the oval office as hostile, the president took internal security measures. . ."

Add this possible factor—and only the president could confirm or deny it:

That both Peking and Moscow were being stymied in attempts to turn Vietnam into an American revolution; that the intensive American counter-intelligence efforts were bearing fruit, but most important the average American citizen and the establishment were riding out the storm.

That confronted with this reality, both major Communist capitals—first Peking, then Moscow—recognized that they had lost, recognized that under Nixon the United States would persevere in Southeast Asia; and worse, it was likely to persevere in other world trouble areas; that it was time for a cease-fire in Indochina.

That faced with this, both decided they had to compromise, because only through compromise with the strongest nation in the world could they hope to gain the agreements, the trade concessions, and the credits that would permit their regimes to survive.

In this thesis, what followed were the invitations for Nixon to visit Peking and Moscow.

If one accepts that there were elements in the anti-Vietnam movement over 10 years that represented a direct threat to American institutions, there can be no question that the government's defense and counter-attack had national security overtones.

This in no way suggests an alibi for the Watergate affair itself, or for other acts of political espionage that we approved. But counter-attacks, particularly successful counter-attacks, are sometimes not easy to stop.

At this writing it appears that President Nixon made serious mistakes in delegating authority. There is evidence that some of the people he entrusted with the counter-attack were carried away, that they lost sight of the fact that they were fighting for a government, not an individual or his party; worst, they did not always differentiate between targets.

If this is true, they will have to answer. At best, Nixon will have to answer for misplaced judgment.

Much has been written in recent weeks about secrecy in government. The overwhelming consensus is that it is inherently bad. Criticism will not eliminate secrecy. For centuries the affairs of nations have demanded it.

What is bad is when men do not properly assess the reasons for secrecy, when they do not properly evaluate intelligence data, when

they become so involved in the "game" that they lose sight of its purpose.

An old Revolutionary War tale recalls the day Gen. George Washington and his staff rode into a New Jersey crossroads hamlet.

A woman rushed up to Gen. Washington and volunteered to tell him everything she knew of British troops.

"Can you keep a secret?" Washington asked.

"Oh yes," promised the woman.

"Well so can I," laughed the general and he rode away.

POMPEY, N.Y., CHURCH CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, certainly any institution which has served our society for 100 years is indeed worthy of whatever recognition that may be provided and especially when the institution is a house of worship.

At this time in my home community, that is Onondaga County, in New York State, the Church of the Immaculate Conception, in Pompey, N.Y., along with Saint Paul's Mission in Fabius, N.Y., have completed a century of service to the community. This milestone was noted with a concelebrated mass at the Church of the Immaculate Conception on June 17, 1973. The mass was arranged for by the pastor, Rev. William P. Reagan. A capacity attendance was rewarded with a beautiful homily enunciated by the Most Rev. David F. Cunningham, Bishop of Syracuse. Much of that homily is contained in an editorial which I attach.

I commend this reading to my colleagues and offer my congratulations to Father Reagan and the parishioners of the church and mission.

CHURCH MARKS FIRST CENTURY WITH SERVICE

(By Ramona B. Bowden)

For the past century the Roman Catholic Church of the Immaculate Conception in Pompey and St. Paul's Mission in Fabius have served the parish. Yesterday's concelebrated Mass marked 100 years of devoted mutual service of priests and people.

That five outstanding priests of the diocese with the Most Rev. David F. Cunningham, bishop of Syracuse; with the pastor, the Rev. William P. Reagan, offered the Mass, marked the significance of the high regard in which the parish is held.

In his homily the bishop said, "The theme for the day is thanksgiving; for at a time like this the heart is overflowing with gratitude for all that God has given and will continue to give."

"What shall I render to God for all His benefits and blessings? This is the feeling of the people of Pompey and Fabius on this joyous day," said the bishop as he paid tribute to Father Reagan for the splendid way he had readied the beautiful little white church for the occasion.

The bishop went on to outline the early history of the parish, noting that Ulysses S. Grant was president at that time, and the country was recovering from the Civil War. First served by nonresident priests, the people wanted their own pastor.

They knew their faith would be preserved

only by an anointed priest of God, assigned by the bishop.

"They petitioned Bishop Conroy of the diocese of Albany, which included Syracuse and Onondaga County at that time. He gave the church its first president, and since that time 17 pastors have served the parish," he said.

"While they differed in various ways, yet all were alike in their priesthood of Christ. All preached the gospel, all celebrated the sacrifice of the Mass in which the worshipper received new life through forgiveness of sin," he said.

"The parish church established as a house of God signified that 'someone lives here' with the altar the focal point where the Mass was offered. 'I have placed my tabernacle among you—you shall be My people and I will be your God,' said the Lord of Hosts," he declared.

"This house is a house of prayer so that the people can come closer to God, and even after 100 years and after 2,000 years we have the faith that God will fulfill His promise that His spirit will dwell among us," said Bishop Cunningham.

"We are beginning the Holy Year of God, a celebration of 2,000 years of striving to bring religion into the world—hence a Holy Year of prayer for a time when religion can be better understood with greater emphasis on God in society. You and I are the living stones of the church. Only through us—the people—will the message of God's love be proclaimed to all mankind," he said.

The bishop went on, "It means a great deal to a pastor to have the affection and good will of his people, and this Father Regan has. The love he has for his people is reflected in the devotion you have for him. Now as we begin the new century we will be quick to say, 'What can I render to God for all His benefits and blessings,'" said the bishop.

An outstanding part of the Mass was the beautiful choral singing, which brought commendation from the bishop.

Father Regan in closing the Mass said that 80 years ago Bishop Patrick A. Ludden, the first bishop of Syracuse, came for the dedication. Today the sixth bishop was presented for the centennial.

"Today, in the Mass, the church presented a microcosm of the church universal—the people with their bishop and priests gathered around the Eucharistic table of Christ.

"This church has rung with prayers and hymns for many years, and the parish for 100 years. The people of Pompey have been generous with their cooperation. Today we thank God for His blessings and pray our work will continue," he said.

LOUISIANA FARMERS' FINANCIAL PLIGHT

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, now that the raging rivers have subsided and most of the spring flooding is over there is little attention paid to the continuing effects of the high water which so recently covered a huge part of our country's farmland. But the damage continues because many farmers who must meet heavy debt obligations on their land and equipment will have no crop at all this year. Most of them can anticipate no income whatsoever until the fall of 1974.

The director of the Louisiana State University Cooperative Extension Service, Mr. John A. Cox, has announced the results of a study done by his organization to determine the cost to Louisiana farmers who are prevented from planting this year. Mr. Cox has found that the farmers of Catahoula Parish, La., who did not plant crops this spring will have suffered an average loss of \$71,064 by the time they complete their harvest in 1974. Mr. Cox' conclusions were published in the Opelousas Daily World of Opelousas, La. Since the House of Representatives will soon consider the omnibus farm bill I include the article for the information of my colleagues:

LOUISIANA FARMER'S FINANCIAL PLIGHT

BATON ROUGE.—Farming can be a reasonably profitable business, but circumstances beyond a farmer's control in a single year can be almost ruinous in spite of his skillful use of modern techniques and machinery.

Currently, much of Louisiana's farm land is flooded. This provides a dramatic case study of the financial effect on the individual farmer when the fortunes of nature turn against him.

John A. Cox, Director of LSU Cooperative Extension Service, said his organization made a study in Catahoula Parish recently to learn just how greatly a farmer could be hurt if high water prevents him from growing a crop this year.

Cox explains the study showed those farmers not able to plant this year will have incurred average loss of \$71,064 by the time they harvest and sell a crop in 1974.

"It is important that people, especially those in business and government, fully understand how great a loss many of our Louisiana farmers have suffered and how difficult the task will be for them to recover," Cox gave as the reason for releasing the findings of the study.

"I ask all lending institutions to continue their traditional leniency in approving credit and debt schedules to farmers in times of crises. Also, I urge all government agencies to provide fullest and speediest implementation of all appropriate services to farmers during these times of unusual hardship," Cox says in behalf of the thousands of Louisiana farmers hit by floods.

In understanding the financial implications involved when a farmer says, "Because of high water, I won't be able to plant a crop this year," two factors must be considered. Cox explains.

First, it must be realized that a farmer has a tremendous investment in land and machinery which carries debt obligations whether he can produce a crop or not.

And second, farmers producing field crops don't have a monthly income. It is lumped into a short period at harvest time.

For example, a soybean farmer usually plants in May and June and sells his crop in October and November. If he loses his crop this year but has the good fortune to plant next season, it will still be October or November of 1974 before he has a cash income. A farmer in his case will have to go almost two years without income and rely on extended credit and loans to carry him through.

The financial situations of the average farmer interviewed in this study projected to the harvest time of 1974 gave the following description:

For 1973, he will have a \$24,683 loss of farm income. His interest on land and machinery debts will be \$4,802, depreciation on equipment will cost him \$8,128 and he will need an additional \$6,000 for living expenses.

Until he sells his crop next fall, he will have incurred losses and obligations of \$71,064. Added to this is an estimated long

term debt of \$64,020, which puts the total loss and obligations at about \$135,084. Even with good yields and a strong market, it will be four or five years before he is clear of the financial effects of a single year's loss of income.

OPEN LETTER TO MR. LEONID I. BREZHNEV

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of interest has been shown by letters of numerous organizations that represent Americans of various nationality backgrounds who originally or whose forebearers are now under Soviet domination or their governments are supposedly kept in power by Soviet military presence.

I believe their points of view deserve proper study especially in the light of the extensive press coverage that is being given to the statements of Mr. Brezhnev.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD an open letter to Mr. Brezhnev submitted by the Czechoslovak, Hungarian, and Polish Councils in North America:

OPEN LETTER TO MR. LEONID I. BREZHNEV

MR. SECRETARY: The terror imposed upon the nations of East-Central Europe by the ideology, the political power and military might of Soviet oppression repudiates and negates almost every article in the Declaration of Human Rights.

It denies that men are born free and equal in dignity and rights and that all should act in the spirit of brotherhood.

It denies the right of life, liberty, and security of person.

It denies the principle that no one shall be subjected to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.

It denies that no person shall be arbitrarily arrested, detained or exiled.

It denies that all are equal before the law and entitled to its equal protection.

It denies the right to fair and public hearings by an independent and impartial tribunal.

It denies the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

It denies the right of opinion and expression.

It denies the right to freedom of peaceful assembly.

It denies that the individual may not be held in slavery or servitude.

It denies that the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government.

That these human rights are so flagrantly repudiated in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and even in your own country is cause for our concern.

1956 in Hungary and Poland, 1968 in Czechoslovakia and 1970 in Poland again have shown clearly the eternal unquenchability of man's desire to be free, whatever the odds against success, whatever the sacrifice required.

Americans of Polish, Hungarian, Czech or Slovak descent will never recognize the Soviet domination of East-Central Europe. We cannot condone in words or even in our minds any summit meeting, treaty declaration or tacit understanding which promotes or acknowledges the subjugation of our sisters and brothers.

The claim of the nations of East-Central

Europe to independence and liberty is not based on sentiment or politics. It is deeply rooted in history, in culture and in law. No matter what sort of puppet government they may maintain we do not mean to see that claim abandoned.

The fulfillment of the political, economic and ideological aspirations of the peoples of East-Central Europe is blocked by the occupation of their territory by the Red Army, by the unscrupulous economic exploitation by the Soviet Union, and by the brutal control exerted by the arms of the Soviet Secret Police. Giving testimony to the sincerity of your stated principles of non-interference in internal affairs, recognition of the right of every state to sovereignty and of promotion of unbreakable peace, behooves you to:

Assure the right to emigrate to those Soviet citizens, residents and political prisoners who desire to leave the Soviet Union and find a new life in their chosen land.

Stop the economic exploitation of the peoples of East-Central Europe and cease to use the products of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland to support the spread of Communist doctrine and Soviet influence throughout the World.

Remove all Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland.

Guided by the traditions, convictions and principles expressed above we call upon you, Mr. Secretary, that in order to accomplish your own stated goal of "unbreakable peace in which alone is possible a true cooperation of sovereign European States with equal rights," during your visit with our President hasten by every honorable and reasonable means the arrival of the day when the men and women of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland will stand again free from Soviet military and ideological domination, in liberty and justice.

REMARKS OF LEONARD DAVIS AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONY OF THE ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues that on February 12, the University of Southern California, in my own 21st District, dedicated new facilities for its Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center.

The center, made possible by the generosity of, among others, Leonard Davis, president of the Colonial Penn Insurance Co., of Pennsylvania, as well as the members of the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers' Association, aims at improving the quality of life for our older citizens through its programs of research in the biological and social sciences, and graduate training and public service programs.

Mr. Speaker, during the formal dedication ceremony, Dr. Norman Topping, chancellor of the university, Mr. Davis, and others, spoke of what the center could mean to Americans aged 65 and over as well as of the generosity of those

who had helped make the center a reality.

Said Mr. Davis:

The Center with its diversity of studies touching on all the areas of life will be a tremendous source of help and enlightenment. The time is at hand to find a new and better way to live old age. That is what those growing old and those studying aging must do together, and we take the very first step here today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert Dr. Topping's introduction of Leonard Davis, along with Mr. Davis' remarks, at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF DR. NORMAN TOPPING

Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen. It has been my privilege to take part in the dedication of many fine buildings on our campus. None of these occasions has been a greater pleasure than today's ceremony.

In this handsome facility we can see a building of the future. For the aged do have a great future. Moreover, the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center stands not only for that future but as a pioneering landmark today, setting an excellent example for other academic institutions.

This building is a culmination of a great and dedicated effort led by Leonard Davis, President of the Ethel Percy Andrus Memorial Fund which contributed so substantially to the construction of the center. A man whom I have the honor to introduce this morning.

Mr. Davis, who is also the President of the Colonial Penn Insurance Company, has long devoted much time and energy, both to the cause of older people and to educational institutions. A graduate of City College of New York, he served as Chairman of the Board of the Alumni Fund. He established the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics at the University of Pennsylvania and has given major support to Brandeis University.

Mr. Davis was in the midst of a successful insurance career in 1955 when he was approached by Dr. Andrus to establish an insurance program for retired people. Until that time no insurance company in this country was able to underwrite the need of the vast number of people in their later years. Perhaps these companies had seen that there was much difficulty as yet. But Leonard Davis, typically, saw an opportunity to serve a great population and so he created the first actuarially sound health and accident insurance plan for the nation's elderly.

For this, and his many other accomplishments, he has received well-deserved honor and respect from retired persons throughout the nation. Indeed the two great organizations for retired men and women represented here today made him their Honorary President.

In recognition of his remarkable achievements, this University presented him with an Honorary Degree two years ago. The Degree citation said, in part, "While still a young man Leonard Davis became outraged by the discrimination against those who have lived more than three score years. Using his innovative talents and business acumen, he has devoted his life to improving the human condition for millions of older Americans."

The citation concluded, "For his far-reaching accomplishments on behalf of each of us in America, the University of Southern California is proud indeed to bestow its highest honor upon Leonard Davis."

Ladies and gentlemen, we felt strongly for Mr. Davis when those words were first uttered, and our whole-hearted admiration for him—which we share with all who know this great man—only increases with the passage of time.

It is a privilege to present our very good friend, Chairman of the Board of Counsellors of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center, Mr. Leonard Davis.

REMARKS OF LEONARD DAVIS

A NEW ERA

Dr. Topping, President Hubbard, Jim Birren, ladies and gentlemen, and very, very distinguished guests. We are here today because of two very remarkable social phenomena, both having to do with human aging.

AARP-NRTA

The first concerns older persons themselves. This building stands today because the members of two great organizations, the American Association of Retired Persons and the National Retired Teachers Association, saw the need for just such a training and research facility. They were determined that it would rise as a living memorial to their founder, Dr. Ethel Percy Andrus, one of our nation's most ardent and innovative pioneers in the field of creative aging.

The second has to do with the brilliant and dedicated men and women who will staff the Center. Men and women who are still young but who have recognized aging as the last, great unexplored frontier in human experience and have chosen to devote their time, their talents, their lives to opening up this frontier and realizing its fullest possibilities.

Twenty-five years ago this building would not have existed because older people, being pushed by great social upheaval into the backwaters of life, had not become aroused to the challenges this very upheaval presented them. It would not have existed twenty-five years ago because at that time only a handful of the most perceptive and far-sighted scholars and scientists were deserting proven fields of study and forging their way into the new study of aging.

A BRIDGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT

But a lot can happen in twenty-five years and today we see proof of it. Here today the people are learning about aging from living it, and the people who are learning about aging through every avenue of science and research open to them have joined hands. They have built the bridge over which will flow—from both directions—the knowledge and experience that will enlighten and enrich generations to come.

I know of no more fitting way to celebrate this occasion than by setting in motion the dialogue, the steady flow of communication between the partners in this great endeavor—between those growing old and those devoting their lives to the study of aging.

Having been so long and so closely associated with the members of AARP and NRTA and having watched them attain leadership status among the elderly of the entire nation, I would like to try to set the stage for this dialogue to begin.

First, to establish the tone, I would choose these words of Dr. Andrus, whose memory we honor here and whose greatest work was done before there were such things as gerontology centers. Dr. Andrus said, and I would like to quote: "The opportunity to live a dignified, productive and satisfying life is within the reach of all of us. We must frankly realize the changes, not only in ourselves but in the social role we can play. We must minimize old activities that we can no longer pursue successfully and adopt new ones that we can. We must graciously and progressively accept changes in the standards we place for our self-assessment. But most of all, we must face fearlessly the great problems of life that is always with us from youth to age. What are the goals that bring value and purpose to our lives? And then we must convert these goals to action."

AWAKENED OLDER GENERATION

And now we come forward to those who honor her. Let me point out that when we started this project 4 years ago, the membership of AARP and NRTA at that time was 2,000,000 members. By the time of the groundbreaking we had reached a total of 3,000,000 members, and now as we hold these opening ceremonies our membership stands at 5,000,000 members. All of which proves the very thing that Dr. Andrus staunchly maintained that this is an awakened older generation. An older generation taking its own destiny back in its own hands.

I ask you that will work at the Center to pause and consider that the subjects of your research and study will be the people who formed the 20th century. They were born with it. They matured with it, and now they grow old with it. Many of these people were born by lamplight with the help of a doctor who arrived by horse and buggy. But they have broken most of the ground rules of past generations and they have challenged most of the values, and their achievements are as diverse as harnessing atomic energy breaking the genetic code of human life and landing man on the moon.

CREATIVE RICHNESS

They have moved through the industrial age and the age of technology, making their contribution and watching everything about American life change in the process. Their knowledge and understanding are awesome. So what is the predominant message these people would like to convey to those who are committed to the study of aging.

First, I think, they would like it understood that old age cannot be treated as a fact apart from life. People do not grow old in a vacuum. They were not born old. Nor are they, through the circumstance of age, cut off from all that formed them and which they formed.

Actually a major barrier to the understanding of old age is the tendency of so many people to talk about the elderly as if they had no prior history. As if they had come into existence old. But how far from true this is. People now old are the architects of what is current. Deep sociological changes do not happen quickly enough to be offered to the people who seem to be making them happen.

They had their inception quite a while ago with the old, thus it is the results, not of abstract historical process but of their own lives with which the aging have to cope. And so we see that the traditional lament for the old man that the world has changed and passed him by is no longer valid.

More than at any other time or place, America's 20th century man has participated in his own history. To an unprecedented degree, he was not done to—he did. And the same creative richness that was capable of shaping an age is capable of shaping a new old age. And I think here we begin to see quite clearly the second overwhelmingly important thing, that older people would like those who work in their behalf to understand. It is that they do not consider aging in itself to be a problem and most certainly they do not consider themselves to be problem people. Not any more than the child, or the adolescent, or the young adult or the middle-aged person could be classified a problem because of the special characteristics of his stage of development.

SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

Certainly this does not mean that today's older people are not realistically aware of the problems that they do face. Their drive to create the center for the study of aging attests to that a thousandfold. They know the problems are many and complex. But these are the peoples who are used to problems. Seeing solutions has been an integral part of their whole lives. Yet only a small part. Now

one of the most devastating things that can happen to them is to see everything about aging; the facts, the mysteries, the deep questions, the changes, the processes and the illnesses—even the new options and opportunities all lumped together in one dismal category called "The Problem of Aging". They are not prepared to accept this.

The people we are talking about are used to thinking of problems as opportunities and acting on them accordingly. They are undaunted by the fact that many major questions about aging remain unanswered. Just as many questions about other phases of life remain to be unanswered. To them aging is just that. Another phase. A new aspect of life to be dealt with as they have dealt in turn with all the other aspects, all other phases. And they enter retirement as they would embark on any other endeavor. It is a new field to conquer and we are determined to conquer it.

And as they do, the center with its diversity of studies touching on all the areas of life will be a tremendous source of help and enlightenment. The time is at hand to find a new and better way to live old age. That is what those growing old and those studying aging must do together, and we take the very first step here today.

IMPOSSIBLE DREAM?

You may feel that what I am saying is too optimistic. We look around us and see many older people whose lives are precarious and bleak. We constantly are confronted by the shameful statistics about the number of older people who live in poverty, who are ill and dependent and have no place to turn. Does this mean that what I have been describing is an impossible dream? I don't think so.

These conditions represent not so much a picture of aging as much as a reflection of social failure which we, as a nation as a whole, must rectify. On the other hand, we know realistically, that even as we make progress that even under optimum conditions it will not be possible to rescue all the people from all of the debilitating effects of aging.

However there is a crucially important fact to bear in mind. That is that even now with so much still to be done, people suffering these effects are just a small minority of the old people. The elderly, themselves, are acutely aware of all this. The good and the bad and given half a chance they prefer to concentrate on the good.

For instance, they know of the diseases that are associated especially with old age. But they do not consider these their special plight. They prefer to regard them as diseases like other diseases, like polio and tuberculosis—and soon, we hope, cancer which will yield to the onslaught of modern medicine. Actually they are convinced, and they have the strong evidence of science on their side, that most older people can have a good and satisfying life. And therefore perhaps the greatest contribution of this generation of older people will be to conquer the fear of aging. Old age has been feared because, in a sense, it has been unknown. As it is made known, the great pleasures and achievements that are possible in this time of life will begin to emerge.

THE NEW AGING

So let's conjecture for a moment what this new aging will be like. I believe that within a relatively short period we can make it the expected thing that retired men and women devote their major efforts to the major problems that are facing them at that time of their life.

Not long ago I read an article by James Michener in which he told of the Japanese tradition which entitles a man after the age of 60 to lie in his kimono and rest as a symbol of authority and wisdom. In the United States we deal more in action than in sym-

bols, and I think this generation of older Americans can be the one that makes it genuinely accepted that older people use their accumulated experience and wisdom, not to cultivate hobbies but for the betterment of mankind.

We will see more and more people entering retirement with the explicit purpose of using leisure for something more constructive than most ordinary work, and as they do retirees may well become the real revolutionaries—or evolutionaries—dedicated to finding ways to improve life in the world as a whole. How to be humane, how to be involved, how to live at peace, how to solve the nation's complex racial problems, how to get at the root causes of crime and violence, how to restore harmony between man and his environment, how to make government more responsive to the people, and how to start this revolution in individual lives in relationships people form with each other. These have proved to be elusive questions for people caught in the stresses and pressures of competitive living. So who is better qualified to search in depth for the answers than people who have graduated out of the competitive hassle, and people with a lifetime of experience behind them. They come forward with the mature insight to do great things. Insight that time alone can bestow. And freed from the pressing duties of middle years they are prepared at last into all the special levels of leadership that they alone can fill.

OUR CONTRIBUTIONS

And so the real challenge facing us at this moment is how all of us together can contribute to this new pattern of aging. You, in the biological and medical sciences, will find additional ways to enhance the body's own miraculous ability to compensate for its gradual losses . . . so that strength and vitality will continue much later in life. You, in the social sciences, will discover what circumstances and what social equations best free the aging capacity for service and participation. And we of AARP and NRTA will continue to do the very things that Dr. Andrus so vigorously advocated.

We will work to destroy those stereotypes of aging that imprison people in narrow, frustrating roles. We will persist in our assault on chronological age, which is in no way ever a reliable measure of either reliability or capability. We will, in our work together, enable this new image of aging to be strengthened and to grow.

As all of you know, during the year that the Center was being built, the White House Conference on Aging was held in Washington, D.C. The conferees at that time called for the immediate establishment of a National Institute of Gerontology, and for the encouragement of other centers of learning to study human aging. Though legislation was enacted in those areas by the Congress, I regret to note that unfortunately it has yet to be put into law due to the Presidential veto. However I take real pride in pointing out that we anticipated this mandate at the White House Conference by at least four years.

Long before the White House Conference called for making Gerontology a separate entity within our National Institutes of Health, the University of Southern California and NRTA/AARP had joined to create a multidisciplinary Gerontology Center which would bring together specialists from every field from all over the world, to apply their expertise for enlarging the options and opportunities of those growing old.

Further, the Center would serve as a model to encourage other great Universities to develop gerontology programs until the potentials of aging can be fully realized.

THE DAWNING OF A NEW ERA

And now I think we will see a new era dawning. The private sector, the universities,

the federal government, all the people, all will be joining their efforts to seek the knowledge and understanding that will preserve the last fourth of human life from the limbo to which it might have been allowed to sink.

We at last, as a nation, will have marshalled all our forces toward achieving that ultimately fruitful maturity that reaches its peak of leadership and creativity—not in the middle years—but toward the end of life itself.

Therefore, this occasion for which we are gathered rates as one of genuine historical importance. It is a forerunner of great forward movement that is just taking shape. True, today started off just like any other day for 20,000,000 older Americans. Those still actively involved in our economic, social or government life had appointments to keep, people to see and plans to set in motion. Others who are pioneering new lifestyles of leisure and retirement approached a different kind of day, with different challenges.

To our shame, many others awoke, as of course did many younger people—as well—to a lonely, unrelenting struggle with poverty or illness. But over 5,000,000, or over 1/4th of all older Americans awoke this morning knowing that this was a special day and they had a part in making it so. Today the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center would open its doors at the University of Southern California. A day when a new dedication to explore the opportunities of aging would be affirmed. When a new probing of the heart of man's full maturity would be launched. A day rich in hope and promise with our own pioneering generation and for countless generations to follow.

AN INTIMATE FAMILY

And if I may take just one minute now in a very sentimental moment, I should like to recognize the intimate family that practically lived together, and certainly worked together during the last twelve years of Dr. Andrus' life—which I am sure were the most productive and the most important period of her life. First there was Ruth Lana, our Honorary President, who certainly was Dr. Andrus' right hand in everything that Dr. Andrus ever did. Then there was Ruth's daughter, Laura Warren, who was there for anything and everything that Dr. Andrus ever needed. And of course there was Dorothy Crippen who was her most faithful and devoted assistant. And on the east coast there were what Dr. Andrus referred laughingly as "The Three Musketeers" and their wives who devoted their entire lives to what was then this new cause to better the lives of older people. . . . Tom Zetkov who is here with us and his wife, Olga, who unfortunately is not able to be with us today . . . Leonard Floco, who recently passed away prematurely, but is with us in thought always, and of course his wife, Doris, who is with us today . . . and of course myself and my wife, Sophie.

We were fortunate to be in a group that were allowed to share her efforts, her joys, her hopes, her plans and dreams, and each of us carries with us a piece of Dr. Andrus within us and I know that everyone of us feel that we and our lives are a lot fuller for having shared this experience.

We were given a mission and I feel certain that were Dr. Andrus able to communicate today with us, she would be very proud of the way we have continued her work in both associations. And she would be equally proud of the great memorial we have built in her memory. It reflects her dignity in physical form and, more important, it reflects her purpose in the work that will be done here.

It has been a happy family and important as this day is for everyone of us here, it has a very special meaning for those of us who

were fortunate to be part of her very special family.

Thank you very much.

NEED FOR ELIMINATION OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE DEDUCTION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Western Hemisphere Trade deduction reduces a qualifying corporation's statutory tax liability rate from 48 to 34 percent, without economic or equity justifications. This tax provision has also benefited taxpayers whom the Congress never intended to benefit. When the Western Hemisphere Trade deduction—WHTC—was incorporated into the law in 1942, its original intent was to exempt American corporations actively doing business outside of the United States, but in the Western Hemisphere, from the World War II surtax.

In examining the original debates on this provision, it appears that the rationale for the original legislation in 1942 was that several American corporations, engaged in actual business operations in Latin America, actively lobbied for the provision—Patino mines in Bolivia, a telephone company in Argentina, and a railway company in Central America claimed that the surtax was unfair. The Patino mines thought the war surtax was unfair and that the U.S. tax was too high a price to pay for a U.S. charter—threatening to charter elsewhere if an exemption was not granted. Also on the committee record was a letter from ITT operating in Argentina urging the exemption. Senator George, then chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said:

That the tax laws of other countries did not levy taxes on the foreign based branches of domestic corporations and that to alleviate the inequity somewhat, and to encourage our American corporations in doing business in the western Hemisphere, we have provided the WHTC.

But what began as a so-called life saver provision for several specific U.S. corporations soon became a "free-for-all." The vague language of the provision soon allowed domestic exporters to utilize the benefits, and through a series of legal and accounting gymnastics, they created domestic subsidiaries to qualify as WHTC's. To qualify, all a corporation must do is:

First. Be a domestic corporation.
Second. Conduct all of its business in the Western Hemisphere.

Third. Receive 95 percent of its income from sources outside of the United States.

After World War II the provision was greatly expanded by judicial interpretation so that exporters, with no investment outside of the United States—or subsidiaries that are designed to benefit from the provision—could become WHTC, for tax reduction purposes.

The following is an example of how the

WHTC deduction is computed for a corporation with \$100,000 net income.

First, \$100,000 net income (normally fully taxable) times 14 percent divided by 48 percent equals \$29,167.

Second, \$100,000 net income minus \$29,167 deduction (WHTC) equals \$70,833 for taxable income.

Third, 48 percent of \$70,833 equals \$34,000 Federal tax payable.

Fourth, \$70,833 taxable income minus \$34,000 approximate Federal corporate tax paid equals \$36,833 plus \$29,167 equals \$66,000 income after tax.

The Western Hemisphere trade deduction saved this corporation about \$14,000.

The same example is taken without the WHTC deduction for a corporation with a net income of \$100,000:

First, 48 percent of \$100,000 net income equals \$48,000 Federal tax.

Second, \$48,000 Federal tax payable.

Third, \$52,000 Income after tax.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE CORPORATION ILLUSTRATES ITS LACK OF ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION

In 1942 the World War II excess profits tax was adopted by the Congress, and an exemption from that tax was granted to domestic corporations that derived 95 percent of their income from sources outside of the United States. This provision was introduced as a floor amendment in the House and passed without debate. The rationale for this special treatment was that the excess profits tax related to fiscal problems of the American domestic economy and was designed to combat the rapid increase in domestic income brought about because of defense spending. For the very few corporations—mentioned earlier—whose business activity was elsewhere in the world, primarily in Latin America, proponents urged that they should not be affected by this tax.

But looking later and deeper into the records it becomes somewhat clearer how this provision actually made it into the law. The following is a committee colloquy which took place in 1955 between Senator Douglas and Prof. Roy Blough, who was the Treasury economic expert on taxes in 1942 when the provision was adopted into law:

Senator DOUGLAS. But there is a special exception made in the case of Latin America and there is exception, as I understand it, made in the deferral of taxes on reinvested earnings of foreign incorporated subsidiaries of American concerns, am I correct?

Mr. BLOUGH. That is correct.

Senator DOUGLAS. My inquiry is, was it wise to get started down this road in the first place?

Mr. BLOUGH. Well, I was in the Treasury at the time the 14 percentage points was first put in, and my recollection is that there were a very few specific corporations which had particular financial problems, and which were represented by some pretty influential people, and Congress—

Senator DOUGLAS. This is not an economic argument. It may be a political argument, but it is not an economic argument. We are trying to be economists and statesmen, and not politicians you see.

Mr. BLOUGH. Yes indeed, and to conclude my point, and it seems to me that the considerations which dictated that action, were different from the ones you have in mind. Now, the matter has been rationalized since

then into something different, but if my memory serves me correctly, that was the actual basis for it in the first place.¹

The Treasury Department was not happy about the resulting preferential treatment and proposed as a solution that the Latin American corporations involved be exempt from the war surtax. The State Department opposed preferential treatment for American branches since it thought foreign incorporation to be a desirable solution. As a result of conflicting pressures within the administration the Treasury took no active position. Unfortunately, this was the climate in which the Western Hemisphere trade deduction came into law. And as Stanley Surrey, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, said of the WHTC in the Columbia Law Review in June, 1956:

Clearly the isolated and atypical problems which were presented in 1942 did not justify the broad rate reduction contained in the WHTC. One is struck with the paucity of Congressional consideration and discussion of these issues in 1940 and 1942. One senses the pressure exerted by a few important or persistent taxpayers and ad hoc resolutions of their problems. Yet the principles and rationalizations poured into these provisions after their adoption, are in marked contrast to their origins.

EXPORTERS JUMP ON THE BAND-WAGON

The most dramatic revenue losses to the Treasury as a result of the Western Hemisphere trade provision have been in an area that was entirely unforseen when the provision was enacted into law by the Congress. Again, speaking in the Columbia Law Review of 1956, Stanley Surrey said:

The draftsmen of the measure having in mind the corporations actively operating in Latin America which had succeeded in obtaining from Congress the lower tax rate, and lacking the sufficient tax knowledge about the general tax background respecting foreign income, simply used the pattern of prior provisions referring to income from "sources without the U.S." They believed that this language, together with a requirement that the income be derived from the "active conduct of trade or business," would properly delineate the situations involved. Subsequent developments proved that they were sadly misinformed.

Today the Western Hemisphere Trade Corp. is largely a feature of export trade and not of domestic manufacturing activities with heavy export sales.

Many corporations will break off part of their operations and create a Western Hemisphere Trade Corp. to receive the lower tax rate. Most exporters readily altered their normal business operations to fit these new tax-dictated patterns.

Nearly all of the exporters who operated under the provision recognized that their new business operations were artificially tailored to the tax rules. Tax counsels carefully scrutinized all business accounts and transactions to insure that WHTC status was not lost. Once these tax counsels make the necessary arrangements, the exporters can readily enjoy tax windfalls which an uninterested Treasury, an uncritical Congress,

and hurried draftsmen handed them in 1942.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATION

The continuance of this provision beyond its World War II setting was an accident of tax history—and an unnecessary one.

The only possible benefits resulting from this provision might be a slight increase in our export trade. But it might also be noted that this export benefit is more than offset by import inducements which are also provided by this provision. With other direct tax inducements to export, it seems needless and senseless to maintain this substantial revenue loss, expected to cost \$190 million in 1973. This tragic "tax mistake" by the Congress and the Treasury has cost American taxpayers over \$10 billion since 1942.

On Friday, June 22, I introduced a comprehensive trade bill, H.R. 8943, designed to provide a wider range of debate and alternatives during the Ways and Means Committee's current executive session consideration of H.R. 6767, the administration-backed Trade Reform Act of 1973. Included in the tax provisions of my trade proposal is a section providing for the long-overdue repeal of the Western Hemisphere Trade Corp. deduction.

It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee, during the present trade reform hearings, will accept this amendment and eliminate this "wart" from the tax code.

SOVIET RESTRICTIONS ON JEWISH EMIGRATION

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following: On June 21 I received a letter which I feel might be considered in evaluating the assurances given June 19, by General Secretary Brezhnev to congressional leaders in regard to restrictions on the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. Dr. Edward A. Stern, professor of physics at the University of Washington in Seattle, has called to my attention the plight of seven Soviet Jewish scientists who since June 10, have been on a hunger strike in Moscow to protest their being refused permission to leave the country. Attached to Professor Stern's letter is a plea dictated by Soviet scientist, Dr. Mark Azbel, which outlines the restrictions and harassment he and his colleagues have encountered.

In General Secretary Brezhnev's appearance June 19, he was quoted to the effect that 95 percent of Soviet Jews are free to emigrate and the cases of some blocked on security grounds can be reconsidered. He went on to urge that, "mutually advantageous prospects of a multi-billion dollar Soviet trade should not be bedeviled by the past." Based on those assurances, the General Secretary has

asked that United States-Soviet trade relations be freed from restrictions, such as the amendment introduced by Senator JACKSON, which would make the granting of credit and "most-favored-nation" tariff treatment to the Soviet Union contingent on a guarantee of free emigration of Soviet Jews.

While I find it encouraging that Mr. Brezhnev chose to confront this question in a spirit of accommodation, I do not believe we should allow his persuasive presence or our unquestionable interests in detente to deter critical examination of the basis on which he has made his assurances.

To contribute to the ongoing discussion of whether or not restrictions to Soviet-American trade should be imposed or withdrawn based on the emigration question, I am inserting Professor Stern's letter and accompanying enclosure in the RECORD.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Wash., June 15, 1973.

HON. FLOYD HICKS,
House of Representatives,
Legislative Building,
Olympia, Wash.

SIR: I am writing this letter to request your support for the seven Soviet Jewish Scientists who started a hunger strike in Moscow on June 10. The State of Washington has a unique and special interest in this situation because the University of Washington became one of the first and the best lines of their communication to the outside world.

In the course of exploring the possibility of inviting Prof. Mark Ya. Azbel to visit our physics department for an extended time, as approved by our department, and with the full support of the College, I telephoned Azbel in Moscow on Friday June 8. He told me that the realization of his visit was not up to him, but to me and other concerned scientists, and asked if I would be willing to copy a letter that he would dictate over the phone. He requested that this letter get the fullest publicity, both in the scientific and general communities, as only through such publicity and support that it may engender could he hope to be allowed to leave the Soviet Union. He had applied for emigration to Israel and heard on May 21, that his application was denied, this in spite of the fact that his 12 year old son is already in Israel and in spite of the fact that he has never been involved in any classified research. He is being refused simply because he is a professor!

Enclosed please find a copy of his letter as dictated to me without any grammatical corrections. I believe that you will agree that it is a very touching and powerful letter.

As per his request, I called him a second time today and received the attached statement from seven Soviet Jewish Scientists including Azbel who have started a hunger strike in protest of their treatment. As you can well imagine, this is a very serious step on their part and their lives are now endangered.

I clearly do not feel qualified to suggest how you could most effectively support these seven Soviet scientists and what they represent, but I earnestly plead for your effective support. A unique opportunity exists with the coincidence of Brezhnev's visit.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. STERN,
Professor of Physics.

JUNE 8, 1973.

To the Scientists of the World:

I address to you my colleagues, Bardeen and Schrieffer, Dyson and Ziman, Peierls and Fawcett, Kittel, Dresselhaus, Mattis, Pip-

¹ Hearings before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report 84th Congress 1st. 624 (1955).

pard and Chambers. I address to all the scientists who are not indifferent to the fate of their friends in science. I address to all the scientists who are human beings and not the two hand computers.

For 20 years I was engaged in science in the Soviet Union. I want to live the rest of my life in Israel. My 12-year old son is already there. He got his permission on March 27, and yet I am not allowed to leave the USSR. I am not accused, as many others are, of being involved in the secret activities, possibly because of the topics of about 100 of my papers which were published in the Scientific magazines all over the world and which were submitted to these magazines from the well-known institute. I happen to be guilty just in being the doctor of science who must not be useful anywhere outside the USSR, and I am condemned to be separated from my son and to be forcibly detained in the USSR.

I do not know who passed this sentence on me. I do not know for how long it will act. I cannot even appeal against it. I have not got any written sentence. It was told to me only orally and only by the irresponsible visa official, the only secret court of our time who announces the most essential judgement in the life of the Jew who wants to live in Israel—without any law, any lawyers, any defenders, any publicity and even without any written sentence. Will the world accept such a bible of inquisition customs, such absence of any control, such arbitrariness? Are the scientists and their societies so weak as to allow the scientific degree to become the stamp of state property? Will the lawyers and their international organizations be silent? I cannot be silent. I appeal! Scientists over the world help me! I can never get rid of my doctor's thesis. Does it mean I shall never see my son in Israel?

MARK AZBEL,
Professor, Doctor of Science.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON PROF. MARK YA AZBEL. BORN 1932 IN SOVIET UNION

Up till the time he declared his intention to emigrate to Israel in the fall of 1972, he was a Professor and head of the Department of Electron Theory of Metals at the Landau Institute of Theoretical Physics in Moscow, the most prestigious institute in the Soviet Union. After applying to emigrate, he lost all his positions and is now receiving no salary. He is not allowed to publish in Soviet scientific journals but can publish in Western scientific journals subject to the reliability of the mails, which in his case is not reliable. Many scientists in the Soviet Union have been prohibited by their institutes to further cite his scientific work. A recent book of his own "The Electron Theory of Metals" is now being withdrawn from various libraries.

His 12-year-old son was allowed to emigrate to Israel, being notified on Mar. 27. The Soviet regulations are that a person has three weeks to emigrate after notification or else forfeit his right to leave. Only after almost two months past his son's leaving was Prof. Azbel and his wife notified on May 21 that their application to emigrate was denied.

Professor Azbel, in desperation, started on June 10, a hunger strike with six other Soviet Jewish scientists, in protest of the denial of their right to emigrate.

EDWARD A. STERN.

STATEMENT OF SEVEN SOVIET JEWISH SCIENTISTS

Seven Jewish Scientists including Professor Mark Azbel began a hunger strike of an indefinite period on June 10. The following is their statement as dictated over the telephone from Moscow June 11:

For sometime past, officials of the Soviet Ministry of the Interior have established a

practice of frankly explaining to scientists and specialists trying to leave for Israel that the reason for their detainment in the USSR is their professional qualifications. Pretense about secrecy is more and more often shed nowadays and motives of state interests and one's value as a specialist prevails. Thus, simultaneously with the suspension of the use of the education tax, it becomes all the more apparent that we are enslaved without the right of redemption. As most of the specialists lose their jobs when they apply for an exit visa, the state interest involved in our detainment is simply the right of the state to dispose of our fate at will. The fact that one of our colleagues Yevgeny Levich has been recently drafted arbitrarily as a soldier shows that the scope of our possible usefulness to the state is quite unlimited. For all we know this new kind of serfdom may be sanctified silently by many political leaders of the world. Relying, therefore, mostly upon ourselves, we intend to prove that we belong to nobody but ourselves. Being considered state property, we prefer, as a matter of principle and provided all other ways are exhausted, to destroy this property rather than recognize that anybody is entitled to our souls and bodies. As a first step we declare beginning the 10th of June a hunger strike of many days in protest against the principle of property in human beings as manifest in our forcible detainment in the USSR. The place of the hunger strike is in Moscow.

Prof. MARK AZBEL,

Physicist.

Dr. VICTOR BRAILOVSKY,

Cybernetist.

Prof. MOSES GHITERMAN,

Physicist.

Master of Science ANATOLY LIBDOBER,

Mathematician.

Dr. ALEXANDER LUNTZ,

Mathematician.

Dr. VLADIMIR ROGINSKY,

Physicist.

Prof. ALEXANDER VORONEL,

Physicist.

MISS NELLORA REEDER CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY AS TEACHER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine work that Miss Nellora Reeder has done as a teacher for the last 50 years in Port Washington, L.I. She has been honored as one of the five "Outstanding Elementary Teachers in America for 1973." About 150 former pupils and friends gathered at the Vincent Smith School in Port Washington to honor Miss Reeder. They traveled from as far as Florida and Illinois. I was delighted to have Miss Reeder visit me in Washington last week. She is an extremely competent teacher, a very charming guest, and a wonderful example for all Americans of what a dedicated teacher can do to improve the lives and education of thousands of children.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the New York Times, June 9, which chronicles only some of Miss Reeder's accomplishments.

FETE IS SCHEDULED FOR LONG ISLAND TEACHER, A RECEPTION TODAY TO MARK HER 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

(By George Vecsey)

PORT WASHINGTON, L.I., June 9.—When friends realized that Nellora Reeder was teaching her 50th year here, they offered to throw her a party at one of the nearby yacht clubs.

But the 73-year-old first-grade teacher had another idea.

"I don't smoke and I don't drink and I don't dance too well," she said. "Besides, the music they play is so loud, you can't hear your friends talk. What I'd really like is a receptor at the school, where I can visit with all the people I taught."

Therefore, the many friends of Nellora Reeder will gather tomorrow afternoon in the home-like atmosphere of the tiny and private Vincent Smith School, to honor the direct little woman who taught them good values and good reading.

The friends will also honor Miss Reeder for being named yesterday as one of the five "Outstanding Elementary Teachers in America for 1973" by an enterprise in Montgomery, Ala., that publishes seven listings of "outstanding Americans" in various fields.

TROPHY AWARDED

The company, Outstanding American Publishers, had previously included Miss Reeder among 6,000 teachers for this year. The Smith School will receive a prize of \$500 and Miss Reeder will receive a trophy, according to the company.

The world has changed vastly since Miss Reeder and Adelaide V. Smith, the founder of the school, first came here in 1923. Long Island was then a series of small villages and farmlands, and the Gold Coast of Nassau County was a playground for the favored people.

"We were never a part of the Roaring Twenties," Miss Reeder said in a recent interview, smiling slightly at the idea. "Oh, somebody might invite us to dinner and we would watch the sun set over the water. But we were trying to keep the school going. We had no time for social life."

Instead, Miss Reeder concentrated on teaching first-graders to read, using the phonetics system she had learned as a child in Florida.

"I used to edit all the textbooks for Holt, Rinehart and Winston and I never saw a method of teaching as good as Miss Reeder's," said the school's headmaster, Dr. Milton Hopkins, who serves without salary here. "All the public schools keep experimenting, but Miss Reeder's children never have a reading problem."

Miss Reeder says that children wanted to learn more and were better behaved in past years. And Miss Reeder, whose apartment is only a few feet from her classroom, laments that teachers have more pressure to rush home after school or take second jobs these days.

CHANGE IN STUDENTS

Once the student body was mostly Gold Coast—the Luckenbachs and Paleys and Guggenheims. She also taught all four children of the poet Robert Morley. Today many families from newer communities on the North Shore pay the \$1,350 for a year of small classes and individualized instruction.

The students remember Miss Reeder. This week she has received letters of praise from California, Scotland, a doctor on an aircraft carrier, lawyers, ministers, writers, teachers and businessmen, and the parents who send the next generation to learn their reading from Miss Reeder.

Most of her friends already know Miss Reeder's personal history: orphaned in Arkansas, raised in Florida by grandparents, taught in Florida and California, and then met Miss Smith, a dynamic woman who had taught Pearl Buck at Miss Jewel's Boarding School in Shanghai.

Miss Smith was running a small school in northern California when her patrons, the Gilbert Elliotts, moved to New York. However, they persuaded Miss Smith, Miss Reeder and Elizabeth Davies to form a school on this peninsula jutting into Long Island Sound.

"We had plans drawn up for a big school building," Miss Reeder said. "Then one day we got a call from Mr. Elliott on Wall Street, saying to cancel our plans. That was in 1929, you see."

The school struggled through the nineteen-thirties as the three women often worked without pay. Miss Davies died in her apartment in 1947; Miss Smith retired in 1961 and died in her apartment in 1971 at the age of 88. And Miss Reeder served as bursar, head of the lower school and director of the summer camp. She also served for 30 years as superintendent of a Friends Sunday school in Manhasset.

Now she hopes to write a book about Miss Smith and teach for at least another year.

"It seems we spend more time teaching right from wrong today," she said. "In some ways, I worry about the loss of spiritual values. But in other ways, I see good signs, I like the young college people today, the natural ones. They want to go back to a more simple life. It reminds me of something Miss Buck said before her death, that the rural life in Vermont might be some kind of salvation."

INFLATION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced into this RECORD the first editorial comment I had seen that inflation was a persistent, worldwide problem which could not be solved quickly no matter how vigorously this country moves.

Today, in the Minneapolis Tribune, columnist Sylvia Porter, says about the same thing. She is pretty straightforward in her statement that anyone who says price stability is within reach is "almost criminally impossible." Her column follows:

DON'T EXPECT SUDDEN HALT OF INFLATION
(By Sylvia Porter)

The very best you can expect from the freeze of "Phase 3½," and even the strictest controls in Phase IV, is a slowing of the annual rate of rise in your cost of living from today's 9-percent rate to a year-end rate of 4½ to 5 percent.

That is the most you can expect—and you have nothing to gain from hiding from this bleak outlook. For any official in Washington or in private industry to try to argue that the President's goal of 2½ to 3 percent by year-end is still reasonable is dishonest.

For any informed source to tell you that price stability is within reach at any time in the foreseeable future is almost criminally irresponsible.

The fact is that the price freeze of June 1973 has come very late—too late and after too much open discussion to have any shock value and thus any real impact on the very deep inflation psychology which pervades the nation now. Mid-June 1973 is far from mid-August 1971. All the freeze does is buy time for the Nixon administration to put the control machinery of Phase IV into working order. By itself the freeze can solve no problems and it may create a few more sticky ones.

Here are the fundamentals you must face:

Inflation is raging throughout the United

States and throughout the industrialized world. It is much worse in other industrialized lands than it is in this nation. This is a dominant characteristic of economic life in the second half of the 20th century. We simply have not learned how to handle it. As Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur F. Burns said in Paris recently, governments usually tackle recessions "with speed and vigor" but show "a reluctance to act with similar decisiveness" to curb economic booms—and thus, all of us have developed a disconcerting bias toward inflation.

A price freeze couldn't possibly be more than a short stop-gap measure in an economy as diverse as ours.

The inflation which is eroding the buying power of the dollar now is of the demand-pull type—meaning that excess demand is pulling up prices. This is in contrast to the inflation which was eroding the dollar when the first freeze was announced in 1971. That was of the cost-push type—meaning surging costs of labor and other items were pushing up prices. Controls could and did help moderate that type of inflation.

The only methods that will curb a demand-pull inflation are stiff monetary and fiscal policies. One fiscal weapon that would work would be tax raises that would lower demand by reducing spendable incomes. One monetary weapon that would work would be curbs on installment credit that would lower demand by reducing borrowing to buy. Both weapons were considered by the Nixon administration and both were rejected—leaving a package many critics feel is not only too late but also too little to be effective.

Our economy cannot keep spiraling upward at this pace, and it is already clearly heading toward a slowdown or a recession. But right now, the business boom is at the stage where demands for credit will be ballooning on all sides. Only the Federal Reserve is battling this inflationary force by tightening credit policy.

A tightened credit policy means higher interest rates—and if you must borrow money, higher interest rates translate into higher costs of doing business or higher costs of living.

Of course, inflation could be stopped by an economic slump so severe that it sent unemployment soaring and bankruptcies skyrocketing. That would slash demand and hold down wage increases. But it would be so criminal a "cure" as to be unthinkable.

It is against this background that you must weigh the private admissions of administration officials that they are discouraged, that they don't know how to cope with the inflation problem, that they have little hope their efforts will be successful and that, at the very best, progress toward a more tolerable annual rate of rise in living costs will be slow.

It is against this background that you must look for the controls which will be introduced in Phase IV and that will remain a part of our economy for a much longer time than the Nixon administration is now prepared to acknowledge.

It is against this background that you must learn on your own how to handle your family finances so that you get the maximum mileage out of a steadily shrinking dollar.

SHOULD ALL CARS IN ALL TOWNS GET 8 MILES TO THE GALLON

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the clean air laws raise the immediate is-

sue as to how far should we go with auto emissions. And the folks back home are asking why new cars cost more to build. Do we need the same rules for a country town as a metropolitan city? Must all cars be cut down to an 8 miles to a gallon schedule? Today the country is facing a gasoline shortage and looking for ways to have gasoline go further—not less mileage. I just read an interesting background article by Burt Schorr of the Wall Street Journal. You will be interested in his comments in the issue of May 18, 1973, and the analysis by the Wall Street Journal's Burt Schorr.

HOW BADLY DO YOU WANT CLEAN AIR?

Sooner than they realize, Americans may have to choose between the automobiles they love and the clean air they say they want.

The necessity for choice may not be obvious yet. Every 10 days Detroit announces that yet another new car sales record has been smashed. And the recent decision by the government to give automakers a one-year reprieve from tough 1975-model air pollution standards was a victory of sorts for the internal combustion engine.

Just the same, the 1970 Clean Air Act is beginning to pose fundamental questions about the nation's economic and psychological dependence on the automobile. As the principal author of that law, Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, (D., Me.), declared recently: "America—the most advanced and dependent automotive society in the world—has now reached a time of testing with the automobile."

In essence, the act sets strict air pollution standards for metropolitan areas as a whole, and urban planners already are finding that the only way to meet them will be to drastically limit the number of cars on the streets.

The law's potential impact is most starkly evident in the smog-ridden, traffic-clogged Los Angeles basin. The Environmental Protection Agency has tentatively concluded that the only way to clean up in the air in the basin may be a gasoline rationing system aimed at lowering consumption by as much as 82%. Even if, as now seems possible, this Draconian measure is modified in practice, the law seems certain to compel that area to reexamine its historic dependence on the automobile.

Meanwhile, in Denver, Washington, Seattle, Houston, New York and other pollution-plagued metropolitan areas, state and local officials are contemplating previously unthinkable steps. These restrictions include limits on downtown driving, public transit as an alternative to the private auto and local auto emission inspection programs.

Nor does the potential scope of the law end there. It also has a potential for limiting real estate developments that would generate unacceptable amounts of traffic.

States already are obligated by the law to halt further concentration of factories, power plants or other stationary emission sources where air pollution is at, or close to, unhealthy levels. (The efficacy of pollution control devices, of course, would be a consideration in any state decision.)

"COMPLEX SOURCE" IMPLICATIONS

Now the EPA has coined a term with still greater implications for an automotive society—the "complex source." It refers to sports stadiums, shopping centers, parking garages, highway intersections, or any other manmade structures whose use would generate unacceptably high accumulations of auto emissions.

The EPA is proposing that the states, or local agencies they designate, review construction plans for such projects, and subject them to public comment. To name a project acceptable, it might only require a relatively easy design change such as expanding entrance and exit ramps for freer traf-

fic flows, EPA lawyers say. But if the project simply were too large for adjacent streets to handle the traffic anticipated, for example, construction could be blocked until plans were scaled down.

Did Congress, which has been dealing gingerly with federal-state land use control proposals for two years without solid results thus far, really want all of this to happen?

Definitely not, believes one EPA official who deals regularly with lawmakers. He's convinced that "half the people on the Hill didn't have the foggiest notion of what they were voting for" back in 1970.

Actually, though, it can be argued that the politicians—if not the general public—had a pretty good idea of what they were getting into. Even though the act's reference to restraints on the automobile was buried in a line of Section 110, explanations of what it all meant weren't lacking.

The line itself required that state clean air plans comply with federal standards by means "including but not limited to land-use and transportation controls." Spelling this out, the committee report on the original Senate bill, which was passed without opposition, stated that "as much as 75% of the traffic may have to be restricted in certain large metropolitan areas" during the 1975-85 decade when low-emission vehicles generally will be replacing uncontrolled and partially controlled older models.

For a nation addicted to rolling through life on rubber tires, that's withdrawal on an awesome scale. Even Mr. Ruckelshaus, who was the man in charge of making it happen until he assumed temporary command of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sees few signs of public acceptance thus far.

"The public is very ambivalent," he says. "They want clean air tomorrow and they don't see why they can't have it. Yet they don't realize that the change of life-style required may be a change in their own life-style."

In Los Angeles, which Mr. Ruckelshaus calls the "worst possible place" to try to break the driving habit, public reaction to the talk of gasoline rationing has been one of shock, outrage and dire predictions of economic depression. Partly as a result, Mr. Ruckelshaus has suggested that the law be amended to allow EPA more flexibility to deal with Southern California's unique topographical and climatic problems. Indeed, Congress eventually may well exempt Los Angeles from some of the strictest provisions of the law.

Even so, Los Angeles is taking a hard look at ways to do without the automobile or, at least, to control its effects. These range from a big expansion of the local bus system to ultra-strict automobile inspections. And despite some holdout states, similar alternatives are being debated in much of the rest of the nation.

SOME TARGETS

New York City, for example, is aiming at a 78% reduction in carbon monoxide levels and a 67% cut in hydrocarbons to bring its air in compliance with federal air quality standards. To achieve this, it plans restraints on taxi cruising, reductions of parking space, new bridge tolls and limitations on truck deliveries. All metropolitan area vehicles also will be subjected to regular emissions inspection and maintenance.

For the Virginia suburban counties across the Potomac from Washington, the targets are 55% less carbon monoxide and 60% less hydrocarbons by 1977. State officials plan to impose a \$2 a day parking surcharge in high density employment centers, arrange the purchase of 1,300 additional transit buses to serve the area and create a carpool information system with preferential parking for shared cars.

The Texas State Air Pollution Control Board already is considering legal action to

block such EPA regulations, if they become final, as contrary to the Constitution's due process clause. The federal proposal means "government control of the developer of the state," asserts board member James D. Abrams, an El Paso contractor, who adds that this would be "a very dangerous thing."

The true test of the Clean Air Act, its ability to shove Americans out of the driver's seat and halt pouring of concrete, is still several years away. Some, like Harvard economist John P. Kain, doubt that the public will tolerate any such extreme changes in their lives, once the costs and benefits "are fully articulated."

EMIGRATION RIGHTS FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, during this past week the American people have watched with great interest the visit to this country of Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid I. Brezhnev.

On of the major concerns voiced to Mr. Brezhnev was the treatment of Soviet Jews, in particular their right to emigrate to other countries.

Last month New York City Mayor John Lindsay visited Moscow. Seymour Graubard, national chairman of the Antidefamation League accompanied him there. The following are his perceptible comments on that visit:

COMMENT: SEVEN DAYS IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By Seymour Graubard)

It is one thing to read about the courage of a people and quite another to see it for oneself. During seven days in Moscow and Leningrad I met with 30 Soviet Jews. I am filled with admiration for their courage, exhilarated by it, and at the same time profoundly depressed that in our contemporary world there is still need for Jews to be courageous if they want to remain Jews.

Last February, Vladimir F. Promyslov, Mayor of Moscow, paid an official visit to John V. Lindsay, Mayor of New York. They discussed city planning, housing, transportation, and many problems common to large cities throughout the world. Mayor Lindsay, invited to visit Moscow, made as a condition of the return visit that he be permitted to bring with him at least one American Jewish leader, that they would be allowed to meet with Soviet Jews and to discuss with Soviet officials the situation of Soviet Jews. It was on that explicit understanding that I was invited by Mr. Lindsay to join his delegation, and that the visit took place.

We arrived in the Soviet Union May 3. In Moscow and then in Leningrad, we met with Jewish activists—mostly scientists, artists, journalists and other professionals—who had applied for and been denied permits to leave the U.S.S.R. for Israel and with those whose applications had been pending for long periods of time. The members of neither group had given up hope. And, despite the fact that they knew the government was aware of our "private" meetings and, indeed, that the KGB was recording every word said, they spoke frankly. "After all," one man explained in almost flawless English, "we have already made our feelings clear to the officials, which is why the secret police has files on us."

I don't know what I expected—maybe highly emotional meetings, tears, raised

voices, expressions of indignation. But it wasn't that way at all. Each person I spoke with recited his story quietly, factually, often with humor and with a perspective of the problems faced not only by Soviet Jews but by the Soviet Union.

They had made their choice deliberately and after much thought. They knew that to apply for emigration meant dismissal from their jobs, isolation from their fellow professionals, harassment by the KGB and, most likely, imprisonment on a variety of trumped up charges. Still they had applied. They accepted the certainty of these difficulties because they sought individual freedom for themselves and especially for their children.

When questioned about anti-Semitism, each gave the same answers. It was pointed out that in the first years of the revolution, Lenin did his best to eradicate the centuries-old anti-Semitism that existed under the Czars. But under Stalin there was a resurgence of anti-Semitism, with official approval. The post-war alleged "Jewish Doctors Plot" engineered by Stalin was the signal for the suppressed anti-Semitism to become overt once more.

Thereafter, I was told, many Jewish students found it difficult to obtain admission to universities. Jewish administrators discovered that they were no longer considered eligible for promotion. Anti-Semitic publications became common under the euphemism of "anti-Zionism." Matters worsened after the Six Day War when Soviet policy became even more aligned with the Arabs.

I was told repeatedly that the head of each family, if he remained quiet, could have continued without difficulty in his present position, but that his children and their children inevitably would suffer the consequences of anti-Semitism and of a systematic destruction of their cultural heritage. So they could not remain quiet or close their eyes to what the future held. Each had gone through the arduous procedures of amassing the necessary documentation and applying for the papers that would allow emigration.

They told me that the government had long considered the desire to leave an act of disloyalty to the Soviet Union. From the Kremlin's point of view, they said, if so many Jews were permitted to leave, the government might have problems with other ethnic groups. From their point of view, they said, this was unlikely since official exit permits are granted only to those seeking to rejoin their families. "The other ethnic groups," said one man with a taut grin, "do not have many relatives in Israel or elsewhere." He said, too, that of all the ethnic groups in the Soviet Union, only the Jews are landless, another reason for wanting to go to Israel.

In an interesting departure, we met with seven of the Soviet Jews, not in their homes, but in the state suite of the plush Hotel Sovetskaya where the government puts up its honored guests. Mayor Lindsay had made plans to meet them in their homes but his host, Mayor Promyslov, was concerned about "propriety" and insisted that they come to see us instead. The seven, led by Dr. Benjamin Levich, the world-famous theoretical physicist who was fired by Moscow University after applying for an exit visas in 1972, included some of the most outspoken critics of Soviet emigration policies. They came to the hotel—and Mayor Lindsay provided cake and wine, at the expense of his Soviet hosts.

Professor Levich is now a scientific worker at the Soviet Academy of Sciences, a lowly job (\$536 a month against \$1,200 he formerly earned) from which he may also be ousted. His wife, a translator, is now without work. His sons, one of whom won his doctorate when he was 20, the youngest in Soviet history, are both being harassed because of the application to leave and have been removed from positions commensurate with their

training. (A few days after my return to the United States, I received a telephone call from Mrs. Levich who told me her son, Yevgeny, had been arrested and sent to a military camp in Siberia.) Others in the group, also ousted from their professional jobs, are now unemployed or working as laborers and dishwashers.

At Mayor Lindsay's insistence, I was permitted to join him at a conference held with Boris T. Shumilin, deputy minister of internal affairs. (I was refused permission to attend Mayor Lindsay's meeting with Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin.) Mr. Shumilin, in answer to arguments in behalf of Soviet Jews, stressed that the right to exit was a matter of internal Soviet concern and that the great majority of people who submitted their papers in proper form were allowed to leave. He pointed out that nearly 30,000 had left last year and that they were leaving at the same rate in 1973. He asked Mayor Lindsay how many Jewish New Yorkers left to reside in Israel. Mr. Lindsay pointed out that the U.S. government allows its citizens to go and come freely. He said that perhaps 1,000 New York Jews a year go to Israel for permanent residence but many more go to visit and our government does not keep track.

He told Mr. Shumilin that giving Soviet Jews the right to leave would vastly improve the U.S.S.R.'s image throughout the world. He said that Americans in particular simply cannot understand why restrictions should be imposed, why Jews who apply for exit immediately lose their jobs.

Mr. Shumilin reminded us that the education tax had been dropped and that this new policy will probably continue for the next several years. He made no comment on the fact that lifting the education tax is unimportant if Soviet Jews are still prevented from leaving and discriminated against for even trying to leave.

There was nothing new or different in Mr. Shumilin's statements. They followed the official Soviet line. What was new and different was the meeting itself, the candidness of Mayor Lindsay's comments, and my participation as an American Jew. In this nation which deals in Realpolitik, the deputy minister of internal affairs was willing to discuss the topic of Soviet Jews with us. What did it mean?

To me it meant that the joint efforts of the Anti-Defamation League and other American Jewish agencies to keep the plight of Soviet Jews before the public have had even more effect than we realized. At a time when the U.S.S.R. is seeking American acceptance in order to improve the economy, Western reaction to restrictions against Soviet Jews can stand in the way. The Soviets, then, have a choice. They can either keep trying to convince us that there are no restrictions, or they can remove them. I believe that continued pressure by Americans, backed by the leaders of our government, can lead to a lifting of the restrictions as a quid pro quo for United States trade.

Hopefully, a result of our seven days may be the granting of relief to a number of Soviet Jews awaiting exit permits. From the Soviet point of view, that would be an important symbol of good will toward New York City, the center of trade and, in large measure, of the American Jewish community.

In the end, it would seem, Western morality will have little to do with U.S.S.R. attitudes toward its Jewish citizens. If Americans find this hard to accept, the Soviet Jews have accepted it long ago. This is why they can talk about their situation so matter of factly, without emotion, and with such a clear perspective of the linkage between their own problems and those of the U.S.S.R. itself.

CONSIDERATIONS ON FEDERAL FIREARMS CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time proponent of strict gun control, I was interested to receive a letter recently from Mr. James B. Sullivan. Attached to Mr. Sullivan's letter was a document he wrote containing his major observations and conclusions on firearms control after 5 years of study of the gun problem. Mr. Sullivan is a board member of the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy. His thoughts on this subject are all the more extraordinary and significant, I think, in view of the fact that he lives in Minot, N. Dak., where, I imagine, his views and his insight on the gun problem are not widely shared. Mr. Sullivan's "Considerations on Federal Firearms Control Legislation" follows:

CONSIDERATIONS ON FEDERAL FIREARMS CONTROL LEGISLATION

Let us acknowledge that no country has ever controlled gun crime without gun control.

Let us admit that the most heavily armed populace on earth is the least protected from gun crime.

Let us control all sales of lethal weapons as we control sales of lethal poisons and explosives.

Let us outlaw certain handguns as we have outlawed switch-blade knives.

Let us license our gun owners as we license other persons whose actions involve human contact.

Let us guard our lethal weapons as securely as we guard legal documents and valuables and let us register our weapons for responsibility and recoverability, if stolen.

Let us be as preventive about gun crimes as about illicit drug traffic.

Let us understand that in gun control matters we are a citizenry in common and that gun owners—60 percent of whom favor licensing—face the same taxes and risks as nonowners.

Let us ignore firearms control with the reasoning that less dangerous, less accurate and less frequently used objects also can kill.

Let us recognize that the use of firearms as murder weapons has increased by 75 percent over the last decade while other methods have remained relatively constant.

Let us remember that a gun in the wrong hands in the home is just as dangerous and as costly as a concealed weapon in criminal hands in the street.

Let us realize that society is guilty of crime not only when we fail to bring the criminal to justice but also when we do not withhold weapons from ex-felons, mental incompetents, addicts, alcoholics, etc.

Let us concede that few criminals are crafty, resourceful, affluent types who would have access to guns in attrition.

Let us listen to our leading criminologists, enforcement experts and crime study commissions on gun proliferation and gun crime.

Let us note that our jail sentences already are more severe than western Europe's.

Let us aid in law enforcement by safeguarding our law enforcement officers from easily acquired weapons.

Let us discourage gun ownership for per-

sonal protection in an age when many alert, armed policemen are being gunned to death.

Let us prohibit ownership which is not interested enough to license and register and which only provides a source of guns for thieves.

Let us accept this small addition to American paperwork as an insignificant inconvenience and a minimum expense.

Let us ponder how much more the public pays when the gun criminal pays his debt to society.

Let us dismiss the folly of small arms civil defense in an age of powerful and sophisticated weapons and let us reason that there would be no political or commercial incentive for confiscation.

Let us leave the meaning of the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution to the U.S. Supreme Court and with the fact we have 20,000 gun laws.

Let us accelerate gun control to protect the public as we have protected the public with food and drug laws, medical licenses and mine and factory safety.

Let us adopt this social reform 142 years after gun registration was adopted in England, just as we adopted old-age insurance 55 years after Germany's; a minimum wage 44 years after New Zealand's, and unemployment insurance 24 years after Great Britain's.

Let us try to conserve lives, money and goods that could be lost to gun crime as we try to conserve natural resources and other endowments.

Let us put domestic tranquility and the right to life ahead of commercial profits.

Let us legislate meaningful gun control laws in order that Americans will pay less and bleed less and die less.

FUNDING FREEZE ON PUBLIC HOUSING IN CALIFORNIA

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have sent letters to directors of housing authorities in California asking what have been the specific effects of the funding freeze for public housing on the current and future plans of their local programs.

Mr. Thomas M. Cook, executive director of the Berkeley Housing Authority, has sent me a copy of the statement he gave before an ad hoc congressional hearing held by Congressman RONALD V. DELLUMS.

As legislators who must formulate public housing policy, we must not permit the frustrations and concerns of housing program administrators to go unheeded.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of Mr. Cook's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS M. COOK

I am Thomas M. Cook, Executive Director of the Berkeley Housing Authority and the Berkeley Redevelopment Agency. These Agencies are responsible for carrying out several programs in Berkeley:

The Section 23 Leased Housing Program for low income families, consisting of 1100 units;

The Neighborhood Development Program which consists of the West Berkeley Indus-

trial Park and the Savo Island Redevelopment Area;

Provision of relocation assistance to any person who is displaced by government action in Berkeley.

I would like to discuss the effects of the recent housing moratorium and other proposed funding cutbacks upon our programs. I also wish to outline several possible ways of influencing the Administration to lift the moratorium and release funds.

LEASED HOUSING

The January 5, 1973 moratorium on subsidized housing will have two drastic effects on Berkeley's Leased Housing Program. Approval of our application for funding of 500 more leased housing units, already pending for two years, will be further delayed. This will mean that the families on our waiting list will have to wait just that much longer. In July 1971 the 1100 unit quota in our present contract was used up. Thus, for nearly two years, families on the waiting list cannot be housed until an existing leased housing unit falls vacant.

Secondly, the moratorium has prevented HUD from approving a fund increase designed to financially stabilize our present program. Two and a half years ago we requested an amendment to our present contract to increase the annual subsidy from \$1,248,120 to \$1,752,344. This amendment was to cover increased costs, such as rents we must pay to owners of the units which we lease. (Our present contract was executed in July 1969 and the amounts in this contract were based upon 1968 private market rentals.) In December 1972 our Board accepted a contract amendment offered by HUD for approximately one-third of the requested increase, however, HUD did not execute this contract amendment because of the housing moratorium.

A financial crisis could result from this failure to act. At present the Housing Authority is dipping into its reserves at the rate of approximately \$10,000 per month. We project a deficit of \$100,000 for next fiscal year. If additional funding is not approved, we may need to take one or more of the following drastic measures:

1. Reduce the size of the program and use the contract authority thus freed up to keep the remaining program solvent.
2. Establish a graded rent schedule. Under such a system somewhat higher income leased housing applicants would be housed sooner and the very low income applicant would have to wait in line much longer than at present.
3. Reduce essential services, such as maintenance and repair of leased housing units.
4. Request a contribution from the City of Berkeley.
5. Request that HUD place the Housing Authority in receivership.
6. Refuse to renew leases on units in which unusually low income families reside. On such units the gap between income and outgo currently exceeds the Federal subsidy applicable to such units.

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The Administration has also threatened sharply reduced funding of Berkeley's Neighborhood Development Program starting July 1, 1973. We understand that the purpose of such cutbacks is to smooth the transition to special community development revenue sharing, which the Administration hopes Congress will enact and make effective by July 1, 1974. (It should be noted that HUD has previously reserved funds required to complete the West Berkeley Industrial Park Urban Renewal Project and that the Neighborhood Development Program we contract with HUD for a portion of these funds each year.)

The proposed funding cutbacks would adversely affect Berkeley's NDP in several ways:

1. Some of the funds previously reserved for the West Berkeley Industrial Park could be lost. As of July 1, 1973 HUD may not permit us to use the remainder of these previously reserved funds. Then if there is a switchover to special revenue sharing on July 1, 1974, Berkeley would lose these funds in the transition. This would mean that Berkeley may need to use the new special revenue sharing funds to complete the Industrial Park, rather than other programs which the community may wish to undertake. The previously reserved funds could no longer be used for the Industrial Park.

2. Reduced funding levels would slow down progress in achieving a primary goal of the West Berkeley Industrial Park—900 additional jobs. For example, roughly 65% of the property in the project proposed for purchase has been purchased. Acquisition of the remaining property is necessary in order to produce saleable sites for job producing firms, including companies within the project area which desire to expand.

3. Our application for next years' NDP funding includes the Savo Island area. The main purpose of this small redevelopment area is to provide reasonably priced sites for housing within the means of low and moderate income families. HUD encouraged Berkeley to include this area in the application because it would help Berkeley better meet the one for one replacement housing requirements for various HUD programs in Berkeley. HUD also stated that funds reserved for the West Berkeley Industrial Park and in excess of need for this project could be used for the Savo Island area.

HUD may not now approve funding this new area, even though no new urban renewal money is involved. Two reasons are being given:

- a. Approval of the new area would involve new temporary borrowing and new land purchases. This would supposedly complicate the switchover to special revenue sharing.
 - b. HUD is no longer approving urban renewal projects which involve construction of subsidized housing, because the moratorium makes such housing infeasible.
4. Several homeowners in the Savo Island area would not be able to obtain Federal 3% remodeling loans or remodeling grants, because funds for these purposes have previously been impounded.

RELOCATION

The Berkeley Redevelopment Agency serves as a central relocation agency for the City. The housing moratorium will impede our relocation work. For example, we have previously been successful in arranging Section 235 1% interest rate loans for families who must relocate and who desire to be homeowners. In several instances this has meant that families have become homeowners for the first time. The moratorium prevents us from using this valuable tool.

What can be done to achieve a lifting of the moratorium and restoration of funding cutbacks? Several efforts are already underway.

1. The National Ad Hoc Housing Coalition was found in January as a reaction to the Federal Government's decision to impound funds. This organization is urging each State and each City to set up a local coalition consisting of a cross-section of people affected by the cutbacks. I would like to urge that Berkeley organize such a coalition.

2. I understand that several Congressmen have submitted to HUD lists of each project which is being affected by the moratorium and the cutbacks. In some instances, HUD has granted relief after reviewing these lists. An effort is being made to urge each Congressman to submit such lists to dramatize the hardship.

3. The successes of the present programs and the adverse effects of the moratorium and cutbacks need wider publicity. An ex-

ample of such an effort is the Homes for American Day held early this week in Washington.

4. People and organizations should be more actively encouraged to write Congress in support of its efforts to secure release of funds.

In 1949 the Congress set a goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. This lofty goal should not be given an indecent burial.

MICHIGAN CITY NEWS-DISPATCH COMMENTS ON HANDICAPPED RIGHTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of a fine editorial from the June 15, 1973, Michigan City, Ind., News-Dispatch concerning the education of handicapped children.

The Select Education Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, has been considering legislation in this field. The editorial follows:

HANDICAPPED RIGHTS

Special education opportunities for America's estimated seven million handicapped children are increasing over the nation at an encouraging tempo.

This is the report of Dr. Edwin W. Martin, head of the Bureau of Education for the handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education. He cites two significant advances.

First is the "comprehensive, dynamic program" authorized for the bureau by Congress. Now in its fifth year, the bureau is administering a record-breaking program of services to provide and stimulate special education for the handicapped, including grants to states, grants for teacher recruitment and training, for teaching materials, for research and innovation and for regional resource centers.

Congress' lively concern for education for the handicapped is evidenced by the fact that it has increased BEH's budget from \$1 million the first year to \$132 million for the current year.

Second, says Dr. Martin, is the intervention of the power of the law.

In Utah in 1971, the state's presiding justice made legal history by ruling that a handicapped child has the same right as a nonhandicapped child to a tax-supported education. Previously, there was no such state obligation.

In another landmark decision in Pennsylvania in 1971, the U.S. Eastern District Court in Philadelphia ordered that all mentally retarded children in the state be accorded access to a free public program of education appropriate to their learning capacities.

Also in 1971, Federal District Court in Washington ruled that the District of Columbia Board of Education could not plead lack of funds for failing to provide a public education to handicapped and emotionally disturbed children.

Legislatures and courts in more and more states are asserting that tax-supported special education for handicapped children is not merely desirable but is a civil, constitutional right.

"These court decisions and legislative enactments constitute the biggest breakthrough in the long history of the uphill fight for the rights of America's handicapped children," Dr. Martin says.

Today, 35 states have some form of mandatory law providing special education for the handicapped. Yet there remain great differences in the quantity and quality of educational services they offer.

A child born in one state may have four times as much chance of receiving special education as a child in another state. Some states have fewer than 20 per cent of their handicapped children in special classes.

Three years ago the Bureau of Education for Handicapped Children compiled the most comprehensive list of sources for education for the handicapped ever developed and invited parents and others to write in for a list of all schools and institutions in their area having such programs. During the 1972 fiscal year, it received more than 60,000 requests for information.

It's all free. Inquiries should be addressed to Closer Look, Box 1492, Washington, D.C. 20012.

POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF WATERGATE ON AMERICA'S FOREIGN RELATIONS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, many articles have been written on the Watergate affair and its consequences. Richard Rovere wrote an excellent article in the June issue of the New Yorker that covered most of the political issues involved and also discussed the possible effects of Watergate on America's foreign relations.

A particularly interesting point that Mr. Rovere discusses is that a possible side effect of the Watergate affair may be a redress of the imbalance between congressional and presidential power.

Mr. Rovere's article appears below:

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

JUNE 1.

The Watergate hearings are about to be resumed in the Senate Caucus Room, and there is pressure on the Select Committee chairman, Senator Sam Ervin, from Archibald Cox, the special prosecutor, to recess the hearings at least until the grand juries and the courts have finished their work—Cox's fear evidently being that the nationally televised hearings may taint the criminal proceedings by too much pretrial publicity. To this the Chairman responds with the assertion that it is far more important to get the facts before the public than to put a few men behind bars. The Chairman is also under some pressure, from both inside and outside the committee, to reverse the entire pattern of the hearings, which has been to question the foot soldiers first and then move on to those in the high command. The Chairman rejects the reversal of schedule as illogical and perhaps it is, but the motive of those who advocate it is to determine as quickly as possible whether or not the President bears any direct culpability beyond that which he has already acknowledged. This, it is felt, is of prime importance to the orderly conduct of domestic and, foreign affairs, under either President Nixon or, if he resigns or is removed from office, his successor. Even if the evidence justifies the House in avoiding a vote on impeachment, Watergate has already had an immobilizing effect on both our executive and legislative branches. No one of competence has as yet judged the nature of its impact overseas, because other governments either have been careful to refrain

from comment or have said that it is a strictly internal affair of ours and would lead to no change in relations—a polite attitude but, in the circumstances, hardly a credible one. (No one attributes to Watergate the lack of progress in the just completed Nixon-Pompidou talks in Iceland, however, for the French government has rarely in the past fifteen years found common ground with us.) It is the practice of diplomats the world over to keep a close watch on the standing of chiefs of state with their own people. Particularly in democratic societies, this is an aspect of power fully as important as the stability of the national currency, the size of the gross national product, or the capability of the military establishment. When Nixon and Henry Kissinger first undertook their new departures, the Administration enjoyed the confidence of the people, and even, despite the large Democratic majorities in both houses, that of Congress, and, indeed, its standing improved because of its diplomatic initiatives. Now the President is in deep trouble at home, and his stack of blue chips is less imposing. To make his position still more difficult, he has, in his latest efforts to account for what he maintains was his unawareness of the squalid and illegal activities of certain subordinates, reverted to Cold War rhetoric—to claims of the dangers we face from unnamed domestic enemies of our "national security," and to renewed assertions of his determination to have this country discharge its obligations as global policeman.

Although it remains the general hope here that impeachment will be avoided, there is increasing talk of it, and a feeling that it will be inevitable if the witnesses who have not yet testified before the Ervin committee or any of the other investigative bodies establish Presidential culpability beyond the oversights and negligence he has conceded. But there are not many, even among those who have always opposed Nixon or have lately come to do so, who hope for such a development, both because it would further unnerve the country and because it would open to serious question the essential assumption that we as a people have the ability to govern ourselves and to exercise good judgment in our choice of political leadership. A few maintain that the nation would demonstrate its soundness if it took steps that came hard but were therapeutic and in the interests of democracy. But, even in the absence of incriminating testimony followed by impeachment proceedings, there is reason to re-examine some basic assumptions. Both Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon have been among the biggest winners in American history, and both demonstrably abused or misused the powers granted them by their countrymen. It is already clear that Nixon, whether or not he was an accessory before or after the fact of Watergate, delegated authority to Cabinet members and to White House aides who were manifestly unworthy of it. Still, though it might ease the national conscience, it seems unlikely that the removal of the President would result in improving the quality of leadership. Evidently, Spiro Agnew was not party to any of the acts now under scrutiny, and perhaps was totally unaware of them, but nothing in his record suggests that he has acquired an ability to create or restore confidence, and he lacks any significant experience in foreign affairs. For all that, the House would be derelict if, given clear evidence of Presidential lawbreaking or participation in schemes to conceal lawbreaking on the part of others, it declined to order impeachment proceedings, and the Senate would be similarly derelict if it did not deliver the necessary two-thirds vote for the President's removal; such failures would merely extend complicity to the representatives and senators who did not discharge their Constitutional obligations.

In the event that no hard evidence of Presidential lawbreaking comes to light, thus allowing Nixon to avoid removal, he and the country will still face some very difficult years. He has already started to build a new Administration, but he is very far from completing the job, and there will be no easy way to persuade the country that his second team will be any more trustworthy than his first; even if he and the new appointees accomplished any such feat of persuasion, there would still remain the question of why his original judgments had brought him to the brink of disaster. There are, though, some people here who see signs of a man chastened by experience and acquiring new perceptions in his judgment of men. In his first term, Nixon was as guilty as Harry Truman ever was of "government by cronyism," and Nixon's cronies were for the most part men with far more experience of moneymaking in the corporate world than of policymaking in the public service. To be sure, there were exceptions—Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, and William Rogers come to mind—but the White House inner circle was drawn largely from advertising and related occupations, and the member with the largest influence of all, the now indicted ex-Attorney General John Mitchell, evidently had no idea that he was accountable to anyone but himself and his former law partner Richard Nixon. Among those who have observed at close range both John Mitchell and the new Attorney General, Elliot Richardson, there is little doubt that Richardson, though he is not anyone's beau ideal of a statesman, is a far better choice for the job than Mitchell ever was, and Richardson's naming of Archibald Cox as special Watergate prosecutor is almost universally approved. Those who know General Alexander Haig, who recently came in as a kind of White House chief of staff, regard him as a man of high intelligence and probity—qualities that have been in short supply in the White House for the past few years. Enthusiasm for John Connally, whose new duties have yet to be explained, is largely limited to his fellow-Texans, but at least it can be said of him that he has had a lot of experience in public life and has a record that shows no evidence of malfeasance.

But the rebuilding has barely begun, and even if the President surrounded himself with men of pure and noble character, it would benefit him little in his dealings with Congress. His critics there are growing in number and boldness—clearly signalled by the heavy voting in both houses for cutting off funds for the further bombing of Cambodia—and the concern of most legislators is with policy rather than with personnel. Until recently, many in both parties were restrained by the size of the Nixon vote last November; his critics often constituted majorities, but not large enough majorities to override Presidential vetoes. Now that the polls show Nixon enjoying the approval of only a minority, there is little political need for restraint, and Administration loyalists are contemplating a resort to the filibuster to head off the Democrats and the dissenting Republicans. Thus, a side effect of Watergate may be a redress of the imbalance between congressional and Presidential power, which is what many reformers have been calling for at least since 1965 but have been unable thus far to get, and if such a redress now comes to pass, historians may have to give credit to felons on the White House payroll. A possible way out for the President—assuming, again, his continuance in office—would be to tailor his policies so as to satisfy and disarm his opponents; he has several times in the past shown himself capable of pursuing such a strategy, but it may strike him as a bit late in the day to do so now, and doing so might bring him not praise but new charges of hypocrisy and of betraying

his closest associates. The reformers who have lamented the supremacy of Presidential power might be gratified by its end—even if they had burglars, bribers, and spies to thank—but there might come a day when they would regret the development. For the recent anguish over the near-sovereignty of the Chief Magistrate has been largely caused by the way the last two Presidents have made foreign policy and undertaken military intervention as they have seen fit. Few people have not at one time or another shared this anguish, but the perhaps unfortunate fact is that the courts have not held it unconstitutional. The roles assigned by the Constitution to Congress are only the control of the purse, the right to declare war, and the advice-and-consent rights given the Senate on appointments and treaties; these have an imposing sound and might have an imposing effect if it were not for the fact that the President is the sole spokesman for the entire country and, as clearly stated, the Commander-in-Chief of its armed services. Congress could not possibly assume either of these roles unless it were overwhelmingly of one mind, which it is not and never has been and, short of a totalitarian reorganization of American society, never could be. No single member has a mandate except from one of the fifty provinces he represents; only the President can claim the authority to speak for all. Even if the claim is spurious—even if he and the people have parted company—it remains Constitutionally defensible, and to that degree valid; there is little balance in this aspect of the system of checks and balances.

Certain observers have described it as fortunate, from Nixon's and his party's point of view, that this scandal emerged at the beginning of a Presidential term rather than close to its end; the public memory, they contend, is so short that by 1976 Watergate will be pretty much forgotten, particularly if in the next three years the Administration is able to score some triumphs in stabilizing the economy and in establishing a less dangerous set of relations with the Communist nations. But others contend that while the public tends to focus more sharply on the events of the year or so before elections than on older ones, Watergate is a very special case—one with too many ramifications to be quickly forgotten. Moreover, it is unlikely to come to an end in a month or two or three, and may, indeed, last through the next several years. In sheer magnitude, there has been nothing in our history to match Watergate. Most earlier scandals have been the product of cupidity on the part of a few individuals, whereas the stakes in Watergate have been primarily power, and the money to achieve power, and it has reached farther and higher in the bureaucracy than anything remotely resembling it. Although the Ervin committee has been low-keyed and responsible in its approach, the television coverage, which has really only just begun, has made the hearings fully as dramatic a television production as the Army-McCarthy hearings of 1954, which remain vivid in millions of memories almost two decades later. The Army-McCarthy affair contributed to the downfall of a single senator and a few men who had worked for him; Watergate has all but destroyed a half-dozen or more high government officials and at least as many of

humbler rank. Also, it is held largely responsible for the new lack of confidence in the dollar in money markets abroad, and it seems bound to have an even stronger impact on international affairs. Before the lightning struck, the President had proudly announced that this was to be the "year of Europe," and that it was his hope to have our Western allies subscribe to the "new Atlantic Charter" drawn up by Henry Kissinger (seen by many as a device for renewing American dominance and for obtaining more substantial economic and military contributions from the participating countries), and to follow this with a summit meeting with Soviet leaders and others in Eastern Europe. The Western leaders never seemed very fond of the idea, and Watergate may lead to outright rejection of it; the Communist leaders may not be put off on this account alone—the masses don't know about Watergate, and the leaders probably don't care—but the whole Nixon-Kissinger plan will fall if our traditional allies sour on it. The common opinion here is that this particular plan will go down the drain, accompanied, in all likelihood, by a lot of other plans.

—RICHARD H. ROVERE.

A-10 CONTRACT

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, distinguished gentlemen who are known to be among our country's leading military experts have testified as to the capability of the A-10 aircraft. It might be well at this time to pause and reflect on the considered remarks of these acknowledged experts.

On April 26, 1973, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Robert C. Seamans, Jr., stated that the A-10 was:

A simple, rugged, and comparatively inexpensive aircraft that can support ground forces better than any existing system. It will carry heavy ordnance loads and loiter in the combat area for extended periods. It will have combat speeds ranging from 150 to 400 knots and will be highly maneuverable, permitting targets to be kept in view for longer periods and enabling operation under low ceilings and in areas of rough terrain.

In this day of fantastic cost overruns and production delays, it is worth noting Secretary Seamans' statement that the A-10 has met all target costs and delivery schedules. Flight began in May of 1972 ahead of schedule and by October of that year, approximately 350 hours of contractor testing had been completed. Based on the performance record of the A-10, contracts were awarded for production of the aircraft.

This contract was not awarded until completion of a competitive-prototype fly-off with the A-9A. Lt. Gen. James P. Stewart, Commander of Air Force Sys-

tems Command, is quoted in the "Armed Forces Journal" of March 1973 as listing among the advantages of the A-10 over the A-9:

The lower maintenance man-hours per flight hour, 8.1 to 10.5 (this is approximately equal to the maintenance schedule for Cessna's A-37, twice as good as for the F-100, and three times as good as for the F-4).

Stewart said total program costs are about the same for both the A-10 and A-9 aircraft. However, the A-10A "prototype to production transition" would be easier and its gun installation was better—another A-10A advantage, according to the general is the "high placed engines, which would reduce chance of its engines ingesting foreign objects and let the engine operate from unprepared strips."

Lt. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, Deputy Chief of Staff for Research and Development, U.S. Air Force, says of the prototype competition:

During the prototype phase, the A-9 and A-10 each flew in excess of 300 hours in a flight test program which clearly established the airworthiness of each design. The evaluation included assessments of performance and flying qualities, operational suitability, weapons delivery, subsystem performance and maintainability. Rigorous testing of cockpit armor and fuel tanks was conducted separately, substantiating the improved survivability features of both designs. After considering the results of the prototype aircraft evaluation and the contractors' proposals for development and production, the Secretary of the Air Force determined that the cost goal could be met and selected Fairchild to continue development of the A-10.

The concept of "fly-before-buy" will be carried forward into full-scale development and production phases. We intend to continue flight testing the A-10 prototype aircraft for an additional 400 hours before an initial production decision in May 1974. This testing will include additional aerodynamic investigations, 30 mm gun-airframe flight testing and Initial Operational Test and Evaluation. After delivery of the preproduction test aircraft, additional development and initial operational testing will be performed to support the major production decisions. This approach has been structured to maximize the benefits of prototype testing to insure that adequate testing is performed to support each milestone while also providing program continuity.

As I noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 28, this is the first major weapon system to be acquired entirely through the new prototyping procedure which was received and endorsed by the Congress from then Assistant Secretary of Defense David Packard. This procedure promises much relief in the constant problem of cost overruns.

As military affairs writer Charles J. V. Murphy observed in the December 1972 issue of *Fortune*—

The AX is the first weapon system to be deliberately designed to cost—the Packard solution as modified by John Foster.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 26, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Dr. John T. Ramsey, pastor, Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who stores up sound wisdom for the upright, Thou who

are a shield to those who walk in integrity, guarding the paths of justice and preserving the way of Thy saints.

Grant the Members of this august body fear of Thee, for thereby shall come wisdom and discretion for their work,

and justice and equity for those whom they represent.

Grant them, in turn, fearlessness in the face of evil, that by their example righteousness may be exalted in our land.

Grant them, above all, increased faith