

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SPEECH BEFORE THE SLOVAK
WORLD CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, representatives of the major Slovak organizations from all parts of the world came together in Chicago to attend the General Assembly of the Slovak World Congress, held June 28 to July 1, 1973, at the Pick Congress Hotel.

The Slovak World Congress is the voice of all Slovaks in the free world with the following aims and objectives:

To support advancement in cultural, political, scientific, religious, social and economic life of the Slovak nation and its people everywhere;

To represent Slovak people before a world forum and to state and affirm the right of Slovak nations of self-determination.

I was honored to have been asked to deliver welcoming greetings to the 1,500 Slovaks who attended the Congress. The text of my remarks was as follows:

SPEECH BEFORE THE SLOVAK WORLD
CONGRESS

President Stephen Roman, Most Rev. Andrew G. Grutka, Honorary President, and Mr. Joseph Trubinsky, the Secretary for the United States of America and my good friend, I welcome cordially, all Slovaks to Chicago.

It is an honor to have the opportunity to make a few remarks before your World Congress; especially at the present time. The newspapers are filled with articles about East-West detente (dā-tant). We may well stop and ask ourselves "detente" for whom? Certainly not for the Slovaks, or other peoples of captive Eastern nations. They have not witnessed a relaxation of tensions. The Communist grip on these countries is as tight, if not tighter, than ever. Five years after the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia, close to 60,000 Soviet troops are still stationed there, and from all indications, they intend to stay.

The presence of Soviet troops on Czechoslovak and Slovak territory has made possible a policy of repression against those associated with the brief and poignant period of liberalization under Alexander Dubcek in 1968. The current series of political trials against intellectuals are painfully reminiscent of the Communist purges of the 1950s.

We in the West, are currently working on a policy of detente with the Soviet Union. Clearly, a move away from confrontation to cooperation can only promote international peace and understanding. But, closer relations with the Soviet Union should not take place without taking into full consideration the plight of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe.

The Western countries were right in insisting that freer movement of people and wider exchange of ideas and information be placed on the agenda for the European Security Conference which is scheduled to open in July. Detente in Europe will become a reality only when the barriers which keep Eastern Europe in physical and spiritual isolation are removed. I also hope that the scheduled talks on Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction will result in the withdrawal of a substan-

tial number of Soviet divisions from the countries they now occupy.

Despite the courage and perseverance the Slovaks and other peoples of Eastern Europe have displayed time and again in their relentless search for internal liberties and external sovereignty, they cannot achieve their goals without outside help. It is our duty, and only in keeping with our own ideals, to extend our support. The world will not know genuine peace until every country enjoys freedom and can exercise the right to self-determination.

The history of Slovakia is one of turmoil, frustration, and heroic struggle. Your continued devotion to the cause of a free and independent Slovakia—despite hundreds of years of oppression—is an inspiration to those of us who cherish freedom as you do. These are the characteristics that help us, in maintaining a better and stronger America.

The existence of this World Congress is an important step in achieving your long delayed place among the family of the free nations.

The true spirit of the meeting was exemplified by the statement of Mr. Stephen Roman, president of the World Congress. I would offer this for my colleagues information, and to serve as an example of the spirit of these courageous people dedicated to the principles of freedom which this country were founded upon.

SLOVAKIA IN THE FAMILY OF NATIONS

Situated at the crossroads of civilizations and exposed to the imperialistic designs of great powers, Slovaks passed through history decimated by invaders and hampered in their cultural growth.

They have survived. They gathered their spiritual and material forces, and after ten centuries of precarious existence in the shadows of European history, they re-emerged as a nation. There are more than five millions of them in their native country, on the slopes of the Carpathians and on the banks of the Danube, and scattered throughout the Sudetenland. Nearly as many Slovaks live in other parts of the world.

Neither invasions nor centuries of foreign rule were able to subdue their spirit. At the dawn of this history, their forefathers forced their conquerors to descend from their horses, cultivate the soil and build abodes. With justifiable pride they can claim that even as a conquered people and deprived of their own ruling class, they made their continued contribution to the development of European culture and civilization.

The existence of the Slovak nation can be measured by millennia. However, while historians of some nations record the glory of their dynasties and wrote pages of triumphant victories over other nations, Slovaks wrote their history by honest and hard work. Notwithstanding trials and tribulations the Slovaks were always God-fearing people, and continued their contribution to the brotherhood of man.

From the earliest days of its existence Slovakia has been a land full of spiritual and cultural resources. The Slovak plains and valleys were the cradle of Slavic civilization. The first literary works in the Slavonic language were created there; the Holy Scriptures were there translated into the vernacular and the uniquely warm and stirring beautiful Slavonic Liturgy was born there.

After their proud emergence on the scene of history in the 9th century the Slovaks were forced to recede into the shadow of European development; but, Slovakia did

not cease to be a land of culture and a place for new ideas. All cultural and artistic currents found an echo and fertile soil in Slovakia, and Slovak contribution became a part of the European cultural heritage.

For centuries Slovaks were forced to fulfill their mission in the community of European nations through the achievements of outstanding individuals. The achievements of these individuals greatly contributed to the overall efforts of humanity towards progress and civilization, although many of them are known today as members of other nations.

The Pan-Slav movement was born in Slovakia and gave it the best known poet, Kollar, and the first scientist, Safarik.

Even, under the present oppressors the people of Slovakia are surviving, as they survived under similar tyrannies in the past. The annals of history will not fail to record that it was in Slovakia where an effort, by a Slovak, Dubcek, was successful, even though brief, to give a human face to the brutal system of Soviet Communism.

These efforts resulted from the moral and philosophical principles which have guided, and continue to guide, the Slovaks throughout their history. Their philosophy of life was anchored in the idealistic rather than materialistic world outlook, in the axioms of humanism (Comenius), and in the appreciation of freedom equally for themselves as for other nations.

Such is the land from where we came and these are the people for whom we claim an equal place in the family of nations.

Today we are citizens of the United States, Canada and many other free countries of the globe; but, we proudly point to our heritage, and feel a moral obligation to speak, today, on behalf of the Slovak people when they are deprived of the freedom to communicate with the rest of the world.

AGENT HELPS WITH BETTER
LIVING ANSWERS

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, one of the unsung heroes in rural America is the local county agent. These dedicated public servants provide a vital service to citizens throughout our Nation, and their good works benefit all of us through the increasing productivity of the American farmer. Today, the county agent is an expert in many fields of endeavor.

I would like to share with my colleagues the story of this expanding panorama of responsibilities that are borne by the county agent.

The Savannah Morning News in its June 14 edition carried an excellent article concerning the work of Mr. Clarence Williams, Liberty County extension agent, and I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

AGENT HELPS WITH BETTER LIVING ANSWERS

HINESVILLE.—When people in this Georgia coastal county call their local University of Georgia Extension office, they want to know far more than how to keep beetles out of their beans.

Agriculture, home economics and 4-H work are still very much a part of the Liberty County Extension program, but leaders here have given free reign to a fourth Extension dimension: community and resource development.

When Liberty Countians call their Extension agent's office, they are likely to pose questions such as, "How can I get a new house built?" "How can I get the road paved in front of my house?" or "What can I do about all this junk sitting in my yard?"

Community and resource development is not a new Extension approach, but it is receiving more attention from Extension agents in counties like Liberty where production agriculture is not the economic mainstay it once was in this county.

AGENT HELPS FIND ANSWERS

The agent helping Liberty County residents find the answers to questions on housing, road paving, solid waste and a myriad of other problems is Clarence Williams.

Williams, supported by Commission Chairman Jones Peebles and Extension Agent Al-freda Adams, works under a clear mandate from his county commission.

Two years ago commissioners charged Williams with responsibility for community and resource development work. They asked him to serve as coordinator for community and industrial progress in the county, and since then he has moved full steam ahead on development projects.

"All my commissioners asked me to do was coordinate with individuals and groups so that we all could work together on projects," Williams said.

TAKES DIFFERENT GROUPS

"Extension is not in a position to do everything the people need in a county. It takes a lot of different people and a great number of organizations to get things done."

"We're working toward an attitude in Liberty County where any person or group planning a project will feel free to call our office and involve us," Williams emphasized. "We just want to be close enough to the people here so they will want to share their efforts with us."

"We're trying to avoid a community situation where every agency or organization is concerned with getting credit for a certain project. We want everybody involved right from the beginning."

PERSON-TO-PERSON WORK

One way Williams has sought to foster this community feeling is to do a great deal of person-to-person work. He spends much of his time talking with people about their problems and digging out what they think solutions might be.

"Often when the county is ready to pave a road, we have trouble getting the right-of-way easements," Williams said. "I find it takes knocking on doors, meeting people in the roadway or out in their fields to tell them face to face they now have a chance to get their road paved. It's a person-to-person education job."

"Sometimes I tell them, 'You remember two years ago when you came by my office and told me how you had to wade out of your yard, or the time you couldn't get your little crop planted because of standing water. We've worked on those problems and it's down to this: If we can get the right of way for this road, then we can get the drainage ditches dug or the paved road you need.'"

TRUST IS IMPORTANT

"Most of them are willing to work with you after you explain the facts to them face to face," Williams continued. "The important thing is that the trust is there. When people come to you for help on a community project, you have got to commit yourself to fulfilling

your end of the bargain. If you do, they will learn to trust you."

Williams enjoys this kind of trust from Liberty County citizens. He's built it over the past 23 years with this person-to-person philosophy. He joined the Extension staff here in 1951 and was working at community development long before the subject was blessed with a name (community development as an Extension program officially began in 1935).

"Clarence Williams has been a real asset to Liberty County," said County Engineer Leroy Coffey. "I can't think of anything going on in the county that Clarence is not involved with in some way. He helps out in every way he can."

COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

Glenn Bryant, chairman of the Liberty County Commission, is one of the people who has worked alongside Williams and has watched the community's trustful attitude grow.

"We've been working hard at it and discussing it for five or six years," Bryant said. "Liberty County didn't get this way overnight and what we've accomplished has taken the efforts of many people."

Williams' trust philosophy has had to be applied in the direction of the County Commission. One example of this developed when Williams became active in helping low income families get new housing.

Most of the land in this coastal area is low. It presents a significant problem for low income people trying to establish new housing.

"I started going to my county commissioners and asking them to have a few loads of soil hauled out to sites where people wanted to build houses," Williams said. "Usually low-income prospective homebuilders don't have the money to get a private contractor to haul the dirt for them."

BUILDING AIDS COUNTY

"Soon the commissioners were telling me this practice couldn't be continued because of the expense. I sat down with them and asked them to look at the problem from a different angle. I figure that every time we influence someone to build a new house, we add to the tax digest."

The commissioners agreed and now lack of proper soil elevation in Liberty County is not a deterrent to new home construction.

"Our efforts in low-income housing have not only meant relief and comfort to the people who now live in these homes, but they have added tremendously to the tax digest," Williams reemphasized. "I have witnessed these new homeowners being taken off the welfare rolls. They can't own one of these homes and be on welfare because they are making too much money now. This new environment has created in them the desire to be good citizens. We've helped move these people from one economic position to another."

Housing has not been Williams' only successful effort. He has been involved, at least in part, with almost every form of development in the county in recent years.

CLEAN-UP, PAINT-UP

He has helped carry out Extension clean-up and paint-up campaigns. He is active in economic opportunity programs, Coastal Area Planning and Development Commission work and other service efforts like citizen band radio, Red Cross and civil defense. He also helped stabilize a nursing home project that had wavered for years.

Another area of Extension where Williams gives a hand is the expanded food and nutrition program administered by Miss Adams. Williams considers nutrition efforts vital to progress of low-income people.

"Our expanded nutrition program has reached many families in Liberty County whom Extension has not been able to reach

before in our regular programs," said Miss Adams. "We've derived a great deal of satisfaction from the program here because we have a lot of people who really need our help."

NUTRITION AIDES

Miss Adams directs a number of nutrition aides, who work with low income people in the county by calling at their homes and teaching them improved food preservation and ways to increase their nutrition economics. Many of the homes these women visit were built because of Williams' influence.

These broad-based cooperative community efforts, in Williams' view, have combined to make Hinesville and Liberty County a growth center.

"This working together has caused Liberty to thrive and we've been relieved of a lot of the problems other communities are having," Williams said.

A RIGHTEOUS NATION

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend a short article to my colleagues that appears in the current issue of "Light for Today," a publication sponsored by the Lutheran Church of America and published by the Fortress Press under the able directorship of editor Ralph Bagger. This short essay for July 4th echoes my sentiments that we can meet the challenges that face American society only if our faith in our democratic institutions is accompanied by an equally strong faith in our God. As we return from participating in the patriotic Independence Day celebrations around the country and once again take up our legislative responsibilities, let us give some thought to the message contained in the article printed below:

A RIGHTEOUS NATION?

"The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; against them he will thunder in heaven. The Lord will judge the ends of the earth; he will give strength to his king, and exalt the power of his anointed." 1 Samuel 2:10

Independence is celebrated today in the United States, as Canada recently observed Dominion Day. Many look upon the freedom of their nation as a mark of Divine favor. But we who enjoy such freedom should never forget that God's gifts carry with them a corresponding challenge of responsibility.

Our text celebrates the chosen status of Israel, but it hinges upon faithfulness, as in verse nine.

Every Christian believes that he has received greatly from the hand of God, and this is true. But when it comes to faithfulness in carrying out the Great Commission, we become strangely silent and unresponsive. It's healthy for us to remember that Israel's disobedience led to captivity. Her great moments were enjoyed when she was faithful.

Today, we would regard our freedom as the natural consequence of our chosen way of living. But we must not forget that God is no less a part of our nation.

God of all nations, keep us mindful of Your will for us as nations and as persons, lest we feel so secure in Your good gifts that we neglect obedience. Amen.

IS THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION REALLY AN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, one of the more interesting educational groups in the country is that organization that bears the noble sounding name, "The National Educational Association." This group, which claims to be primarily interested in bettering education for the benefit of students, actually does very little for the welfare of the student. As one news reporter recently phrased it:

The National Education Association is now a big business.

It is worth noting that less than 6 percent, under \$2 million of NEA's \$31.6 million budget, is used strictly for educational activities. To me, this is not only tragic, but hypocritical, for these are the very people who are constantly badgering the Federal Government for more funds for education. If these "educators" are truly concerned about student learning, then why are they so actively spending their money in other non-educational endeavors? I was stunned to learn that, among other things, the NEA operates a multimillion dollar travel and charter flight business for the exclusive use of its members.

It seems to me that many of those arguments made to the Congress by the NEA lose much of their creditability in light of the recent article by John Mathews that appeared in the Washington Evening Star and Daily News on July 5, 1973. I am, therefore, inserting Mr. Mathews' article for I fully believe that it is worthy of the serious attention of my colleagues. The question I have is, just exactly how concerned is the National Education Association about education?

The article follows:

THE \$31.6 MILLION BUDGET: RUNNING NEA IS BIG BUSINESS

(By John Mathews)

PORTLAND, OREG.—Like big labor unions, the National Education Association—the 1.3 million-member teacher organization—is now a big business.

At its annual convention here this week, the teacher delegates are approving a \$31.6 million budget for running the NEA national office with 650 employees in Washington.

The national budget is only the tip of the financial iceberg of the teacher organization. The NEA's 53 state affiliates plus 9,000 local chapters have their own budgets estimated at \$170 million annually, according to Michael F. Dunn, the top NEA financial official. With total state and national resources of around \$200 million a year, NEA in terms of money equals the nation's largest labor unions.

At national and state levels, NEA owns elaborate office buildings and runs a multimillion dollar travel tour and charter flight business for its members. The nearly 200,000-member New York state United Teachers has its own eight-seat Beechcraft with a full-time pilot whose official employee title is "air transportation specialist."

The elected NEA president receives a salary during the year-long term of \$40,000, plus \$10,000 in expenses and a combined salary of

\$10,000 less during the year as president-elect—a healthy jump from the usual classroom teacher's salary.

The appointed NEA executive secretary, Terry E. Herndon, the organization's top administrator, is believed to be paid close to \$60,000, including fringe benefits, but his salary is not disclosed to the membership. NEA officials say they are hesitant about disclosing the executive secretary's salary because it would have an effect on salary demands of its other employees, who are represented by four different unions.

About one third of the NEA's \$31.6 million budget goes for salaries to support professional and supporting staff who give services to local teacher associations, ranging from aid during strikes to legal counsel for teachers who have been fired or suspended.

Nearly \$4 million is spent on public relations activities and publications for the membership; over \$600,000 to campaign for increased state and federal aid to education and nearly \$800,000 for Capitol Hill lobbying on behalf of legislation of interest to teachers.

Less than \$2 million or about 6 percent of the total NEA budget is allotted to strictly educational activities such as research and improvement of teacher professional skills, the budget report presented to members indicates.

In most states, NEA members pay about \$100 in dues, \$25 sent to the Washington headquarters, about \$50 to \$60 to the state organization and the remainder to the local affiliate.

As a growing enterprise, NEA is beginning to have internal disputes about possible conflicts of interest among its staff and elected leaders. Some of the state affiliates own a substantial portion of stock and have directors on the board of Horace Mann Educators, a holding company which operates a huge insurance business mainly serving teachers.

The annual convention is a major financial enterprise. The 9,000 delegates spend an estimated \$4 million to \$5 million to pay for their transportation here and their room and food expenses for seven or eight days. Most of the money comes from membership dues.

Another money-producing feature of the NEA convention is the exhibit display. Several acres of the convention hall here at the Portland Coliseum have been taken up with displays promoting everything from computers for classroom teaching to imported watches and jewelry from Switzerland, snowmobiles and "Olympic Skip Ropes."

Among the less-frequented booths are those sponsored by the three armed services. All stress the educational advantages of military services, the U.S. Army, for example, advertising itself as "Partners in Education."

Government agencies are also heavily represented in the exhibits, including many parts of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Office of Civil Defense now stresses survival techniques during natural disasters, rather than bomb shelters. The Selective Service Commission is trying to get a message out to students that they must register before their 18th birthday, even though the draft has ended.

FRANK E. BATTAGLIA

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Frank E. Battaglia, who recently retired as dean of the Corps of Official Re-

porters of Debate, after 30 years of dedicated service to this body.

Needless to say, we are all deeply grateful to Frank for his conscientious and efficient service in the House of Representatives. And while it must be difficult for him to leave the people and work he has known these 30 years, he will, I am sure, more than enjoy the opportunity for travel and relaxation that comes with complete independence.

Frank, undoubtedly, carries away with him many memories of moments both great and small on the floor of the House and we will, of course, always have fond recollections of his excellent performance and pleasant personality.

MR. GERSTENBERG SAYS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, alarming as the possible energy crisis is, it is always helpful to have somebody show up who knows the situation and who talks with good commonsense. No matter how bad off this world is, I am positive that Detroit will find a remedy. The following article, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of June 22, comments on recent remarks of Richard C. Gerstenberg, chairman of the board of General Motors:

THE VOICE OF GENERAL MOTORS: BOARD CHAIRMAN IS SANGUINE ABOUT THE ECONOMY

(By Robert J. Donovan)

WASHINGTON.—Richard C. Gerstenberg, the level-headed chairman of the board of General Motors, came to town the other day to make a speech suggesting that the country is not going to hell.

In the current atmosphere of Washington, the proposition was so startling that I dropped around to see him afterward to inquire how he could be sure in view of such things as the energy crisis, for example.

"Please," he said. "I disagree with that term. 'Energy Crisis' suggests that our own survival is at stake or that we have reached a great turning point. If everyone keeps talking about a crisis, they will create one."

"Some folks," he said, looking in the specific direction of the press, "seem to have their mind on creating one. I don't mean you will get gas every time you want it and every place you want it. I suspect we are going to have to pay more for gas. There will be temporary shortages until supplies catch up with demand. I don't look at this as anything we won't resolve. We have got to do a little better job in establishing priorities on fuel."

"We have got very extensive programs in our plants right now to see if we could do a more effective job with less fuel. In two of our plants we have pilot projects to see if we can't find a better way, despite the particular pollution problems, to get back to coal. There's a hell of a supply of coal in this country—400 to 500 years, if we could find some way to use it."

"There are 100 million vehicles on the road today. We are trying to get some sort of thing going to remind everyone of the need to conserve gasoline."

"If you lower your speed from 70 m.p.h. to 50, you might save 15% of your gas."

"This business of trying to be the first one away from a stoplight is one that is very costly in terms of fuel. You are just pouring

that old gas through every time you do it. And this business of starting, stopping, accelerating, putting your brake on is very costly not only in terms of fuel but of wear and tear.

"Also, people have become careless about the maintenance of their cars. Almost nobody ever takes his car in to have it checked, it seems. I have a notion that we have improved these cars to the point where people think all they have to do is put in a little gas and the car will take care of itself. If everyone would take their cars in and have them tuned up, it would make a tremendous difference on fuel.

"True, human nature is a very difficult thing to change. The best illustration I can give to you in that respect is that, with all the emphasis we have put on safety belts and the proven success of safety belts in saving lives, only about 30% of the people who have them use them.

"Controlling speeds is even more difficult than getting people to use seat belts because most people on the highway are always in a hurry. But I think we will get a certain response if we keep hammering away at this."

Gerstenberg, who worked his way up from timekeeper to chairman and chief executive officer of the world's largest corporation, is not one of those who shares the vision of a gasoline-short America reverting to crude little cars that get you there but without air-conditioning or other conveniences.

"People," he said, "will still want conveniences, and we have got to be smart enough to find a way to accommodate ourselves to these new pressures and still give the consumer what he wants. And he wants more convenience rather than less.

"I don't see any revolutionary change coming. The average guy has become accustomed to the freedom the auto gives him. A car gives a guy more personal liberty than he can get in any way, shape or form. On the other hand, I think we are going to have to find a better way to move people in and around our big cities other than by the private auto. GM is working on improved transit buses and locomotives for commuter lines. We have got to find better commuter stuff than we have now.

"With regard to the fuel problem, the size of the car is a big factor—weight would be a better measure. There have been dramatic changes in the kind of car today from 1968, only five years ago.

"Take our four categories: small, intermediate, regular, big. Of the first two categories, the combined GM sales in 1968 were about 30%. Today they are up to 52%. We suppose it is probably going to continue to move farther in that direction."

Speaking of the need for new power plants and an Alaska pipeline, he continued, "I am an environmentalist. I like to hunt and fish for trout, but I don't think we can retain the out-of-doors just to satisfy the trout fishermen in this country. We have got to think of the general public. I am the kind of guy who thinks we ought to grow, and if we are going to grow we have to find new sources for all the things we need, and fuel is one of the things high on the list.

"We have got to grow and look forward, and we can't have this zero-growth business. No growth, no hope. That is not for America.

"Any way you look at it, our business is awfully good at the minute. People are spending money, yet they are concerned. I guess inflation is the main worry. We will always have a certain inflation but the recent inflation in particular things, notably food, is far beyond what we can live with.

"No part of the money a guy spends, day to day, does he become more conscious of than what his wife has to pay for food. This food thing touches the housewife every day, and she complains to her husband, and this brings a hell of a lot of pressure on the unions to ask more than they might have

otherwise. It's awfully important that we get the price of food under control.

"In spite of the fact that business is good, look at what is going on in the stock market—almost an all time low in relation to earnings generally. I can't understand it. It must be lack of confidence on the part of investors."

What about the reports from Wall Street that the Watergate scandal has had a debilitating effect on the market?

"Kind of hard to assess the psychology of that thing, and psychology is a hell of a factor," Gerstenberg replied. Watergate hasn't affected car sales. As long as we make cars, that means that the guys in steel, in glass and other products we use are going to have good business.

"But I suppose that there are those who feel that if the top people in government are preoccupied with other things, then the economic problems aren't going to get the attention they deserve and I guess that is a pretty good observation.

"But it is difficult to reconcile the stock market with the business outlook as we see it, because we think business is good and is going to stay good."

CYRUS EATON DECORATED BY CHILEAN EMBASSY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, last month, during the Nixon-Brezhnev talks, Mr. Cyrus Eaton traveled to Washington, D.C., to meet with his old friend, Leonid Brezhnev. On June 19, 1973, during his Washington stay, he was decorated with the Order of Bernardo O'Higgins at the Embassy of Chile.

In presenting this honor, Mr. Pablo Valdes, Chilean Charge d'Affaires, praised Mr. Eaton not only for his help in making the Nixon-Brezhnev talks a reality but for his continuous efforts to present a realistic portrait of Chile to the American people.

I know that my colleagues in this Chamber will want to join me today in congratulating Mr. Eaton upon the receipt of this much deserved honor.

Following is a Washington Post article of June 20, 1973, describing Mr. Eaton's trip to Washington, D.C.:

HIS EFFORTS REWARDED

(By Judith Martin)

Cleveland financier Cyrus Eaton, whose business in and around Washington this week ranges from board meetings of his railroad empire on Monday to a private visit on Thursday with his old friend Leonid Brezhnev, was decorated yesterday by the Embassy of Chile.

"In your many articles and lectures, in your travels, in your conversations with leaders of this country and abroad, in your attitude, you have projected the true image of the Chilean process, which often—and many times with biased intentions—we see distorted, taken out of its actual context and judged in the light of other realities and of other experiences that have nothing in common with the road Chile has taken," said Charge d'Affaires Pablo Valdes in presenting Eaton with the Order of Bernardo O'Higgins.

He also praised Eaton as "one of the main promoters" of the international rapport symbolized in the Nixon-Brezhnev talks, and said, "What enormous satisfaction Mr. Eaton

must feel for his clear foresight at this most solemn and transcendental moment of mankind—to see in this event the culmination of one of his greatest expectations, a fact which until very recently, most people thought impossible."

Eaton will be attending a businessmen's luncheon for Brezhnev Thursday, and said that a private visit with his "old friend of more than 15 years" is being set up for that day.

In his return speech, the 89-year-old industrialist said he foresaw dramatic "changes in our Constitution—not the Constitution itself, but the interpretations it is likely to undergo." Pointing out that in the British Empire—he was born in Canada—there is no executive privilege, and every day prime ministers have to appear before their parliaments to answer questions, he predicted "fewer secrets between departments" will be allowed.

A protege of the late John D. Rockefeller Sr., Eaton made his first millions with a Canadian power plant and has, at various times, controlled Republic Steel and the Goodyear, B. F. Goodrich and Firestone tire and rubber companies.

His peacemaking career began in the 1950s, when he established the Pugwash Conferences (named after his Nova Scotia birthplace) to promote East-West understanding. He has also been credited with arranging the visits to the United States of Nikita Khrushchev, Anastas Mikoyan and Alexei Kosygin.

Although Eaton has received numerous honors from foreign universities and academies, this is only his second foreign decoration, the other being the Lenin Peace Prize, his wife said. Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W. Va.), one of the guests at yesterday's ceremony, said he keeps proposing him for the Nobel Prize.

TESTIMONIAL TO JOHN PIERINI

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pause from the deliberations of this body for just a moment to take note of the imminent retirement of Mr. John Pierini, whose service in the labor movement will long be remembered by those who have had the privilege of knowing him. Born and raised in New York City, John Pierini began his career at the age of 15 as a tile workman with his father. From this humble background, he has risen through the ranks of labor and has become an important figure in the labor movement in my hometown, San Jose, Calif. His posts in Laborers Local Union 270 in San Jose have included member of the executive board, 1951, of the local, vice president, 1956; dispatcher 1958; assistant business representative, 1960; and, finally, business manager in 1970.

These few words of praise can certainly not match his own sense of pride and accomplishment in all that he has done for his fellow members of Local 270 and, indeed, for all of his fellow citizens of San Jose. I do want him to know, however, that his efforts are appreciated by many of us and that he has the commendation of this body. I certainly hope that his well-deserved retirement is rich and fulfilling.

THE NIXON COURT

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many times in this Chamber in recent months various Members of this body have taken the floor to criticize the President of the United States. Without commenting at this time on the merits or lack of merits of that criticism, I would like to observe that in their haste to condemn the President, many of his critics and many Americans are overlooking the many positive and good accomplishments of the present administration. Unfortunately, the President's achievements in the area of foreign affairs and on the domestic scene have been frequently omitted during discussions of the Nixon Presidency.

Today, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues one of the most praiseworthy accomplishments of the current administration—its efforts to balance and strengthen the U.S. Supreme Court.

Clearly, one of the greatest influences this administration will have on the future of this Nation will be made through its appointments to the Supreme Court which have lent balance to their deliberations and strengthened the strict constructionist viewpoint of our Constitution.

I would like to commend the President on his appointments to the court and at this time, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the two following articles, both published recently in the Washington Star, on the Nixon court and on Justice Rehnquist, a Nixon appointee:

REHNQUIST ON RIGHT
(By Fred Barnes)

During an interview last fall, President Nixon extolled the virtue of having "constitutional conservatives" as federal judges.

Which particular judges was the President talking about? The first name that came to Nixon's mind was Justice William H. Rehnquist of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Since the President spoke, Rehnquist has completed his first full term on the highest court, fashioning a voting record that clearly justifies his ranking at the top of the President's list of judicial conservatives.

In fact, Rehnquist may be the most thoroughgoing and consistent conservative to serve on the Supreme Court in more than a generation.

He is an ardent advocate of judicial restraint, believing that federal and state governments should be given wide leeway in enacting and carrying out laws—without second-guessing by the courts.

States should have a right, for instance, to prohibit abortions, said Rehnquist in dissenting from the court's ruling last January which struck down state anti-abortion statutes.

In criminal cases, the justice invariably sides with police and prosecutors, voting to give them considerable leeway, too, in conducting investigations and seeking courtroom convictions.

Antitrust is one of the few areas in which Rehnquist is willing to put limits on the authority of government officials. In the only four cases decided in the 1972-73 court term which involved government attacks on al-

leged monopolistic business practices, he voted against the government each time.

Of the four justices appointed to the Supreme Court by Nixon, Rehnquist is by far the most inclined to go his own way rather than run with the crowd.

He split from the other three in 12 cases during the 1972-73 term, usually to stake out a more conservative position. The term ended last week.

This was twice as often as Justices Harry A. Blackmun or Lewis F. Powell Jr. voted against three Nixon justices. Chief Justice Warren E. Burger did not disagree with the other three even once.

The abortion case is a good example of Rehnquist's independence, and it also provides a glimpse at his brand of judicial restraint.

In the case, the court held on a 7-2 vote that states cannot bar an abortion during the first three months of pregnancy and can only demand that the abortion be performed in a hospital during the second three months. States can prohibit abortions in the final three months, the court said.

Burger, Blackmun and Powell voted in the majority. The other dissenter besides Rehnquist was Justice Byron R. White.

In his dissenting opinion, Rehnquist first raised a technical point. The court did not know, he said, how long the plaintiff had been pregnant when she filed suit seeking an abortion.

She may have been in the last trimester of pregnancy, the justice said, and the court held that states are entitled to bar abortions in this period.

"In deciding such a hypothetical lawsuit the court departs from the longstanding admonition that it should never 'formulate a rule of constitutional law broader than is required by the precise facts to which it is to be applied,'" he wrote.

Then Rehnquist complained that the ruling thrust the judiciary into the legislative domain. "To break the term of pregnancy into three distinct terms and to outline the permissible restrictions the state may impose in each one . . . partakes more of judicial legislation than it does of a determination of the intent of the drafters of the 14th Amendment," he said.

"To reach its result," he added, "the court necessarily has had to find within the scope of the 14th Amendment a right (to privacy) that was apparently completely unknown to the drafters of the amendment."

Rehnquist also dissented from the decision last month which declared unconstitutional tuition grants and tax deductions for parents of children attending parochial schools.

The financial troubles of private schools, he said, have led "to efforts on the part of those who wish to keep alive pluralism in education to obtain through legislative channels forms of permissible public assistance which were not thought necessary a generation ago."

"Within the limits permitted by the Constitution," said Rehnquist, "these decisions are quite rightly hammered out on the legislative anvil."

In other dissents, Rehnquist took these positions:

Mayors of small towns with "speed traps" should be allowed to sit as judges in traffic court, even though their salaries are paid in part from traffic fines. Seven justices disagreed and barred mayors from serving as judges.

Mississippi has the authority to levy a tax on liquor sold on federal military installations in the state.

Burbank, Calif., can prohibit jets from taking off or landing at the city's airport between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. The court majority said only the federal government has the authority to limit takeoffs and landings.

Rehnquist seems particularly out of sympathy with complaints that a statute or regu-

lation violates someone's right to equal protection of the laws. The equal protection argument was the basis for many liberal rulings during the regime of former Chief Justice Earl Warren.

When the court in May struck down an Air Force regulation on equal protection grounds because it provided female officers with fewer fringe benefits than male officers, Rehnquist was the lone dissenter.

He dissented alone again when the court last month ruled that New York violated the equal protection clause by preventing resident aliens from gaining permanent jobs with the state government.

Rehnquist's dissents demonstrate the consistency of his conservatism, but he mostly voted with the majority, since the court usually handed down conservative rulings.

He joined the majority in rejecting claims that the financing of public schools through property taxes denied equal protection to the poor. Despite the fact that property tax financing leads to wide disparities in per-pupil expenditures, the court said it is lawful.

Rehnquist authored the majority opinions in two important cases in which the court, again turning down equal protection arguments, cut back on the one-man, one-vote ruling of the Warren court.

In one case, Rehnquist said that deviations of up to 16.4 percent between Virginia legislative districts are "within tolerable constitutional limits."

"Neither courts nor legislatures are furnished any specialized calipers which enable them to extract from the general language of the equal protection clauses for the 14th Amendment the mathematical formula which establishes what range of percentage deviation are permissible, and what are not," he said.

Since Virginia had a rational reason for the deviations, he said, they were acceptable. Rehnquist joined the majority in a subsequent ruling which warned federal judges to leave reapportionment to state legislatures whenever possible.

In a second opinion written by Rehnquist, the court held that the right to vote in water district elections could be limited to landowners.

"Nothing in the equal protection clause precluded California from limiting the voting for directors of appellee district by totally excluding those who merely reside (but do not own land) within the district," said Rehnquist.

In criminal cases, Rehnquist regularly favors the rights of police and prosecutors over those of the accused. For instance, he joined the majority in clearing the way for a crackdown on purveyors of allegedly obscene films, books and magazines.

Rehnquist wrote the majority opinion in a major criminal case last term in which the court gave undercover agents considerable discretion to participate in crimes without risking the loss of convictions of the others involved in the crimes.

The federal agent in the case provided a key ingredient in the manufacture of an illegal drug and a lower court held that this amounted to illegal "entrapment" of a suspect.

"The infiltration of drug rings and a limited participation in their unlawful present practices," said Rehnquist, "is a recognized and permissible means of apprehension."

There are "circumstances when the use of deceit is the only practicable law enforcement technique available. It is only when the government's deception actually implants the criminal design in the mind of the defendant that the defense of entrapment comes into play," he wrote.

Rehnquist is given to using strong and vivid language to press home his point. He said topless and bottomless bar feature "Bacchanalian revelries" which states are entitled to ban under the 21st Amendment.

Accusing the court majority of misconstruing a federal law in another case, he said: "The court apparently feels, like Faust, that it has in its previous decisions made its bargain with the devil, and it does not shy from this final step in the rewriting of the statute."

In an antitrust case, he claimed that the court majority had performed a "theory transplant" in order to rescue a government prosecution that was a "litigation casualty."

He said the court ruled in the government's favor on the basis of a theory which the government had never raised during the initial trial.

The highest court's action, Rehnquist declared, "is a drastic and unwarranted departure from the most basic principles of civil litigation and appellate review." The justices were guilty of "flagrantly disregarding some of the axioms upon which our judicial system is founded," he asserted.

Better than any other justice, Rehnquist's voting record coincides with the positions of President Nixon, who favors antiabortion laws, aid to parents of parochial school students and a crackdown on obscenity.

The President has also opposed systematic desegregation of school districts in the North, and Rehnquist was the only justice to agree with him on this issue.

At 48, Rehnquist is the youngest member of the Supreme Court. Powell and Burger are 65 and Blackmun is 64. By all odds, Rehnquist will remain on the court far longer than the other three.

Because of this, the appointment of Rehnquist may have been Nixon's most important, for Rehnquist's conservative influence on the law may be felt for as long as Justice William O. Douglas' liberal influence has been.

THE NIXON COURT: A LASTING INFLUENCE

To a large degree, President Nixon has built on sand. The wind soon by the Plumbbers in the spring of 1972 has reaped the Ervin Committee whirlwind of the summer of 1973. The massive electoral majority achieved by Mr. Nixon last November, which made anything possible in the domestic field, has evaporated in the gusts and uncertainties of Watergate to the point where the prospect is for an emasculated presidency incapable of commanding either obedience or respect.

Even in the field of foreign affairs, where Mr. Nixon feels most comfortable, much of the flow of summitry has worn off. Even to men such as Senator Henry Jackson, who has been a staunch supporter of the President, it now appears that the Russians have hornswoogled us on everything from grain deals to emigration agreements.

The dust accompanying the collapse of conservative dreams of major gains in domestic legislation and foreign policy has largely obscured what may well prove to be Mr. Nixon's lasting legacy to the nation: the emergence of a Supreme Court—whether it be called the Burger court or the Nixon court—less activist than the Warren court and more attuned to what the mass of the people of this country want the judiciary to be.

No president since Franklin Delano Roosevelt has had as great an opportunity to shape the court in his own image. Roosevelt in 1932, like Nixon 1968, inherited a court whose members were deeply antipathetic to his political views.

Although Roosevelt's plan to pack the court failed, the nine justices "read the election returns" of 1936 and New Deal legislation thereafter received a more sympathetic hearing. Ultimately, FDR was able to appoint eight justices (the last survivor is Associate Justice William O. Douglas), more than any other president except Washington, who started with an empty bench.

Mr. Nixon in his first term had the opportunity to fill four slots on the nine-member bench. His first appointment, on May 22,

1969, was Chief Justice Warren Earl Burger, who is now 65. Burger was followed by his life-long friend and "Minnesota Twin," Harry A. Blackmun, now 64, appointed on April 14, 1970, after the Haynsworth and Carswell fiascoes. There followed, late in 1971, the appointments of Lewis F. Powell Jr. of Virginia and William H. Rehnquist of Arizona. Powell is 66, Rehnquist 49.

This gave Mr. Nixon a solid, four-man bloc of conservative judges, opposed to which are three liberal holdovers from the Warren court, Associate Justices William Brennan Jr., 67, Thurgood Marshall, 65, and Douglas, 74.

In such a situation, the attitudes (and legal opinions) of the court's two "swing" members, Eisenhower-appointed Potter Stewart, 58, and Kennedy-appointed Byron R. ("Whizzer") White, 56, clearly became crucial.

Somewhat surprisingly to the politically doctrinaire, it has been White, the former All-American and Rhodes Scholar, who has carried the ball more frequently for the Nixon team than Stewart, the Republican appointee.

In the court term recently concluded, White joined the four Nixon appointees on 101 of their 107 joint decisions, a whopping 94 percent of the time. Stewart was slightly less dependable but still gave the Nixon bloc considerable support, voting with it on 75 percent of its joint decisions.

This is not to say that the Burger court has been slavishly subservient to Mr. Nixon's will. The court has, in effect, struck down the death penalty, which the President favored, and upheld a restricted right to abortion, which Mr. Nixon opposed. Again in contrast to the President's publicly expressed will, the court has ruled against state aid, direct or indirect, to hard-pressed parochial schools.

In contrast to the dark predictions of many liberals, the court has made no effort to turn back the civil rights clock. If anything, the court has taken a more hard-nosed view of de facto school segregation in the North, ruling (in the Denver case) that a substantial pocket of segregation in a school district is unconstitutional even if it is a consequence of socio-economic pressures rather than (as in the South) a remnant of de jure segregation. Women, like blacks, have gained under the Burger court in their fight against discrimination, and the court—long before Watergate became a cause celebre—sharply restricted the admissible use of electronic surveillance in domestic security cases.

Where the court did take a tougher stance—and one in our view long overdue—was balancing the rights of the accused against those of the victims in criminal cases. Without going into detail on what the court's position was on individual cases, suffice it to say that in 23 of 36 cases it upheld the position of the prosecution.

Doctrinaire liberals take exception to the court's upholding of a Virginia reapportionment plan which allows for variations of up to 16.4 percent among its lower-house districts. While this is in technical violation of the "one man-one vote" principle, doctrine always must be tempered with practicality.

In our view the one major decision in which the court erred was its 5-4 (White voting with the Nixon bloc) obscenity decision. We grant that the smut glut had become unpleasantly prevalent, but to combat it at the expense of the First Amendment, opening the gates to local sheriffs and vigilante committees to act as self-appointed guardians of public morals, hardly made sense.

In any case, what emerges from a scrutiny of the first full term of the Nixon court is something a little more complex than a simple swing to the right. This court clearly is less activist and pioneering than the Warren court, and it could become even less so

if Mr. Nixon has an opportunity to make further appointments.

But rather than attempting to overturn any of the landmark decisions of the 1960s, the Burger court has contented itself with interpreting these decisions in a narrower and more restrictive way. Precedents are not being swept aside but redefined.

There are those who regret the end of the judicial crusade toward a utopian and egalitarian promised land. But it takes a while for a people to accept and digest sweeping, court-ordered social changes. The Warren court did well by America. But so, too, in its first term and in a different way has the Burger court. It has given us respite and time to reassess who we are and where—and how fast—we want to go, and there is nothing the matter with that.

In the end, despite promises unfulfilled in domestic legislation and foreign affairs, the Supreme Court he leaves behind him may prove to have been Mr. Nixon's most solid and lasting achievement.

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has shown its concern for the progress and development of rural areas on several occasions. In the future that interest and concern may become even more specific as it gets near harvest time and the energy crisis turns into a potential food crisis. Energy is needed both on the farms and in our rural communities to process food and sustain those communities. The city council of New Ulm, which is in my district, recently passed a resolution setting forth their concern will be heard here in Washington and policies established to address the difficulties they face.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Councilor Germann offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Whereas, the entire United States is experiencing a shortage in basic fuels, and

Whereas, said shortage apparently is more acute in Upper Midwestern States, including the State of Minnesota, and

Whereas, the City of New Ulm, Brown County, Minnesota as a municipal organization generates and provides electricity, and both high and low pressure steam, and distributes natural gas to its residents, businesses and industries, and

Whereas, the economic well-being of said City is thus dependent upon its ability to acquire sufficient amounts of natural gas, fuel oil and coal.

So, therefore, be it resolved, by the City Council of the City of New Ulm, Brown County, Minnesota that the Congress of the United States be urged to establish as a matter of national priority, an overall and coordinated program of fossil fuel usage and allocation to insure prudent and fair use of national fuel resources so that the economic viability of the entire country can be sustained.

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman Ancher Nelson, Senators Hubert Humphrey and Walter Mondale and to Governor Wendell R. Anderson.

The motion for the adoption of the fore-

going resolution was duly seconded by Councillor Mowan and the roll being called, the following vote was recorded:

Voting Aye: Councillors Germann, Hippert, Huevelmann, Mowan and President Gafford.
Voting No: None.
Not voting: None.

Whereupon said resolution was declared to have been duly adopted this 5th day of June, 1973.

BILL LUCY, A FIGHTER FOR THE POWERLESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a man in Washington who has done more work for the poor and powerless in the last 10 years than many do in an entire lifetime.

His name is William Lucy, a former constituent of mine from Richmond, Calif., now a resident of Washington, D.C. He has gone from local California politics in Contra Costa County, Calif., to Washington, where he now heads the District of Columbia Democratic Central Committee.

The vehicle through which Mr. Lucy has led his fight for the working man has been the labor union. While working in a county agency, he helped convert an employees group into a local independent union that eventually affiliated with the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees. This was in the early 1960's. In 1966, he was named associate director of AFSCME's Washington lobbying office, and just last year was elected to the No. 2 post of secretary-treasurer. Through his leadership capabilities and dedication to his work, Mr. Lucy has continued to build a better place in society for those whose voice would not otherwise be heard.

On Saturday, June 9, 1973, the Washington Post printed an article about Mr. Lucy, covering his career with AFSCME over the years. I submit it to the RECORD in recognition of a new leader in service of an important union; a personal friend, not only of myself, but of the powerless everywhere:

TOP DISTRICT DEMOCRAT NEEDED MORE THAN
"A BIG MOUTH"

(By Paul Ramirez)

William Lucy's cursory explanation of how he began his quick ascent in organized labor is that "if you have a big mouth, you get elected to something."

But those who have observed Lucy's rapid rise as he became one of the highest ranking black labor leaders in the country and, more recently, an emerging figure in Washington's local Democratic politics, say that it was ability and dedication—not the strength of his vocal cords—that thrust Lucy into a string of leadership roles.

In more introspective moments, Lucy, the 39-year-old secretary-treasurer of the 500,000-member American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, says it was frustration that set him on the way, the frustration of the "little people," especially the poor, and the belief that labor unions are

ideally suited to lead the fight on their behalf.

It was this view of unions as social and political catalysts that drew Lucy into local politics, first in Contra Costa County, Calif., and, more recently, in Washington, where he heads the D.C. Democratic Central Committee.

His involvement in local D.C. politics began in 1970, when the local chapters of the AFSCME endorsed the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy in his first bid for D.C. delegate to Congress. Lucy says that endorsement played a crucial role in Fauntroy's subsequent victory. "If we hadn't supported him, he would have been a dead turkey," he says. The union represents some 10,000 local workers, including 7,500 D.C. government employees in jobs ranging from trash collection to clerical positions.

But even that endorsement was somewhat uncharacteristic of Lucy, who claims to prefer "issues" to "politicians."

"Getting involved in candidates . . . (is) . . . a waste of time," he says. "You generally have to reach an understanding with the candidate and he reaches an understanding with you and both of you lie to each other and, in the end, it's the poor guy in the street who gets hosed."

But it was this association with Fauntroy that led to Lucy's election to the D.C. Democratic Central Committee. And it was his subsequent election as chairman of the committee (the party's committee charged with getting Democrats elected and speaking for the city's Democratic majority) that has contributed to friction between him and some of Fauntroy's supporters.

Lucy conducts committee meetings in an out-of-pocket manner, standing as a lightning rod between the inexperienced new members—most of whom rode Fauntroy's coattails onto the committee—and the more senior party members, like D.C. National Democratic Committeeman John Hechinger and the Rev. David Eaton, the activist pastor of All Souls Unitarian Church.

From the first meeting of the then newly elected committee. Last year, when Lucy became the city's first black central committee chairman, through the most recent meeting, when he was re-elected, central committee gatherings have been stormy affairs characterized by lengthy arguments and the frequent invocations of parliamentary procedures. (The last meeting was punctuated by a flying ashtray and a brief scuffle.)

And through it all, the wiry-framed chairman with the boyish, handsome looks calmly recognizes those who wish to speak and occasionally adds, "You may say I'm a ruthless game-player, but you can't say I'm unfair."

Thursday night's meeting, in which Lucy narrowly defeated Mr. Eaton and was re-elected to the post he had won easily in a May 2 election last year, was a vivid example of how he is no longer identified with Fauntroy or any other clear faction in local politics.

If the schism, now separating Fauntroy and Lucy were to widen, some suggest Lucy could make a formidable political opponent. With his youthful looks, his gregarious demeanor and informal approach, "he could give anybody a run for his money," says one Fauntroy adversary who admits he would like to see a Lucy-Fauntroy confrontation.

But Lucy is not talking about elections.

His union work, he says, is becoming increasingly demanding, and he would like to have some time to relax with his wife, Dorothea, and three teen-age children, William, 19; Benita, 16; and Phyllis, 14.

A native of Memphis who moved to Richmond, Calif., when he was 5 years old, Lucy grew up thinking of becoming an architect who would plan buildings for the future. Today, he sees himself as a builder of that future itself.

As a young boy, he learned "the indecencies that people are subjected to" when they are poor. That was after his father, a foreman at a nearby ranch, separated from his mother. She held a variety of service-oriented jobs, and he stayed with his mother "in a household that received welfare for a number of years."

"You spend a little bit of time thinking about the kind of a system that makes people remain over there, that forces you to stay unless you just get so much of it in your gut that you just decide to get out of there . . ." he says of those early years.

After graduating from El Cerrito High School in Richmond in 1951, he abandoned his goal to become an architect after recognizing that "at that point in time, the best a black architect would be allowed to do was lettering."

After a stint in the engineering section of the U.S. Naval Shipyard in Mare Island, Lucy joined the Contra Costa County public works department in 1953, while taking civil engineering courses at the University of California at Berkeley.

He was to work 13 years for the county agency, become its assistant materials and research engineer, and helped convert an employees group into a local independent union that eventually affiliated with the AFSCME in the early 1960s.

"In our society the trade union movement is really the only institution that can bring about change on behalf of those who have no power, on behalf of the poor."

"If a union simply becomes a dues-collecting agency or is limited to just the narrow concerns of bread and butter, then an awful lot of power is being wasted," he says.

For the half million members of the AFSCME, union activism in local issues is essential, he says.

"Our responsibility, then, goes beyond just that of the members and into the community because our people live right where they work and the union has to be a much more significant factor in not just their work but their entire lives."

By 1966, after completing a term as president of his local, Lucy's organizational performance had attracted the attention of the union's national officials. He was named associate director of the AFSCME's Washington lobbying office, dubbed the legislative and community affairs department.

In 1970, he was named executive assistant to international president Jerry Wurf, and, last year, Lucy was chosen for the union's No. 2 post. He was elected without opposition by the 1,500 delegates attending an international convention in Houston. About 30 per cent of the union's members are black.

ERNEST P. HAMMAKER

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week Frederick County lost one of its most distinguished citizens, Mr. Ernest P. Hammaker. Mr. Hammaker, 69, passed away in Hagerstown, Md., on the 4th of July.

Ernest Hammaker was active in community, business, and church activities throughout his life. He was admired and respected by all those who knew him and worked with him over the years. He was chairman of the board of Thurmont Bank, and he was associated with the Thurmont Shopping Center as well as

president of Hammaker Brothers, Inc. Memorials in Thurmont.

Ernest Hammaker will be missed by his family and his many friends throughout Frederick County. His many contributions to his community will be long remembered.

POLICE JONES

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the term "law and order" has come to be known as a familiar phrase in American life. A man who epitomizes law and order is a retired Cleveland police officer named John Henry Jones. In the community where I grew up, he was affectionately known as "Police Jones."

This policeman became a legend in his own lifetime. He was a fearless, dedicated police officer who was all man. He went about his business in a quiet, business-like manner without imposing upon any man. But, neither did he permit any man to impose upon him. He met gentleness with gentleness and violence with violence. Whatever way the arrestee chose to be arrested, "Police Jones" accommodated him—the fact was that he was going to take you in.

Mr. Speaker, John Henry Jones was one of the best known and respected black detectives in America. Last February 24, the Cleveland Call and Post carried an article written by Alvin Ward on this retired racket buster who worked with the late Elliot Ness. I commend this article about my friend, "Police Jones," to my colleagues:

JOHN HENRY JONES TELLS OF THE DAYS OF RACKET BUSTING AND ELLIOTT NESS

(By Alvin Ward)

If John Henry, in black history, has been named Jones he still would not have had any more fame, or any more of an interesting story to tell than former city detective John Henry Jones, now retired.

John H. Jones, who will be 74 years old come April 7, called the Call & Post last week to tell us that he is not dead and is still very much alive. He was referred to as "the late Detective John H. Jones" in a front page story concerning the death of another police officer.

All the inmate alumnus of the late 1930's and 1940's who served time in Ohio correctional institutions remember the famous policeman Jones who worked with the late racket buster Elliot Ness.

Relaxed in retirement now, Jones recalls with a sound of excitement in his voice how Elliot Ness called him at his home one hour before he was sworn in as Cleveland Safety Director and said to Jones, "I got a special job for you just as soon as I'm sworn in."

MAYFIELD MOB

Jones said Ness kept his word and assigned him to a special investigation that broke the Mayfield mob and sent six men to prison. Jones named Nick Satulla, Shonder Birns, Elsworth Jewell, Larry Gaskin and Herbert Oliver. Jones said a man named Richardson, who had joined in with the Mayfield mob to fight against black numbers men. The fight was to gain control of the lucrative numbers racket.

Jones said the men were indicted on extortion and blackmail of Negro numbers men. Jones worked almost four years with Ness.

The story of John H. Jones dates back to St. Clairsville, Ohio where he was born in a family of three sisters and one brother. Only one sister, Roberta Jones, is still living in Columbus, Jones says.

In his youth pictures of Jones portray a handsome six-foot-tall 210-pound dark complexioned man who dressed and acted in the suave manner of black detectives on the modern screen.

Jones says in his hometown there were only about 15 Negro families. After graduation there he went to Belair, Ohio and worked in a steel plant, but did not like the work.

He decided to come to Cleveland despite his mother's protest. His first job in Cleveland was with the Warren Paint Co.

The only other job he had before joining the police force was with the family of Burdick Jewelers at their Heights home.

JOINED POLICE

One morning Jones was seated in the kitchen of the Burdick home drinking coffee with the German maid when she spotted an announcement in the Cleveland Leader (morning newspaper) that the City was seeking applicants for the police force.

The next morning Jones went straight to City Hall for an application after dropping his boss off at the Burdick store, 1010 Euclid Ave.

The rest of the story is all success. He was in his 20's when he was appointed to the force. Jones was called 9th on the list. You could name and count the black policemen at that time on one hand. Jones calls their names to memory just as if they were together yesterday: "Pete Hill, Art McFarland, detective; John Shaffin, John Byrd, and Earl Stewart."

Jones believes those blacks on the force when he started are all deceased now with the exception of Earl Stewart and he is not sure whether he is living or not.

ROARING THIRD

Not only did Jones work on the Cleveland police force for 30 years, he also lived in the Central area, the "roaring Third District" for 25 years. Jones was well known in his neighborhood at 2306 E. 65th St.

He married twice, but had no children. He now lives at 16405 Glendale Ave.

Jones admits that he is just a little bit off on his shooting but he goes regularly to a shooting range where he keeps in practice with his gun.

"One thing they told me when I first started" Jones said, that was to never let no one touch your gun. I only did that once. A guy challenged me to a fight without my gun and so I took it off and handed it to a man standing in the street and beat the man that started the fight.

SECRET JOBS

Jones worked on many special secret assignments in 11 different states for the racket busting Safety Director Elliot Ness. For several years the television serial "The Untouchables" portrayed Ness' police work. Jones said his own personal top man was the late Detective Claude Lee.

Promoted to the detective bureau in 1940, Jones retired June 1, 1954. He visited Europe for several months, and also parts of Africa, after he retired. "As bad as they say the United States is, I'll still take America," Jones said.

For about three years after his retirement Jones served under Ohio's Mark McElroy, State Auditor, as a special investigator. He says he still does some investigative work for other sources.

He charges the judges and law makers for the high crime rate we now experience. He says today's policeman is discouraged. The criminal is released with a slap on the wrist.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS: THE QUEST FOR MORAL COURAGE

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at this time it gives me great honor to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sermon delivered by Rev. John R. Graham of the United First Parish Church in Quincy, Mass. The sermon, entitled "John Quincy Adams—The Quest for Moral Courage," was delivered on May 20, 1973.

Rev. John R. Graham, who had the honor of delivering the opening invocation on the floor of the House of Representatives on March 13 of this year, is the minister of the United First Parish Church, also known as the Church of Presidents, "where a noble heritage inspires today's living." John Adams and John Quincy Adams, the second and sixth Presidents of the United States, are buried in the crypt of the historic church.

In the following sermon, Reverend Graham illustrates the motto, "where a noble heritage inspires today's living" with his sermon concerning the moral courage of the sixth President of the United States, John Quincy Adams. A highly moving and most interesting address, I am taking the liberty of including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues to read and contemplate.

As Reverend Graham points out quite well, John Quincy Adams was a man devoted to principle. He felt that one must remain true to justice and truth at all times, without regard to self-interests. As a result of Adams' independence from partisan interests and his strict adherence to justice and truth at any price, Adams was defeated for his second term as President of the United States. He did not let this stand in his way, though. He continued in his pursuit of justice for the people of Massachusetts and the Nation as one of the most well-respected and admired Representatives to have ever served in the House of Representatives.

Reverend Graham depicts President John Quincy Adams as an inspiration to us for his dedication to service over his own interests. I believe that his sermon is of great value for today and that Reverend Graham truly shows that the late President John Quincy Adams gives example of the motto of this historic Church of Presidents, United First Parish Church of Quincy, "where a noble heritage inspires today's living."

The text follows:

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS—THE QUEST FOR MORAL COURAGE

THE STRANGE AMERICAN FOLK HERO

It's almost inconceivable that a century and a half after he was President of the United States, John Quincy Adams is emerging as an American folk hero. Yet, that's exactly what's happening today. Of all the figures in our history, none seems less at home in a twentieth century world. But, as the days pass, more and more interest is aroused in the life of "the venerable Nestor of Massachusetts."

How can it be that a man who lived by the

stern rigidities of the Puritan ideal should be honored at a time when moral values are undergoing radical change, when virtue is anything but highly regarded?

Why is it that a man who believed that hard work was the godliest of goals can find respect in a day when labor is an impertinent interruption in the life of leisure?

How can John Quincy Adams, a person of uncompromising principle, be venerated at the moment when all authority is in question and disrepute?

Isn't it strange that the most aristocratic of leaders should be rediscovered at a time when we refuse to admit that class barriers even exist?

In our day it's men of action who are honored, respected—and highly rewarded. Why should a brilliant intellectual and scholar come to enjoy unprecedented prominence?

At the very moment when religious faith and devotion seem unnecessary, why should we be concerned with a man who read the Bible daily and prayed beside his bed each night of his life?

But, of all his qualities, none seems less worthy of our interest than the inner life of John Quincy Adams. Overcome with severe self-pity and hounded by insecurity, Mr. Adams was the victim of despair and self-deprecation. Why should we concern ourselves with a man who viewed himself as a failure in a day when personal assurance and self-confidence are our most hallowed virtues?

THE SOURCE OF FASCINATION

How can we explain this fascinating affinity for John Quincy Adams? What is there about him that attracts such growing interest? It's more than awe because by many standards he was indeed a failure. Certainly his presidency was nothing less than tragic.

Perhaps, our attention for "John the Second of the House of Brantree" has nothing to do with the offices he held, the posts he filled, and the books he wrote. It may be far more personal.

We honor and respect—and even revere—Thomas Jefferson, the man who loved the young son of John Adams. Jefferson, too, was a genius. We see him as a man of the people. But in spite of the strong appeal of his greatness, Jefferson remains remote, a leader distant and different from us.

John Quincy Adams is unique. We know about Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers, but we know the sixth President. His seemingly endless diaries open the secret door to his very heart and soul. He let down the barriers; he revealed himself. Who can help but feel close to a man who wasn't afraid to share his life with others? Who can help but love a man who was strong enough to lay bare his weaknesses? Through his awesome austerity, we see his humanity. Through all the accomplishments, comes a real man.

What stands out in John Quincy Adams' life is not simply fifty years of service to his country. Just about the only office he missed was Vice-President. That, in itself, may reveal his inordinate wisdom and genius!

It isn't the wide array of positions he occupied which have propelled him into popularity. More than anything else it's his lack of self-confidence which makes him so human, so genuine. We all feel insecure and unworthy; we all know the pain from pangs of doubt. We try to cover our uneasiness with bravado; we put up a good front. Even though we fool others, we can't deceive ourselves. Also, we're irresistibly drawn to a man who walked our path.

THE INNER PAIN

In the early 1830's John Quincy Adams was asked, for the third time in his life, to deliver a Fourth of July address. As unbelievable as it may seem, he suffered attacks of anxiety over the assignment. He was afraid that it would be a poor speech, an "exhibition of faculties in decay." He became so upset that he broke out in boils on the right

side of his face, which then caused him to worry over his appearance on the platform! This is the man who had already been a Senator, a distinguished diplomat, Secretary of State—and President!

His insecurity surfaced in a most painful way when he was asked to address the Columbian Institute. On March 4, 1831, the day he began a new term in the House of Representatives, he wrote in his diary:

"There was yet one other reason for me to decline delivering an address. It was impossible for me to open my lips or write a sentence before the public but there were liars in wait—to catch, to garble, to misrepresent, to falsify what I say. They had raked up every vote I ever gave in the Senate, from twenty-five to thirty years ago, to belie their purposes and my motives. They had ransacked my Lectures on Rhetoric to distort and misrepresent them."

On and on he went, revealing the depths of his uncertainty and the anguish he felt within himself.

Over a decade earlier, in 1820, he accepted the office of president of the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston. At that time, he said that he was "mortified at being raised to the head of a learned society with qualifications so inadequate to the Station." In all truth, of course, few men in the nation possessed the vision of John Quincy Adams when it came to understanding the potentialities of science.

And even earlier he wrote "I am forty-five years old. Two-thirds of a long life are past and I have done nothing to distinguish it by usefulness to my country or mankind."

Down through the decades the feelings of unworthiness pursued him with a relentless tenacity. When years later he took the train to Ohio to lay the cornerstone of the Cincinnati Observatory he couldn't understand why crowds appeared everywhere along the route to greet and honor an old man who had been a failure as President.

In a day when the masses are manipulated, heroes created, and images manufactured at will, there's an irresistible appeal for a man who felt the sting of personal pain, who suffered, even as we suffer, who knew the agonies of inadequacy.

More than a legacy of unparalleled services did he leave us. Who among us can match him for his achievements as the father of culture with the establishment of the Smithsonian, the peace-keeping author of the Monroe Doctrine, the architect of the abolition of slavery with his victory over the infamous "gag rule" in the House of Representatives? Behind the legacy was a real man, a man not unlike the rest of us.

THE PLEDGE TO PRINCIPLE

His appeal is magnetic. Along with his overwhelming sense of inadequacy there was his unwavering allegiance to principle. He was what we want to be! The Massachusetts legislature rejected him for re-election as Senator because he was unwilling to cater to his party's wishes. While the Federalists bowed to England, John Quincy Adams said, "Put your trust in neither France nor England; let America trust itself." For his lack of partisan loyalty, he lost his post as Senator.

His devotion to principle also cost him re-election to the Presidency. Patronage was the royal road to political survival for a President of the United States and his party advisers pleaded with him to clean out the office-holders and replace them with employees who supported him. John Quincy Adams refused! Only twelve people were dismissed from office during his four years as President. In each case the reason for removal was the same: incompetence. Ultimately, the disloyalty in his own ranks halted his efforts to effectively bring about his dreams for the nation. And, finally, that disloyalty resulted in his rejection. How can

we help but admire a man who placed people above his personal gain?

"I must square every vote I give to some principle," he exclaimed, "and not say aye or no as the mere echo of my file leader." How can we help but want to emulate a man who placed independence and reverence for principle above conformity and success?

For John Quincy Adams, his country was "the first and most imperious of all obligations." "The duties of my life are vigorous," he warned his future wife, Louisa Catherine. How can we help but be drawn to a man who was determined that service would be above self even when that service brought him the cruellest derision? His independence stands as a monument to what we can become if we care enough to follow the path of principle.

"Old Man Eloquent" even took issue with the most sacred of all emotions, patriotism. Despite of his undaunted love for his country, he questioned Stephen Decatur's famous toast: "Our country: in her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right; but our country, right or wrong." Can you imagine the reaction when John Quincy Adams altered those near sacred words: "Our country, right or wrong." He said, "I disclaim all patriotism incompatible with the principles of eternal justice." His independence was incorruptible!

EVER CLIMBING

Through every defeat, he came back to climb higher. His most enduring contributions to our nation came after he was President, when he emerged as the most distinguished member ever to serve in the House of Representatives in Washington.

As one biographer comments, "His basic principles of life became almost an obsession with John Quincy." A signet ring which he had commissioned was sent from London. It was of his own design and depicted a cock and the motto, "Watch." It came from the saying of Jesus as he charged a disciple to always be alert to duty. John Quincy Adams knew full well that the admonition had been given to the disciple who had denied Jesus.

After the ring had arrived, he wrote a poem which he sent to his son, George. The last two lines tell the story:

Let the shrill summons call me not in vain
With fervor from on high to Watch and Pray.

Religion for John Quincy Adams was the source of the summons. His reading of the Bible wasn't for comfort but for courage. He prayed not for solace but for renewed strength.

On the last day of 1812, while in St. Petersburg, Russia, he ends his diary for the year reflecting on the death of his infant daughter, Louisa Catherine: "For myself, may the divine energies be granted to perform fully all my duties to God, to my fellow mortals in all the relations of life, and to my own soul!"

His religion wasn't designed to meet his needs. Rather, it served as the motivation for his life. Religion was the inner voice calling him to strive even harder. And, after a particularly bitter experience, he wrote, "My conscience presses me forward."

Through the decades of his personal discontent, what emerged was more than the son of a President and a President himself. John Quincy Adams was an aristocrat. But his was an aristocracy of character, independence and principle. There was nothing small about him except his stature. He allowed nothing, absolutely nothing, to blemish his life.

Over the years, his enemies tried to bring him to his knees. At the opening session of the House in 1836, the Southern congressmen fired their biggest guns at the former President. A representative from South Carolina entered a resolution to censure Mr. Adams for his abolitionist views. The threat of condemnation was nothing new to John

Quincy Adams. It occurred regularly. On this occasion, the idea was to embarrass the sensitive old man so brutally that he would feel disgraced. Nevertheless, he stood his ground even while admitting that censure would be the worst calamity of his life! He said, "Not a single word of what I have said do I unsay; nay, I am ready to do and say the same tomorrow."

Impressed by his courage and conviction, the House voted down the resolution of censure even though a vast majority of the members were against him on the issue of slavery.

A SYMBOL FOR ALL

In a day when cajoling, compromise, back-patting, gratuitous greetings, and intimidating smiles are said to be the sure road to success, we would do well to remember John Quincy Adams, and how he refused to campaign for office or seek votes. He relied on his colleagues and his constituents to see the rightness of his principles, the integrity of his life, and his vigorous dedication to duty. The man was his message!

The old Puritan was so out-of-place, even in his own time, that his enemies were baffled by his behavior. They sent him a resolution requesting that he be tried as a public enemy. He immediately entered it in the House!

John Quincy Adams is without comparison in the history of our country. And when he dies, The Reverend Theodore Parker eulogized, "... The champion of the neediest, of the oppressed: the conquering cause pleased others, him only the cause of the conquered." In a day when far too many spend their lives advocating themselves and promoting their own importance, John Quincy Adams stands forever as the symbol of human achievement and integrity.

Not once did he use his power, his influence, his authority to assure his own survival, let alone his own gain. In all honesty, can we say as much about ourselves?

Not once did he stand on a principle unless it provided for the improvement of the nation. To be sure—he was a partisan—but only of the people. Can we say as much of ourselves?

Never did he seek personal security. His vision was always of tomorrow. Can we say as much about ourselves?

Never did he stop comparing himself with the most rigorous of standards. His eyes were destroyed by reading and writing. He realized that self-certainty was nothing less than self-delusion. Can we say as much about ourselves?

His most successful poem tells us his life story. In "The Wants of Man," John Quincy Adams reveals himself:

*I want a keen, observing eye,
An ever-listening ear,
The truth through all disguise to spy;
And wisdom's voice to hear;
A tongue, to speak at virtue's need,
In Heaven's sublimest strain;
And lips, the cause of man to plead,
And never plead in vain.*

SERVICE—NOT SELF

Was John Quincy Adams a happy man? Is not the question impertinent? Was he successful? Is not such a question irrelevant? Of far greater significance, John Quincy Adams can be measured by the trees he planted—trees which are still blossoming. Would that as much could be said for us.

In the life of a man the truth is revealed, the paradox unveiled. Torn throughout his life with feelings of inferiority, John Quincy Adams emerged as the most heroic of men. Consumed with a sense of inner weakness, he was nothing less than a figure of strength. Here, then, is the lesson of his life: It's not who we think we are but what we stand for that's important.

Even his enemies came to discover the giant in their midst. The monumental man who lived by the awesome words, "A stout heart and a clear conscience, and never despair." It was a Southern antagonist who said at the death of John Quincy Adams, "When a great man falls, the nation mourns; when a patriarch is removed, the people weep." But we weep not for our loss—but for ourselves. For we see in another what we might become if we cared more for service than we do for self.

PRESIDENT SHOULD APPEAR BEFORE THE ERVIN COMMITTEE

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the most expeditious manner in which the Watergate scandal can be resolved is through an appearance by the President before the Ervin committee. I have written to the President to urge that he follow this course, which has been endorsed by Members of the House and Senate of both parties, and I regret that thus far, he has resisted the idea.

For the information of my colleagues, I now insert into the RECORD a copy of my letter to the President:

JULY 3, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with deep regret that I learn from the day's news dispatches that apparently you have decided to resist any appearance before Senator Ervin's Committee on the Watergate matter. I do hope you will reconsider and agree to come voluntarily to Capitol Hill to submit yourself to cross-examination by the Senate panel.

I hasten to add that I, for one, would oppose any attempt to compel your appearance. I do think we are confronted here with a problem involving Constitutional separation of powers and the co-ordinate—that is to say, equal—status of the three branches of government. To force the Chief Executive to submit to a Congressional subpoena (regardless of certain historical precedents which I consider to be inappropriate in the present circumstances) carries with it the danger of opening the door, at some time in the future, and on some other or lesser issue, to arbitrary Congressional action that could humble and undermine the Presidency.

However, it is clear that a voluntary appearance by you would leave the traditional relationship between the President and the Congress undisturbed—and it would avoid a Constitutional confrontation, since Senator Ervin and other members of his Committee have indicated they might indeed attempt to compel your testimony.

It seems to me that no better platform than the Ervin Committee exists for the purpose of your communicating to the American people on Watergate. If you were to answer the charges against you with a formal address on radio and television, you again would be accused of trying to rest your case on still another self-serving statement. If you were to submit yourself to questioning at a news conference, you would be participating in an event which is likely to be marked by an unruly atmosphere,

where the questioning of you—while pointed—would not be well structured, and where time would not allow exhaustive interrogation with ample opportunity for follow-up questioning. As a lawyer, I am sure you would prefer a formal and more dignified way of putting your views across—and I am confident that you would not want to rely solely on the newspapers for trial of the most crucial aspects of your case.

To say, as I did at the beginning of this letter, that cross-examination of you is necessary does not reflect a prejudgment on my part. Rather, it reflects the need to come to terms with the facts of the situation as they exist.

You have been accused, and are suspected, of being implicated in serious violations of the criminal statutes. But, besides being a citizen subject to the same laws as all Americans, you are the President of the United States. Therefore, I submit, it is not becoming of you to act as though you are pinning your hopes on the standard presumption of innocence until and unless proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. I should think that a President would not want to fall back on so narrow a defense. For whether or not you are indeed criminally culpable, and convictable, is not the only issue that concerns the American people. The fact is that no President ought to be in a position where he even appears to be culpable, or possibly culpable, and therefore you have a duty to take affirmative action and assertive action to erase this impression in the public's mind.

I reiterate, then, that no action by you could appear more sincere and convincing than a formal appearance by you, voluntarily, before this duly constituted Committee of the U.S. Senate. Should you not agree to appear, it seems to me that you would greatly enhance the prospects of your impeachment, since you would be forcing the Congress to seek and establish the truth in the only matter that the Constitution clearly prescribes.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

A SALUTE TO FRANK DEL BALZO

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to congratulate Frank Del Balzo, who retired at the end of June as Assistant Journal Clerk of the House.

For the last 12 years he has worked in the Journal Clerk's office. Prior to that time, he served as a doorkeeper and a member of the Capitol Police Force. He served honorably as a member of the Armed Forces during World War II.

Frank has always been a pleasant, amiable member of the House staff. His work and efforts will be an example to the others who follow in his path. All who have worked with him respect him as a sincere, dedicated public servant.

I want to join with my colleagues in wishing Frank Del Balzo a very happy and pleasant retirement. With him goes the grateful thanks of all the Members of the House and its staff.

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD each month the monthly calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The July calendar of events follows:

JULY AT THE SMITHSONIAN

FESTIVAL OF AMERICAN FOLKLORE,
JUNE 30-JULY 8

(Detailed schedules will be carried daily in local papers)

Seventh annual festival, to be held along the Reflecting Pool by the Lincoln Memorial. Co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service. Theme activities are scheduled from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m., with music continuing until sunset. Four program themes are featured:

Regional America (July 4-8)—150 Kentuckians will represent their state with craft demonstrations, bluegrass and gospel music, horses and exhibits of bourbon manufacturing. Tobacco growing will be featured with a half acre tobacco field and a tobacco barn that will be used for square dancing and musical events. Horse racing, barn raising, and tobacco auctions will be regular program features.

Old Ways in the New World—A Tribute to Tamburashi. Croatian-Americans and Serbian-Americans join groups from Yugoslavia in a tribute to the musical tradition brought from the "old country" in the 19th century. Performances daily 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. A traditional kafana or open tavern will have singing and dancing from 5 to 7 p.m. Special concert, July 3 at 6:30. Next year's Old World theme—British music, song and dance from England, Scotland, Ireland and America—will be previewed.

Native Americans—nine tribes of Northern Plains Indians showing both past and present culture and life styles, with dancers, craftsmen and seminars on Indian life. Films on American Indians will be shown during the Festival in the History and Technology Bldg. 2 p.m. June 30, July 1, 4, 7 and 8.

Working Americans—"Workers Who Build Our Shelters." Traditional skills of American workers are represented with members of 10 unions building portions of a two-story house and garage, one-story structure with fireplace and a modern office building. Tipi demonstrations will be presented by Northern Plains Indians and a hewn-log smokehouse will be built. Panels, workshops and folklorists are also scheduled. This portion sponsored by the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Department of Labor and the American Federation of Musicians.

In addition to these themes, Gospel Music will be featured in concerts on July 1 at 5:45 p.m., July 7 at 5 p.m. and July 8 at 5 p.m. A Fiddlers Convention and competition will be held July 7.

Saturday, June 30—Film: Tatonka—The Plains Indians and the buffalo. 2 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Presented by the Free Film Theater and the Indian Awareness Program of the Division of Performing Arts.

Sunday, July 1—Film: Okan—the Sun Dance of the Blackfoot Indians. 2 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Presented by the Free Film Theater and the Smithsonian's Indian Awareness Program.

Tuesday, July 3—Museum Lecture: Time Capsule 1776: The Continental Gondola Philadelphia. Speaker: Dr. Philip K. Lunde-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

23369

berg, Curator, Division of Naval History. 11 a.m., Museum of History and Technology auditorium.

Wednesday, July 4—Exhibition: The Black Presence in the Era of the American Revolution 1770-1800. Portraits, prints, broadsides, petitions, poems, letters and a variety of other related objects combine to provide a comprehensive view of the participation of black men and women in the Revolutionary War and the affairs of the early years of the Republic. Early efforts for freedom are traced from battle service, petitions and court actions, to the establishment of the black churches, the recognition of individual talents and finally to the fact of the "Incomplete Revolution." The black church, which led the way in social action, is highlighted with a reproduction of the interior of an early church. National Portrait Gallery, through September 3. Free guide service available 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. daily. A special tour of this exhibition will be presented for children by the Smithsonian Associates on July 21 and 28 at 11 a.m. and 12 noon. \$2.50 non-members; \$1.50 members. For further details call 381-5157.

Film: Circle of the Sun—a film on the Sun Dance of the Blackfoot Indians. 2 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Presented by the Free Film Theater and the Smithsonian's Indian Awareness Program.

Friday, July 6—Exhibition: A Measure of Beauty: The Diffusion of Style in Early 19th Century America. Approximately 80 prints, drawings, watercolors, banknotes, handboxes, and pieces of wallpaper by artists of the early 1800's, who emulated the perfect standards of the antique works of Greece and Rome. National Collection of Fine Arts, through September 16.

Saturday, July 7—Film: The Hopi—both the traditional and progressive viewpoints of the Hopi are presented. 2 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Free Film Theater and the Smithsonian's Indian Awareness Program.

Sunday, July 8—Film: The Navajo—includes rare footage of a curing ceremony. 2 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Presented by the Free Film Theater and the Smithsonian's Indian Awareness Program.

Tuesday, July 10—Museum Lecture: Advances in Communication. Philatelic lecture by Bruce Kelley, Curator, Antique Wireless Association of Holcomb, N.Y. 8 p.m., Museum of History and Technology auditorium.

Thursday, July 12—Creative Screen: The Ceramic Art. Four films on potters and pottery-making. Ladi Kwali—A six-day visit to the Washington-Baltimore area of this internationally renowned Nigerian potter; The Ceramic Art of the Natzlers—The work and philosophy of Gertrud and Otto Natzler; Rauk—students at the Rochester Institute of Technology demonstrate and discuss this traditional process; Maria, Potter of San Ildefonso—a new film on Maria Martinez, famous Pueblo Indian potter now in her 90's. Complete showings begin 11 a.m., 12:45 and 7 p.m., The Renwick Gallery.

Friday, July 13—Creative Screen: The Ceramic Art. Four films on potters and pottery-making. Repeat. Complete showings begin 11 a.m., 12:45 p.m. The Renwick Gallery. See July 12 for film details.

Saturday, July 14—Museum Lecture: Death and the Art of Colonial Virginia. Speaker: Patrick Butler, Visiting Research Associate in the Departments of American Studies and Cultural History. 10:30 a.m., Museum of History and Technology auditorium.

Sunday, July 15—Concert: 18th Century music performed on antique instruments. Chamber music of J. S. Bach, A. Scarlatti, D. Purcell, G. P. Telemann, B. Pasquini, A. Balente, J. Lidon, and L. C. Daquin per-

formed by Page C. Long, harpsichord and recorder; Helen Hollis, harpsichord; Robert Sheldon, baroque flute; and Eugene Enrico, recorder. 2 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, Museum of History and Technology. Free.

Film: Reminiscences of a Journey to Lithuania. Jonas Mekas will appear to preview his recently completed work that was filmed when he returned to his homeland after a long exile. 5:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. \$2 general, \$1.50 members. Call 382-5157 for reservations.

Friday, July 20—Drama: A Tribute to the Black Woman, performed by the Inner Voices of Lorton Reformatory. An original play by Rhozier "Roach" Brown, founder and director of the group, that speaks in an eloquent way to the beauty and strength of all black women. 7:30 p.m. Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, 2405 Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue. Free.

Saturday, July 21—Museum Lecture: New Zealand: A Nation's History in Postage Stamps. Speaker: Reidar Norby, Associate Curator, Division of Postal History. 10:30 a.m., Museum of History and Technology auditorium.

Sunday, July 22—Films: Serpent, Sgt. Swell, This Is the Home of Mrs. Levant Graham, The Tempest, Phenomena, La Jete. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. History and Technology Building auditorium, 5:30 p.m. Free.

Monday, July 23—Concert: Light and Sound by the New York Light Ensemble. Great classical music and exploration of the beauty of light, presented by the New York Light Ensemble, the foremost group in establishing the use of light as an aesthetic medium. An explanation of what, how and why the group works with lights will also be given, with questions from the audience welcomed. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associates. \$4.50 general admission; \$3 members; \$3.50 students. For reservations call 381-5157.

Tuesday, July 24—Museum Lecture: Greek and Roman Sundials. Speaker: Dr. Sharon Gibbs, Smithsonian Fellow, Division of Mathematics. 2:30 p.m., Museum of History and Technology auditorium.

Thursday, July 26—Lecture: Aspects of American Women Artists. William H. Gerds, Professor of Art at Brooklyn College, will talk on the American woman artists of the last two hundred years. Among them are Romaine Brooks, Georgia O'Keeffe, Cecilia Beaux, Susan McDowell Eakins (wife of Thomas Eakins), Maria Benson (Winslow Homer's mother), Maria Oakley Dewing (wife of Thomas Dewing) and Lilly Martin Spencer. Presented in conjunction with the Spencer exhibition now on view. 12 noon, National Collection of Fine Arts. Free.

Creative Screen: The Ceramic Art. Four films on potters and pottery-making. Repeat. Complete showings begin 11 a.m., 12:45 and 7 p.m. The Renwick Gallery. See July 12 for film details.

Exhibition: Form and Fire: Natzler Ceramics 1939-1972. A retrospective exhibition of 174 objects created by Gertrud and Otto Natzler, remarkable for their combination of simplicity and perfection. The museum's initial major exhibition of 20th century ceramics. The Renwick Gallery, through October 22.

Friday, July 27—Creative Screen: The Ceramic Art. Four films on potters and pottery-making. Repeat. Complete showings begin 11 a.m. 12:45 p.m. The Renwick Gallery. See July 12 for film details.

Saturday, July 28—Museum Lecture: Pascal and Technology. Speaker: Uta C. Merzbach, Curator, Division of Mathematics. 10:30 a.m., Museum of History and Technology auditorium.

Sunday, July 29—Films: Eggs, Blues Ac-

cordin' to Lightnin' Hopkins, Re-entry, Un Chien Andalou, The Dentist, Les Mistons. 5:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. Free.

Changes of address and calendar requests: mail to Central Information Desk, Great Hall, Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, D.C. 20560.

SUMMER HOURS

(Open 7 days a week, including July 4)

Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History, Arts and Industries Building, National Air and Space Museum—10 a.m.-9 p.m.

Freer Gallery of Art, National Collection of Fine Arts, National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution Building—10 a.m.-5:30 p.m.

The Renwick Gallery—10 a.m.-5:30 p.m. Thursdays, open until 9 p.m., through Labor Day.

National Zoo buildings—9 a.m.-6 p.m. Anacostia Neighborhood Museum—10 a.m.-6 p.m., weekdays; 1-6 p.m. weekends.

DEMONSTRATIONS—MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

(No demonstrations July 4)

Steam Engines. Wednesday through Friday, 1-2:30 p.m. 1st floor.

Machine Tools. Wednesday through Friday, 1-2 p.m. 1st floor.

Spinning and Weaving—Tuesday through Thursday, 10 a.m.-2 p.m. 1st floor.

Hand-Set Printing Presses. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 2-4 p.m., 3rd floor.

Musical Instruments. A selection of 18th and 19th century instruments, and American folk instruments. Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor, 1:30 p.m., Mondays and Fridays—keyboard instruments; Tuesdays—wind instruments; Wednesdays—lutes and guitars; Thursdays—folk instruments.

Musical Machines—American Style. Mechanical and electronic music machines. Monday through Friday, 1:00 p.m., 2nd floor. As part of this exhibit, excerpts from musical films are shown continuously.

MUSEUM WALK IN TOURS

Highlight Tours—Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History, National Air and Space Museum (Arts & Industries Bldg.): Weekdays on the half hour from 10 a.m. to 12 noon, and from 1 to 3 p.m.

National Portrait Gallery—guide service available between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m., 7 days a week.

Dial-A-Phenomenon—737-8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

Dial-A-Museum—737-8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

PUPPET THEATER

Alice in Wonderland. Lewis Carroll's dream fantasy featuring all the favorite characters insulting, advising and delighting Alice as she tumbles after the White Rabbit into an incredible dream world of eternal tea time. A new production for children by Allan Stevens and Company, presented in the Arts & Industries Bldg., by the Division of Performing Arts. Performances Wednesdays through Sundays, 11 a.m., 1 and 2 p.m., including July 4. Admission \$1 children; \$1.25 adults. Group rates available. For reservations call 381-5395.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9-9:30 p.m. The program schedule for July:

1st—Man and African Wildlife. A discussion featuring John Owen, former Director of National Parks in Tanzania, and Helmet

Buechner, Senior Scientist, National Zoological Park.

8th—Great Tenor Sax Men. From the "Radio Smithsonian" jazz series, with Martin Williams, Director of the Smithsonian's Jazz Studies Program.

15th—Life with the Bushmen. John Yellen, Museum of Natural History pre-doctoral fellow, recalls his experiences while living for two years with the Bushmen of Southwest Africa.

22nd—The Black Presence in the Revolution. A look at the new exhibit opening this month at the National Portrait Gallery.

29th—Concert. Baroque music, presented by the Smithsonian's Division of Musical Instruments.

Radio Smithsonian can also be heard over WAMU-FM (88.5), Fridays at 2 p.m.

Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, June 3, 1971.

Domestic Study Tours—for further details write Mrs. Kilkeny, Room 106-SI, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Alaska Float Trip: July 18-Aug. 1. Waiting list only.

New Hampshire Archaeology Dig: One week, Aug. 5 or 12. Students only, Aug. 19.

Acadia National Park: Sept. 9-15.

California Colonial History: Sept. 16-23.

Sea and Shore Laboratory: Oct. 11-18.

Big Cypress Swamp and Everglades National Park: Nov. 11-18.

Louisiana Plantation Architecture: November.

The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs. Editor: Lillas Wiltshire. Deadline for entries in the August Calendar: July 8.

EXPERIMENTARIUM

An experimental prototype of the Spacearium to be built in the new Air and Space Museum opening in 1976. The demonstration show, entitled New Born Babe, introduces the Spacearium concept and includes a simulated Apollo launch, explains why stars have different colors, describes pulsars, and provides an imaginary closeup of a quasar on the edge of the universe. Programs are scheduled Monday through Fridays, 10:30, 11 a.m.; 4 and 4:30 p.m.; Saturdays and Sundays, 10:30, 11:30 a.m., 12:30, 1:30, 3:30 and 4:30 p.m. For last minute schedule changes call 381-6264. In the National Air & Space Museum.

Foreign Study Tours—for further details write Miss Schumann, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Mexico and Guatemala: Aug. 27-Sept. 14.

International Aerospace Tour: Sept. 17-Oct. 3.

Copernicus: The cities in Poland and Italy where he lived and worked. Oct. 1-23.

West Africa: Jan. 8-Feb. 1, 1974.

India and Nepal: Jan. 18-Feb. 10, 1974.

Sites of Civilization, Cruise from Rome to Athens: April 6-22.

Greece, Sites and Flowers on the mainland and Peloponnese: April 27-May 12.

Ethiopia and Africa: May 23-June 14.

Black Sea Cruise: Sept. 17-Oct. 6.

Afghanistan and Pakistan: Oct. 21-Nov. 11.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON S. 1585

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights of the House Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on

S. 1585, to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Woody Owl," and for other purposes.

The hearings will commence with testimony from the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture on Monday, July 16, 1973, at 10 a.m., in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Those wishing to testify or to submit written statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

NONCHEMICAL CONTROL OF PESTS—BOLL WEEVILS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a number of us in this Chamber have urged increased research into methods of pest control that do not involve conventional pesticides. We realize that while nonchemical means are not the sole answer to this Nation's pest control problems, they are a move forward.

Many of the current pesticides create hazards not only for the environment, but for the farmer himself. Besides presenting an increasing cost to the farm community, the pesticides lose effectiveness as newly evolved insect strains become resistant to their deadly effects.

I am happy to report that the programs which we have funded have resulted in some important breakthroughs. One program to eradicate the cotton boll weevil has the potential to reduce this Nation's total pesticide consumption by 30 percent. This program is indicative of the types of research these funds support, and of the need for continued support in this important area.

The Milwaukee Journal June 25, 1973 article inserted below should be of some interest to the House:

BOLL WEEVILS FACE EXTINCTION IN SOUTH

MEMPHIS, TENN.—The boll weevil, the pest that has plagued the Cotton Belt for decades, may be facing extinction from a sterilization program that has shown convincing results thus far.

The National Cotton Council says demise of the weevil could bring down consumer prices paid for cotton clothing and could significantly reduce the amount of pesticides used in this country. The council estimates that 30% of the nation's pesticide use is aimed at the boll weevil.

The sterilization program being used against the boll weevil has thus far cleared the insect from 28,000 acres in three states, officials report.

Congress is taking a keen interest in the findings of research funded so far by federal and private money. The result shows male boll weevils can be chemically sterilized, bringing about a reproduction dropoff that wipes the insect out.

"There is an awful lot of pressure to reduce chemical spraying, so I think reducing national pesticide use by about a third would be one of the biggest benefits of this program," said Rep. B. F. Slak (D-Calif.) after a visit to the US Agriculture Department's Boll Weevil Research Laboratory. The lab, the only one of its kind in the world, is

located at Mississippi State University in State College, Miss.

Under the technique now being tested by the boll weevil lab, male weevils are chemically sterilized and then are released from low flying aircraft into fields. The sterile males mate with female weevils, but the eggs never hatch.

After trying the system for two years on 28,000 acres in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, researchers told Sisk that weevils are down to undetectable levels in the experiment areas.

Sisk said one main concern was the effect of the program on other animals that might be deprived of food if the weevils are wiped out. Researchers said environmental effects of eradication appear minor compared to those from aerial application of pesticides.

The Cotton Council said one reason that eradication of the weevil would have little impact on Cotton Belt wildlife was that it was not native to this country. It began migrating from Mexico about 1895.

Sisk's visit to the boll weevil lab was in preparation for congressional attempts to write a farm law to replace the expiring Food and Agriculture Act of 1970. Sisk said he was hopeful that the boll weevil program could be applied against the bollworm and pink bollworm, insects found in cotton fields in the West.

BAHAMA INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today, July 10, 1973, there is one more independent democratic nation in the world. Today the Bahamas, after nearly two and one-half centuries of colonial rule, gain their independence from Great Britain. One hundred and ninety-seven years after American independence, the Bahamas have achieved independence without violence and without firing a shot.

Our neighbors in the Caribbean are to be commended for their peaceful efforts to attain democratic government. It should be stressed that democracy in the Bahamas has come about as an evolution rather than a revolution. For many years, and especially over the last decade, the people of the Bahamas have gradually taken on many of the rights and responsibilities that come with democratic government. They have gained voting rights for men and women, regardless of one's position in society. They have begun to handle their own domestic affairs with a spirit of responsibility and leadership.

The people of Florida have come in contact with our neighbors in the Caribbean for many years. It is, therefore, with a special spirit of congratulations that the citizens of Florida wish the Bahamians the very best as they enter the role of a separate democratic nation. The people of Florida will remain the good friend and neighbor of the Bahamas as they have in the past.

The men and women of Florida know that the Bahamas represents the spirit of democracy well. I hope that you will join with me and the people of Florida in commending their achievements, and

wishing the Bahamas a happy and prosperous future.

THE WHOLESOME LEGACY OF A QUIETLY GREAT MAN, FRANK MURPHY OF WORCESTER, MASS.

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, on July 4, 1973, a quietly great man, Francis P. Murphy, of my home city of Worcester, Mass., passed away.

By profession, "Murph", as he used to sign his personal notes, was a journalist and he spent practically his entire life as a working newspaper reporter and managing editor.

His renowned professional excellence will always remain as a model standard in the journalistic history of our Commonwealth and New England region. However, it was his unshakable belief in and everyday practice of the highest principles of personal conduct and integrity, together with his boundless exercise of charitable understanding, wise, encouraging counsel, sympathetic compassion, deep humility, blithe spirit, and genuine good nature that will ever endear his memory to those of us who were privileged to call him friend and those who were fortunate enough to work with and for him.

Mr. Speaker, the hourly life and deeds of Frank Murphy, an exceptionally ordinary man, provide a timely and moving inspiration, particularly in this dark period of our national history, to everyone who wonders what they can individually do to stem the tide of disappointment and discouragement that is unhappily enveloping our country today.

If he were asked that question I think that Frank Murphy's summary reply would be—stand by your basic beliefs, support your free American system and institutions, honor your obligations, give your best effort to your work, respect and help your neighbor, teach by example, not dictation, and thank the Almighty for all the personal and national blessings that you have.

In daily fulfillment of this creed Frank Murphy proved that one person can really be a mighty influence for good upon his fellow men.

In his own self-effacing but tremendously effective way he truly made his community, his Commonwealth, and his country better places to live in and for that contribution all our people will be in his everlasting debt.

If his example is largely followed, Mr. Speaker, this Nation can and will more quickly and completely achieve its destiny of becoming an eternal citadel of human honor, freedom, decency, opportunity, equality, and good will, in a world at peace.

On this score I am pleased to include here excerpts from an article that appeared in the Worcester, Mass. Telegram newspaper issue of July 5, 1973, outlining the life of Frank Murphy and containing

a few of the multitudinous and pre-eminently deserved tributes that were expressed upon his death. The article follows:

FRANK MURPHY DIES, EX-MANAGING EDITOR

Francis P. (Frank) Murphy of 291 Beverly Road, retired managing editor of the Worcester Telegram, died yesterday at Cape Cod Hospital in Hyannis. He was stricken ill Tuesday while vacationing in Harwich Port.

He had observed his 77th birthday Sunday. Associated with the Telegram for 49 years before retiring at 70 in 1966, Mr. Murphy remained a working newspaperman until his death. He had kept active in recent years working as a copy editor for the Catholic Free Press, leaving his desk three weeks ago to vacation on Cape Cod.

He had been managing editor of the Telegram from 1945 to 1966.

A man of few but telling words, Mr. Murphy was renowned in journalism as a teacher of young reporters and for his ability to organize a newspaper staff for coverage of fast-breaking news.

Mr. Murphy's harnessing of men and machines to assess and accurately report the June 9, 1953, tornado was an outstanding example of his talents.

Never one to seek personal credit, Mr. Murphy did say when retiring from the Telegram in 1966 that he considered his greatest accomplishment in journalism to be "making newspapermen out of suitable college graduates." In that regard, he added modestly, "I have had a prideful success."

Of the hundreds of writers who began their careers under Mr. Murphy, at least four were later Pulitzer Prize winners—Leland Stowe, the late Joseph A. Koblinsky, James S. Doyle and Sanche de Gramont.

Joseph McGinnis, author of the best seller, "Making of the President, '68," started as a newspaperman under Mr. Murphy, as did Noah Gordon, author of several books, including the best seller, "The Rabbi."

A veteran reporter recalled when Mr. Murphy retired in 1966 that "he brought me up in the newspaper business almost like a father brings up a son."

Maybe that fatherly interest developed because Mr. Murphy began, what he called "his newspaper life" on a weekly operated by his father, Peter B. Murphy, later city clerk of Marlboro.

STARTED ON WEEKLY

In 1914, when Mr. Murphy was graduated from Boston High School of Commerce, he went to work for the Marlboro Times which his father published weekly while also running a print shop.

Mr. Murphy had studied journalism at Boston University, taking night courses in 1913 and 1914 while going to high school days.

A thin man, with craggy features, coal-black hair parted in the middle, Mr. Murphy in his days as a reporter was nothing like Hollywood's bolsterous press card-in-hat reporters. Old timers mourning his passing last night could not recall him ever wearing a hat.

They remembered him always with sleeves rolled up, bony elbows against the desk wielding a copy editor's pencil.

Mr. Murphy served with the American Expeditionary Forces in France during World War I. He was with the 33rd Engineers.

The day after he retired from the Telegram, the Catholic Free Press said of him:

"Did he 'manage' the news? Of course he did. No newspaperman, especially one who has been an editor as long as he has, would ever profess that journalism is a completely objective science. But there is a difference between 'managing' and 'distorting' or 'sensationalizing.' The latter words are not part of his vocabulary."

The Free Press concluded, "Mr. Murphy's insight and talent will be missed, but more so will be his integrity and interest."

SERVED IN WORLD WAR I

Following service in World War I, he returned to the Telegram, moving into the city room from Clinton in 1921 and becoming county news editor.

During the Roaring Twenties and Depressing 1930s, he served as state editor, city editor, wire editor, and news editor under the late Mose H. Williams, whom he succeeded as managing editor in 1945.

When the world gloried at Charles A. Lindbergh's solo flight across the Atlantic in 1927, Mr. Murphy's charges already were writing of Robert H. Goddard's first pioneering rocket firings in a cow pasture in Auburn.

For more than 40 years, Mr. Murphy loved to vacation at Cape Cod. But he was a newspaperman 24 hours a day, which led in 1963 to a Telegram "scoop" of the national press with a story that there would be a new summer White House on Squaw Island in Hyannis Port.

In developing the copyrighted story, Mr. Murphy had learned the wife of President John F. Kennedy was interested in acquiring a home owned by singer Morton Downey.

The White House later confirmed the Murphy story, and in that summer of 1963 shortly before his death President Kennedy did locate his White House on Squaw Island.

In recalling his own career, Mr. Murphy noted he had "covered spot and breaking news stories in every town and city in the Telegram's circulation area except Phillips-ton and Royalston, where apparently nothing ever happened in my day."

At one time, whistling was said to have bothered the old-time telegraphers and was long a newsroom taboo.

One of the first lessons of journalism experienced by a cub reporter was to hear Mr. Murphy's thunder, "Who's whistling?"

Mr. Murphy, however, always looked as though he was whistling inside. "He was happy with every story he worked on, every paper he ever turned out. It was his whole life. And . . . he did a good job," said his widow, Mrs. Callie M. (Clifford) Murphy.

Richard C. Steele, president and publisher of the Telegram, and The Evening Gazette, Inc., said, "I am terribly grieved. Frank Murphy was a dear friend as well as a professional colleague for years.

"Frank Murphy was one of the most competent and professional newspapermen it was my privilege to know and to work with," said Steele, recalling that reporters who had worked with and for him "have gone all over the world" in the field of journalism and related fields. "Their achievements serve to illustrate the professionalism Frank Murphy instilled in his reporters," Steele said.

"He was a man of courage and principle, a great editor, an excellent teacher and one of the finest persons I have known," said Robert C. Achorn, vice president and editor of the Telegram and Gazette.

Mr. Murphy had but one professional interest in life—newspapering. He loved it. He lived it.

Mentioned in the current edition of Who's Who in America, Mr. Murphy for many years belonged to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Associated Press Managing Editors Association, the New England Society of Newspaper Editors and the New England Associated Press News Executives Association.

He also was a member of the Boston Veterans Journalists, the Academy of Political Science, the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Holy Name Society of Our Lady of the Rosary Church.

GIVE A FRIEND A LIFT

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a commendable energy-saving concept initiated recently by the Aetna Insurance Co. of Hartford, Conn.

The program, called "Give a Friend a Lift," encourages employees to car-pool by reserving preferential parking spaces near the home office for cars which bring three or more employees to work. Parking spaces for the car-pools are reserved

right up to the start of the 8 a.m. work-day.

This timely program had been started before the summer season's heavy demand for gasoline dwindled reserves and brought prices up.

Of this program, Aetna president, Frederick D. Watkins said:

It is our thought that if business takes steps like this, the danger of a gasoline crisis could be alleviated.

I feel that this sort of incentive program is a step in the right direction.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT,
MAY 1973

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the May 1973 Federal personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MAY 1973

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in May 1973 was 2,815,938 as compared with 2,808,246 in the preceding month of April—a net increase of 7,692. These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

Total pay for April 1973, the latest month for which actual expenditures are available, was \$2,718,191,000. Total pay for fiscal year 1973 is forecast to be in excess of \$33 billion.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in May is compared with the preceding month of April, with May a year ago and with May five years ago, as follows:

	Full-time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary, part-time, etc.	Change	Total employment	Change
Current change:						
April 1973	2,431,933		333,619		2,765,552	
May 1973	2,433,635	+1,702	339,122	+5,503	2,772,757	+7,205
12-month change:						
May 1972	2,511,380		299,437		2,810,817	
May 1973	2,433,635	-77,745	339,122	+39,685	2,772,757	-38,060
5-year change:						
May 1968	2,613,232		305,846		2,919,078	
May 1973	2,433,635	-179,597	339,122	+33,276	2,772,757	-146,321

Full-time permanent employment in the month of May was increased by 1,702. The largest increases were in Postal Service with 1,814 and HEW with 812 and the largest decrease was in Defense with 1,540. Since April a year ago such employment showed a net reduction of 77,745 mainly in Postal Service with 48,179 and Defense with 46,498. Major increases during the year were in Veterans with 7,911, HEW with 7,098 and Treasury with 2,475. In the 5 years since May 1968 full-time permanent employment has dropped 179,597 mainly in Defense with 235,657 offset by a net increase of 56,060 in all other agencies.

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

Total civilian employment in the Executive Branch in May, as compared with April, is shown for civilian and military agencies, as follows:

	May	April	Change
Civilian agencies	1,713,225	1,706,623	+6,602
Military agencies	1,059,532	1,058,929	+603
Total civilian employment	2,772,757	2,765,552	+7,205

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increases in May were Agriculture with 2,588, Postal Service with 2,509, Interior with 2,309 and HEW with 1,504 (due to the conversion of certain public assistance grant programs, previously operated by the states, to direct federal administration). The largest decrease was in Treasury with 4,280.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in May totaled 34,371, an increase of 475 as com-

pared with the preceding month of April. Employment in the Judicial Branch in May totaled 8,810, an increase of 12 as compared with April.

UNIFORMED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Uniformed military personnel in the Department of Defense has decreased 1,028,946 in the 19 years since 1954, while civilian employment has decreased 150,044 over the same period.

In the Department of Defense annual military personnel costs are now running at about \$22 billion and civilian pay costs at about \$12 billion—both more than doubled since 1954.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from

the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent posi-

tions by executive branch agencies during May 1973, showing comparisons with

June 1971, June 1972, and the budget estimates for June 1973:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	May 1973	Estimated June 30, 1973 ¹	Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	May 1973	Estimated June 30, 1973 ¹
Agriculture.....	84,252	82,511	81,949	83,400	General Services Administration.....	38,076	36,002	35,737	38,100
Commerce.....	28,435	28,412	28,038	28,200	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	29,478	27,423	26,746	26,800
Defense:					Panama Canal.....	13,967	13,777	13,652	14,000
Civil functions.....	30,063	30,585	30,023	32,400	Selective Service System.....	5,569	5,791	4,999	5,700
Military functions.....	1,062,741	1,009,548	972,609	980,000	Small Business Administration.....	4,004	3,916	4,063	4,200
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	104,283	105,764	113,491	110,200	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	13,612	14,001	13,881	14,000
Housing and Urban Development.....	16,030	15,200	15,991	15,800	U.S. Information Agency.....	9,773	9,255	9,184	9,400
Interior.....	57,570	56,892	56,511	57,000	U.S. Veterans' Administration.....	158,635	163,179	169,201	171,600
Justice.....	42,662	45,446	45,837	47,200	All other agencies.....	31,333	33,499	34,175	35,800
Labor.....	11,352	12,339	12,309	12,800	Contingencies.....				2,000
State.....	23,398	22,699	22,588	23,200					
Agency for International Development.....	13,477	11,719	10,516	10,800	Subtotal.....	1,955,530	1,910,854	1,886,980	1,915,200
Transportation.....	68,482	67,232	65,771	67,700	U.S. Postal Service.....	564,782	594,834	546,655	569,500
Treasury.....	90,135	95,728	98,528	103,000	Total ⁴	2,520,312	2,505,688	2,433,635	2,484,700
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,920	6,836	7,061	7,000					
Civil Service Commission.....	5,324	5,260	5,883	6,000					
Environmental Protection Agency.....	5,959	7,835	8,237	8,900					

¹ Source: As projected in 1974 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

² Excludes increase of 5,000 for civilianization program.

³ Excludes increase of approximately 9,000 in adult welfare categories to be transferred to the Federal Government under Public Law 92-603.

⁴ May figure excludes 1,422 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 2,601 in April.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the Dickinson amendment does not win approval of the House tomorrow, I plan to offer the following amendment as a compromise:

AMENDMENT BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS TO H.R. 8860

Page 59, line 12, after section 4(n) add a new subsection as follows:

(o) Section 5 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2014), is amended by adding a new subsection, as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a household shall not participate in the food stamp program while its principal wage-earner is, on account of a labor dispute to which he is a party or to which a labor organization of which he is a member is a party, on strike: *Provided*, That such ineligibility shall not apply to any household that was eligible for and participating in the food stamp program immediately prior to the start of such strike, dispute, or other similar action in which any member of such household engages: *Provided further*, That such ineligibility shall not apply to any household if any of its members is subject to an employer's lockout: *Provided further*, That for purposes of determining eligibility under this subsection, such strike or work stoppage shall not be considered after the 60th day of such stoppage."

(e) By adding the following new paragraphs at the end of section 3:

"(n) The term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

"(o) The term 'strike' includes any strike or other concerted stoppage of work by employees (including a stoppage by reason of the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement)."

OPERATION YOUTH PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, recently an event occurred in my district which I feel would be of interest to other Members of Congress.

Approximately 65 high school students representing schools in Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky met at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio to participate in the program, Operation Youth. This program has been held successfully in the past and is a definite highlight of a high school year for those students who are chosen by their schools to attend.

The Operation Youth program is a week long seminar in the principles of government, democracy, and patriotism. Group discussions, an active study of civics and government, and listening to speakers from varied fields of interest, are some of the activities scheduled. This year my office had the privilege of participating by conducting a short talk on the importance of volunteer services to the community and good government.

The busy democracy in action week culminates in a mock election of a mayor and an event known as Flag Day. The mayor of Operation Youth is elected by the students using the democratic methods they learned about during the week. A final closing activity of the Operation Youth week is the Flag Day program in which special tribute is given to the U.S. flag. The flag, which, incidentally, I had the honor of contributing, is then presented to the new mayor of Operation Youth.

The 1973 Operation Youth week was under the able directorship of Mr. Bill Smith who devoted many, many hours to this program. I commend Mr. Smith, other faculty members, and Xavier Uni-

versity for making successful such an important program for youth and the Nation.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, during May and June, the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, held 6 days of hearings on H.R. 4715, and related bills, to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act.

I want today, Mr. Speaker, to share with my colleagues, the statement delivered before by subcommittee by Evan H. Bergwall, Jr., executive director of the youth services bureau of South Bend, Ind., in my own Third District.

Mr. Bergwall presented many interesting insights to the subcommittee, and told us that drug education must be more than the simple presentation of information.

Said Mr. Bergwall:

To begin, drug education must be experiential rather than intellectual. It must begin to touch the affective nature of the individual. The problem must be clearly defined as a problem with individuals who will not be responsible for their own lives, but who rather choose to escape problems and pain via drug use.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Bergwall's incisive analysis of drug abuse problems at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY IN BEHALF OF H.R. 4715, DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION EXTENSION

Congressman Brademas, and honorable members of the Select Sub-committee on Education:

I am grateful to be able to appear before you to speak to the need of drug education and to the favorable implementation of House Bill No. 4715 and its budget.

To say that drug education is needed today is almost trite, yet many persons treat the subject in the same hushed terms as sex education not very many years ago. Drug education is now in its infancy in my community and it must begin to develop into a more comprehensive effective tool—it can no longer be simply “drug information”.

WHAT DO I DO?

Briefly, let me illustrate but a few experiences which have occurred within my jurisdiction as the Director of the Youth Services Bureau in South Bend, Indiana. While sitting waiting for an appointment with an elementary school principal one day, a six year old black male first grader was very, very active while sitting next to me waiting to see the assistant principal. After a good deal of first grade kind of conversation, it was apparent that this boy was indeed extremely hyperactive. Our conversation suddenly ended with the principal's door opening and my entrance to deal with the business at hand. During our conversation, I mentioned the young boy in the waiting room, only to discover he had been stealing large quantities of diet pills from local drug stores and taking them.

Not many weeks later, the same principal called my office in a great deal of turmoil and near panic with the words, “I think I've got a kid who has O-D'ed. What do I do?” His discomfort was greatly apparent along with the fear of what would happen to the boy.

The same week, a high school principal called on some high school youth trained in crisis intervention to deal with a fellow student who was on a bad trip while in school.

The stories could be repeated a hundred times over each day across our country. The cry continues to go up as to what to do about so great a problem. It is obvious to me in dealing with school officials—teachers, nurses, and administrative personnel—that many have no awareness of or ability to cope with young people who are using drugs.

MEANINGLESS AND IRRELEVANT CURRICULA

A great deal of time and effort must be set forth by our federal government in the area of drug education. Today, drug education in South Bend is almost non-existent. At best, some drug information is given to students about the different kinds of drugs and their effects on the human body, but over use of scare tactics and biased information is also given. The total spectrum is not viewed with any effectiveness nor is the “cause” of drug problems dealt with in any meaningful way.

It would appear at least in some communities in the midwest (and I would surmise we are not all that unique) that money poured into school systems for developing a drug curriculum is wasted money. The curricula developed are usually done by ill-trained persons who know little or nothing about drugs and the drug culture. Hence the curricula turns to be meaningless and irrelevant as students are told one thing in the classroom and experientially know better from their participation with drugs and/or from their peers. Perhaps what is developed is drug propaganda, not drug curricula. This points to the necessity of developing and accepting some standard of fact in the preparation of drug curricula in the school systems of this country.

DRUG INFORMATION “INOPERATIVE”

However, the best curricula in the world is meaningless unless those who teach are aware, alert, open, and emphatic to the needs and concerns of those being taught. Drug education, I believe, goes much farther than information about drug use and abuse. If I may borrow some Washington language, “let me make this perfectly clear,” drug education is the equivalent of drug information is “inoperative”.

I say this because we do not have a “drug problem” in America, we have a people problem. In dealing with over 600 youth in varying degrees of trouble over the past eight months, I have discovered that drug use, delinquent behavior, and running away from home are substantially the same—a means of escape. The problems of today's youth are innumerable, but nowhere in the structure of most schools do we teach the alternatives available within the resources of man to solve one's personal problems. Education today is basically the same as it was a hundred years ago and the cry still goes up to teach the three “R's” and eliminate all the rest of this “stuff”. Too often this “stuff” includes sex education, drug education, and means of coping with one's world.

PROBLEM-SOLVING TECHNIQUES

Consequently, it seems to me that drug education must take some radical shifts from the usual run of the mill classroom education. It must begin in the lower elementary grades in the form of problem solving techniques and the learning to trust and use the resources of one's peer group to work through personal problems and grow from that pain rather than escaping through drug abuse. This can be accomplished if the model developed by Dr. William Glasser in *Schools Without Failure* will be effectively utilized. The classroom meeting of which Glasser speaks is a powerful tool in the development of positive peer pressure in problem solving situations. The time has come in America when we must begin to teach children that pain in life can produce strength and that emotional escape through drug abuse does not solve any problems, but simply creates more grave crises in one's life.

Drug education then must include not only information about drugs, but it must also include a discovery of one's self—both strengths and weaknesses. The thought is awesome in that it implicates some radical change in teacher education; namely, an increasing amount of psychological training for teachers in place of the now over done educational methods courses. It means educating the emotional development of the child as well as his intellectual development. It means greater teacher involvement with students and less labeling of students as “successes” and “failures”. It means a revolution in education. A new look—a reformation if you will.

EXPERIENTIAL NOT INTELLECTUAL

To begin, drug education must be experiential rather than intellectual. It must begin to touch the affective nature of the individual. The problem must be clearly defined as a problem with individuals who will not be responsible for their own lives, but who rather choose to escape problems and pain via drug use. Furthermore, drug education must include more effective modes of coping with personal problems and life situations rather than delineating drug use as a “no-no”. Scare tactics, school expulsion, harsh discipline, will not be effective in curbing drug abuse. Effective human learning in being successful will. If this is done, peer pressure to cope will gradually replace the peer pressure of escape, and when that happens, not only will drug information be less necessary, but drug abuse will begin to diminish. Hopeful, then, instead of needing to increase appropriations for drug education, we can begin to utilize these resources to solve some other pressing problem of our age.

WHERE TO BEGIN?

The question now turns to, “where do we begin?” It is my conviction that some basic and major shifts need to occur in drug education. Primarily, the greatest concern of mine is to fund persons and agencies who are currently dealing with drug treatment to be responsible for the development of in-school drug education. Drug treatment professionals

and ex-addicts can be a viable tool in drug education in that they are acutely aware of the total implications of drug abuse. Educators who develop curricula from academic knowledge only come up with a job which is less than half done. I believe any school corporation requesting monies for drug education should be required to contract with a person associated with a drug treatment program for assistance and consultation on the realities of the curricula being developed. Thus, the credibility gap which often occurs between the volumes of drug information and the drug user can be reduced if not eliminated.

CURRICULUM CONSIDERATIONS

As curricula are developed, it would be my judgment that the following items be considered:

1. Begin in the lower elementary grades to teach children how to effectively cope with life and solve personal problems and concerns. This would include how to make decisions and weigh alternatives available.
2. Develop systematic programs in human potential and growth with emphasis on personal worth and success.
3. View drug abuse in the total spectrum of alcohol, tobacco, misuse of aspirin, etc., as well as the commonly abused drugs among youth and adults such as marijuana, amphetamines, hallucinogens, etc.
4. Gradually teach drug information in the context of how drugs work when used properly and improperly.
5. Deal with the fact of peer pressure (youth's most effective tool) and begin to develop alternatives in early grades.
6. Develop curricula which is experientially as well as intellectually meaningful. Drug education must include the emotions as well as the mind.

TEACHER TRAINING

Furthermore, I believe a crash program in drug education is needed for the majority of elementary and secondary teachers. Initial reactions to drug abuse by these educators usually ranges from fear to outrage. Tragically, they see a “drug problem” rather than a frightened, confused, often lonely youth. The perspective must be changed to view the person rather than the drug as the problem in need of help and solution. Again, I feel the persons to most effectively carry out this process are persons involved in drug treatment and ex-drug abusers. The unwarranted fears of faculties around the country need to be changed to deep personal concern for those youth involved in drug abuse.

MINI-GRANTS

Finally, I wish to comment on one of the existing components of the Drug Abuse Education Acts, namely, the “Help Communities Help Themselves” project of mini-grants. Those teams who apply for training should present, with their application, some design for their community involvement when they return to their home base. Often I think teams are trained and nothing happens. Some follow-up is needed.

RESEARCH

Also, I believe some hard core research is needed in the area of drug education, and I think the teams who are trained could provide the data. Some models may be developed which are statistically bringing about changes in communities and these need to be brought to light along with their statistical analysis. The same critical eye needs to be applied to the training methods being utilized by the staffs training persons under the mini-grant programs.

One method which I think could be effectively utilized is for training to be based on goals and objectives set out by the teams themselves. If the objectives are met, and programs in local communities succeed as a result of the training, then the work is being accomplished.

EVALUATION

Regardless of the method, a continuous and rigorous evaluation must be undertaken if we are to be true to our goal of eradicating the drug abuse growth through educational means. Accountability must cease to be a threatening word and become a word of challenge and integrity. Only then can we learn from our failures and successes without fear and personal failure.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I trust this legislation appropriation bill will gain passage. I endorse it completely.

THE HONORABLE BARBER B.
CONABLE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal on July 9, 1973, carried an article featuring the distinguished and able gentleman from New York, BARBER CONABLE.

I find it somewhat amusing that a Member of Congress who has become more and more known and respected among his colleagues and has also been noted several times in the national press is still considered little known and unsung.

Let us hope the Wall Street Journal article will help make known to more people the CONABLE integrity and CONABLE ability which his colleagues have been privileged to appreciate for some time.

The article follows:

WAYS AND MEANS' UNSUNG MR. CONABLE
(By Albert R. Hunt)

WASHINGTON.—Barber Conable is not a household word but his views seem likely to have an increasing effect on not only households but businesses across the nation.

For Mr. Conable, a relatively unknown Republican Congressman from upstate New York, is rapidly emerging as one of the key GOP operatives in the House. Indeed, he's rated a good bet to fill the void created by the retirement of Wisconsin Republican John Byrnes as House Republicans' chief economic expert.

He's only the fourth ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee. But already his legislative acumen and diligence has made him an important Republican force in the committee's key jurisdictional areas of taxes, trade, Social Security, welfare and health insurance. His importance could grow if the committee's strong-willed chairman, Wilbur Mills (D., Ark.), carries out his intention, announced unexpectedly Saturday, to retire soon unless his health improves (see story on page 6). It is likely that whoever succeeds Mr. Mills as chairman will be a less skilled and forceful legislator.

"Barber has decided that he's going to know more about Ways and Means business than anyone in Congress," notes Rep. Perry Pettis (R., Calif.), also a member of taxwriting panel. "He has the intelligence and interest to emerge as a real leader."

This possibility is increasingly recognized by business groups, which are starting to shower the highly articulate Congressman with speaking invitations, and most importantly by the Nixon administration, which is vitally concerned with upcoming trade and tax legislation. "Conable is the Republicans' heavy hitter on Ways and Means," says an

administration lobbyist. "He probably understands the substance of issues better than any other Republican in the House."

A former state senator and attorney ("I studiously avoided tax law," he recalls), Mr. Conable was first elected to Congress despite the 1964 Democratic landslide. Two years after that he was named to the Ways and Means Committee and later to the congressional joint economic panel. In 1971 he joined the GOP House leadership as head of the Republican Research Committee. This is largely a ceremonial post, but it does bring Mr. Conable into the top GOP hierarchy. He has developed fairly close ties with House Minority Leader Gerald Ford and participates in House Republican strategy sessions and periodic meetings with President Nixon to discuss the entire range of important issues.

NO EASY LABELS

The 50-year-old GOP lawmaker is a man not easily labeled. He has a fairly conservative voting record, but has been a leader in the moves for internal House reforms and frequently displays a political pragmatism that moves him away from conventional conservative positions. Though an indefatigable worker on the busiest committee in Congress, he still finds time to personally write a thoughtful and provocative monthly newsletter to constituents. He has received high praise from such diverse groups as Ralph Nader's congressional project and top officials of Eastman Kodak Co., the largest employer in his district.

Although Mr. Conable's future seems secure in his overwhelmingly Republican district, he goes home politicking almost every weekend. In eight years as a Congressman, he has never gone home fewer than 40 times a year. This constant contact, serves as a political "catharsis," he says, explaining that "Washington is an easy place to go stale."

The New Yorker generally has eschewed much involvement in national Republican politics. Most of his House votes reflect the Nixon administration's position. But already this year Mr. Conable has tried to prod a reluctant Nixon administration to join the drive for tax revision legislation. In part, this reflects his native pragmatism. "Tax reform has an ongoing constituency and I believe we can legislate more effectively when we're not in the emotional atmosphere of an election year," he explains.

Unlike some conservatives, Rep. Conable is not adverse to change in the tax code. "It's not very conservative to say, 'I'll keep my money and never mind about others,'" he says. As with most other tax-writing legislators, he won't commit himself on most specifics. But he does think tax shelters should be tightened and predicts there'll be a tighter minimum tax "for those who use tax incentives extensively." While indicating some approval for tightening capital gains taxes, he opposes major tinkering with most investment and depreciation provisions.

He remains a fairly strong free trader and voted against the 1970 trade bill which would have imposed import quotas on a variety of materials. This year he essentially backs the President's trade bill, and administration men say he'll be a key contact man in the weeks ahead as the committee starts writing the trade legislation.

On other issues, Mr. Conable backed the administration's unsuccessful welfare-reform legislation and has voted for most Social Security bills, although he bitterly opposed last year's 20% hike in benefits. He says he has an "open mind" on such other issues as health insurance and pension legislation.

REVENUE-SHARING CHAMPION

Mr. Conable's most notable legislative achievements came as a champion of the administration's revenue-sharing concept in 1971 and 1972, while it was bottled up in committee due to the opposition of Chairman

Mills and Mr. Byrnes. Despite such formidable foes, Mr. Conable persisted in working with the administration to build pressure and line up votes. "I saw all those urban Democrats on the committee, and knew they'd be under pressure from their mayors," he says. "Then when the chairman's presidential ambitions started, I knew we could get revenue sharing through."

Sure enough, Mr. Mills eventually relented and revenue sharing sailed through the committee and the Congress. "Barber didn't get a lot of credit, but there's no doubt he was the prime mover for revenue sharing inside the committee," recalls Murray L. Weidenbaum, former top Treasury official and chief architect of the administration plan.

Mr. Conable says his advocacy was unusual; he remains an essentially cautious man who doesn't like to get so far out in front on an issue. "The legislator's natural instinct is to still the hostile voices of the moment," he notes. "There are a few real moral issues where I can be stirred, but in the great bulk of issues, there's a need for maneuvering and bargaining positions, and an ability to talk to both sides. This way I feel, I can maximize my influence on the way we ought to go."

Clearly, though, Rep. Conable enjoys being in on the action. "I went on Ways and Means to be astride the great issues," he declares.

Right now, several factors limit the New York Republican's role. For one thing, a number of colleagues find him a bit abrasive.

"Barber is terribly bright and sometimes that comes across as arrogance," says one. "He's not one of the boys," notes another acquaintance. "He has a touch of the aristocrat in him which doesn't sit well with other members."

Another limitation is his lack of seniority as fourth-ranking Republican on the committee. Only the three senior Republicans meet with Senate Finance Committee members in the conference committees where much crucial legislation is ultimately fashioned.

A third limitation is Mr. Conable's need to tread gingerly in his relations with the committee's new ranking Republican, Rep. Herman Schneebeli of Pennsylvania, a popular figure among his colleagues. Both men go to great lengths to deny frequent speculation about a possible rivalry, and the 65-year-old Mr. Schneebeli freely admits his younger colleague is a growing force in House affairs.

"Barber is going to be around here a lot longer than I am," he says, "and he certainly is looked to for real leadership already."

While versed in issues, Mr. Conable equally enjoys the legislative gamesmanship of the House. He's often a key contact for Minority Leader Gerald Ford in developing GOP strategies, and one of his favorite vocations is trying to analyze and outguess that most masterful of all House psychologists—Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills. "Barber usually stays about a step ahead of the rest of us in figuring out what the chairman is really up to, that's no small accomplishment," says one Ways and Means member.

As a potential Republican leader in economic matters, Mr. Conable has worked with, and at times against, ways and means chairman Wilbur Mills. Though Mr. Conable has warmly praised two of Mr. Mills' recent floor speeches, their relationship at times has been more tempestuous.

"Barber just doesn't believe the sun sets and rises on the chairman," says a committee insider. Mr. Conable has clashed with the powerful Arkansas Democrat in private committee sessions. Earlier this year, the New York Republican reportedly demanded that Mr. Mills categorically deny that a minor Social Security bill might become a vehicle for another major welfare measure. The enlig-

matic Mr. Mills, observers recall, didn't appreciate being pinned down this way.

A similar forthrightness comes through in the Congressman's newsletters to constituents and monthly columns for newspapers in his district. These reports describe his own activities, of course, but also ventilate his philosophy about government and people. They are insightful, occasionally self-deprecating and rarely marked by clichés.

Thus, talking about the constant rhetorical jockeying in Congress, he recently noted: "Like the lawyers many Congressmen used to be in private life, we are always summing up the case to the jury in the best possible light for our cause, using the tricks of advocacy within the commonly accepted bounds of emphasis, omission and argumentative selection."

Naturally, Watergate has been a prime topic lately, and the New Yorker's deep concern is quite evident. The responsibility must rest with President Nixon, Rep. Conable recently wrote, since he "has not been the captive of his staff, but has deliberately used them to insulate him from personal confrontation with detail." Nor is Rep. Conable sanguine about major White House personnel changes. While praising the appointment of former Congressman Melvin Laird as the new domestic policy chief, Mr. Conable was less pleased with the selection of General Alexander Haig as White House chief of staff. "I assume," he wrote pointedly, "that General Haig is a fine general, a fine administrator and a temporary replacement for Mr. Haldeman."

DISCLOSES PERSONAL FINANCES

A man of some means, Mr. Conable is scrupulously open about his financial affairs. He recently made available to constituents an accounting of all his official expenditures, also revealing that he paid \$13,665 in federal income taxes and \$4,539 in state taxes last year. He refuses to accept any speaking fees for more than \$150, and other than from the Republican Party itself, won't take any campaign contribution that exceeds \$50. Last year, he raised and spent about \$20,000 while rolling up almost 70% of the vote in his safe Republican district.

Despite accumulating more prestige and power, Mr. Conable shows occasional signs of frustration, and a few acquaintances even speculate he may quit Congress soon.

But this seems very unlikely, for he plainly enjoys being the Congressman from New York's 35th District. "I have a constituency that I understand and understands me, and allows me to interest myself in government," he says. "In the House, we have the capacity and time to look at issues. It's a much more satisfying place than the Senate if you're interested in the patterns of legislation."

ETHEL PAYNE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, Ethel Payne is everything that a good journalist should be. She is tenacious, aggressive, and persistent. Perhaps more importantly, she is intelligent, concerned, and aware.

After 20 years of covering events in Washington, D.C., for Sengstacke Publications, Ethel Payne is returning to Chicago. Although she has received a much-deserved promotion—to the position of associate editor for Sengstacke Publica-

tions—Ethel's departure leaves a void that will never be filled.

I know Government officials throughout this city will miss the phone call from Ethel Payne that we all learned to expect as soon as an important story broke. I know that I am not alone in saying that I will miss her presence at press conferences, where she never failed to ask the one question that brought the whole issue into focus.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is going to miss Ethel Payne. I know that the Members of this Chamber, and especially the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, will want to join me in extending an open invitation to Ethel Payne to "come home" as often as she can make the trip.

OPEN LETTER TO MR. LEONID I. BREZHNEV

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Russian domination of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland has been a source of great concern to all Americans since World War II, but it has been a special cause for worry for those Americans who have families still living in these countries.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I enter an open letter written by the leaders of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations, and Polish American Congress Inc., to Secretary General Leonid I. Brezhnev:

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 to freedom 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 unquench-

ability 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 co-operation 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.

RESOLUTION

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, last week, during the congressional recess, the city of South Portland, Maine, was celebrating its 75th anniversary as a municipal corporation. The week-long celebrations were many and varied, ranging from parades through the city's streets to the dedication of the city's first public housing facility—high-rise apartment for the elderly. The residents of South Portland can be proud of their city, and I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the resolution adopted by the South Portland City Council in commemoration of this historic event:

CITY OF SOUTH PORTLAND, MAINE, IN COUNCIL

Whereas, Cape Elizabeth was divided into two towns on March 15, 1895; and

Whereas, the northern part became known as South Portland; and

Whereas, the inhabitants of South Portland were granted a city charter which was officially adopted on December 5, 1898; and

Whereas, the year 1973 marks the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the city as a municipal corporation; and

Whereas, these seventy-five years have seen tremendous strides taken in all facets of municipal government;

Now therefore, the Council of the City of South Portland does hereby resolve that the week of July 2 through July 8, 1973 be observed with proper and fitting ceremonies commemorating the occasion.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE McHENRY COUNTY FAIR

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, an occasion which deserves special recognition in McHenry County, Ill., is the 25th anniversary of the McHenry County Fair being celebrated at the county seat of Woodstock—in my Congressional District on Saturday, July 14, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the traditional American County Fair with its combination of exemplary arts and crafts, livestock exhibits, as well as special events and amusements, is unique to the American scene. It is an institution which characterizes the American spirit of fellowship, achievement, and competition and which tends to hold our Nation together.

The McHenry County Fair which was established 25 years ago provides an outstanding showcase for 4-H boys and girls to exhibit their handiwork and their produce and to compare the results of their efforts with one another, as well as with their counterparts from other parts of the State and Nation. This county fair activity fits accurately the description of "learning by doing"—and is accompanied by the substantial benefits which flow from the discussions of 4-H'ers of their individual interests.

Mr. Speaker, the business and industrial communities have joined with the farmers of McHenry County in developing the McHenry County Fair as one in which citizens from all walks of life may participate and benefit. This year, business and farm leaders will direct hundreds of volunteers whose individual efforts and active participation will make the 25th McHenry County Fair the greatest in the county's history. Consistent with the aims of the board, the fair provides a forum for the people to exhibit and compare.

Mr. Speaker, the McHenry County Fair highlights American traditions, customs, and accomplishments. Present day interests are joined with a respect for the past. One indication of this principle is the new department established at this year's fair featuring antique furniture and furnishings, most of which will be associated with an earlier period in McHenry County's history.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege as a former member of the Illinois General Assembly to support legislation which provided a State financial support for

county fair improvements. It is gratifying to see that this legislative program has brought to fruition a wholesome and useful event such as the McHenry County Fair provides.

Mr. Speaker, it seems particularly appropriate on this 25th anniversary of the McHenry County Fair to salute the past presidents of the McHenry County Fair Association. I recall such past presidents as Elinar Bakkom, Mark Hansen, Henry Marlowe, Lyle Paulsen, Loren Massey, Carl Bault, and Donald Hansen, and the present president, Chuck Weingart.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I carry with me to the 25th anniversary banquet the greetings of my colleagues in this Chamber. I shall extend to all who are present Saturday evening in Woodstock and to all of the citizens of McHenry County congratulations and the good wishes of all of us who are assembled here.

COTTON, INC.

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, again I rise, as I did just 3 weeks ago, to offer an amendment to call for an end to all Government subsidies for Cotton, Inc., a quasi-public organization ostensibly in the business of cotton promotion and research.

On June 15, the House accepted this amendment to the 1974 Agriculture Appropriations bill by the overwhelming margin of 234-125. I urge my colleagues to repeat the acceptance of this amendment so that we can forget this outrageous giveaway of taxpayers' money for at least 4 more years.

The sordid financial history of Cotton, Inc. reveals a gross misuse and abuse of taxpayer moneys. Let me remind my colleagues of some of the worst plays practiced by Cotton, Inc.

For 1971 and 1972, the budget for Cotton, Inc. was \$20 million a year. Half of this sum came from private cotton producers, based on a dollar-a-bale checkoff. The other \$10 million came from the Federal Treasury.

Rather than spend all this money, Cotton, Inc., put between \$12 and \$15 million into a reserve fund and spent mostly Government subsidy funds.

In 1972, Cotton, Inc., budgeted an astronomical \$1,278,000 for the move into, and renovation of, new offices in New York City and Raleigh, N.C. The Secretary of Agriculture, who has the power to disapprove specific projects of Cotton, Inc., declared this figure amounted to an "injurious use of funds by a quasi-public organization that is heavily dependent on tax revenues and on backing of cotton farmers."

Subsequently, Cotton, Inc. was told it could spend \$800,000 on these moves, but that it had to cut excessive moving and renovation expenses. Contrary to the Secretary's orders, Cotton, Inc., went ahead and spent the entire original budget of \$1,278,000. It made up the dif-

ference of \$478,000 by drawing on its reserves of unspent funds from private producers.

Included in this exorbitant expenditure was \$25,000 for a private elevator between three floors in the New York office; \$160,000 for the purchase of telephone equipment; \$96,000 for cabinetry and woodwork; \$125,000 for floor, wall, and window coverings—which sounds expensive for cotton drapes—and \$7,200 for granite in the reception room.

Three weeks ago, during the debate on the agriculture appropriations bill, I defied the executives of Cotton, Inc., to explain to me why these extravagant bables were indispensable to cotton promotion and research. I am still waiting for their answer.

Salaries paid to the top executives of Cotton, Inc., are excessive and injudicious. The firm's president receives \$100,000 a year, about twice the salary paid to the Secretary of Agriculture. Six other executives receive salaries ranging between \$44,000 and \$35,000.

Even without its extravagant spending and excessive salaries, Cotton, Inc., would earn the rating of a first-class Federal boondoggle based on its sorry performance alone. As far as cotton promotion is concerned, Cotton, Inc., has been a flop. In 1970, when Cotton, Inc., began its operations, domestic cotton consumption was 8.1 million bales. Two years later, domestic consumption had fallen to 7.8 million bales, our lowest level since 1948.

The irony is that cotton is becoming a commodity demand and this demand is driving its price up. Higher prices force manufacturers to use more synthetic fibers in place of cotton to save money. And from here on, you can see the vicious cycle.

Textile mills in my district complain that they cannot buy enough high-grade cotton. They cite heavy buying by the Japanese. I am not carping against the Japanese, because they order well in advance, and everyone knows we have done enough damage to them lately with the soybean embargo. My point is that there is more demand for cotton than there is supply; but, despite this and the over-rated activities of the cotton lobby's oversubsidized promotion outfit, domestic consumption of cotton is in a tailspin.

Mr. Speaker, Cotton, Inc.'s poor performance, its lack of effectiveness, its exorbitant spending practices, and its willingness to violate or ignore legitimate government directives concerning these practices are a sum of failures that add up to a demand for an immediate end to all Federal funding for this outfit.

Of the "big six" commodity crops, cotton is the only one that receives Federal money for promotion and research. For corn, wheat, and feed grains, funds for these purposes come from the private sector. I cannot understand why cotton alone receives such favored treatment.

Further, Federal subsidies for this cotton boondoggle are intolerable. While many worthwhile human resource programs are being slashed and abolished with reckless abandon, I cannot justify throwing any more Federal seed money

into this cotton gin. Cotton producers and consumers are not receiving a thread in return.

I call upon my colleagues to support my amendment and end this wasteful, arrogant scandal once and for all.

THIRD REPORT ON THE 93D CONGRESS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I send each family in my district a regular newsletter to keep my constituents informed of my work as their Representative in Congress. I insert the text of my third report on the 93d Congress at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Dear Friend and Constituent: I feel honored to have been chosen by Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Thomas Morgan to head the Subcommittee on International Narcotics Control.

As Chairman of this official House Subcommittee, I intend to vigorously pursue a tough course of action to curb the illicit flow of narcotics to our shores from foreign nations, particularly those from the Golden Triangle of Asia and from various parts of South and Central America. My deep concern over the dangerous and deadly results this international traffic spawns in the form of heroin addiction and related street crimes here at home is intensified by the fact that the Administration currently has made only a minimal commitment to eradicating this world-wide scourge.

My Subcommittee will seek to increase the deployment abroad of trained narcotics agents to watch-dog and crack-down on unscrupulous drug traffickers and their ports of transit. We also will investigate and monitor nations receiving our foreign aid funds to determine if their officials are cooperating fully in efforts to halt the production and influx of drugs. Those nations which do not implement positive curbs on the illegal drug traffic will be cut off from all U.S. aid funds.

As a first step, I am happy to report to you that my amendment to increase funding for enforcement operations by our agents, in concert with foreign government officials, has been passed by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. This action will be a valuable assist to our plans to implement a rigid system of reporting that will track investigation advances, or lack of progress.

The drug menace in America is at the flood level. To reverse this tide, we must make a total commitment to wiping out the sources of supply—our nation's well being is at stake.

VETERANS BENEFITS

Education and training are the keys that open up job opportunities for our veterans, especially those who lack essential and specific skills. However, family and financial responsibilities often force many veterans to forego the available benefits upon discharge and the eight-year time limit soon lapses.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 8627, to eliminate the time barrier under which veterans must use their educational benefits. In particular, this would enable our Vietnam veterans to utilize GI benefits without a time limitation.

PROHIBITED KNIFE ACT

How many more senseless deaths by stabbing do we have to endure before the federal government acts to ban the manufacture and distribution of switchblade, gravity, and folding knives?

During the last four years, I have been pressing legislation in the Congress to effect such a ban at the federal level—a ban that would remove these knives from circulation for they have no purpose, or use, other than to threaten and kill. Make no mistake, we are not talking of knives used by the sportsman or fisherman but of those murderous weapons used to perpetuate acts of violence on innocent people.

My Prohibited Knife Act now has gained substantial backing in the House and I am encouraged that we finally will see the wisdom of speedy enactment. I would welcome your letters of support in this matter, as I believe strongly that these tools of crime must be banned.

CAMP SAFETY ACT

This is the season for summer camps and while the majority of such youth recreation facilities maintain excellent safety standards, there are some well below the acceptable level. Each summer, there are reports of needless tragedies at children's camps. But, in most instances, these mishaps could have been averted.

The Youth Camp Safety Act, which I have introduced to provide federal grants up to 80 percent of necessary improvement expenditures, would establish minimum federal safety standards and provide for on-site inspections and penalties for violations of safety requirements.

Parents should not have to worry about the security of their children away at camp for a summer of fun and rewarding experiences. Their lives and their future are too precious.

LONG ISLAND RAILROAD

To prevent future Long Island Railroad strikes and disruption of commuter service and to, once and for all, place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs—with the state—I have introduced legislation HR8611, to exempt the LIRR from the National Railway Labor Act.

In the past, whenever there has been a LIRR labor-management dispute, the New York Legislature has passed the buck to the federal railway act. Washington then steps in and declares a cooling-off period to get the line running again. This procedure is nonsense.

The LIRR is an intra-state commuter carrier and a strike by its workers is not deemed to be a national emergency. These disputes should be dealt with and resolved by the state. Long Island's tons of thousands of commuters and consumers, who depend on the LIRR, cannot bear the hardship of another strike like the one that crippled the line for seven weeks last winter.

I am working for prompt passage of my bill, for the LIRR must continue to function without further interruption.

THOSE STILL MISSING

To determine new ways we may ultimately obtain a complete accounting of our American servicemen who were lost in action or simply disappeared without a trace in Southeast Asia, I held an ad hoc hearing in NYC to open up dialogue between MIA families and government officials. A wealth of pertinent data and insight into the problem was gathered and I subsequently presented this testimony to the House Foreign Affairs Committee for use in their ongoing efforts to find a satisfactory resolution of the fate of these men.

I also intend to continue probing the activities of the South Vietnam government in their refusal to disclose the status of the thousands of prisoners they still hold an abuse that is obstructing final peace throughout Indochina.

TIME TO APPLY

I now am accepting applications from interested young men of the 6th Congressional District who wish to be considered for a

June, 1974, nomination to one of the military service academies—Army, Navy, Merchant Marine and Air Force. Further information on requirements may be obtained by contacting my District Office, 156A Main St., Port Washington, N.Y. 11050; (516) 767-4343 or (212) 423-1050.

MORE ENGINEERS NEEDED

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is facing an unprecedented challenge. We constitute 6 percent of the world's population but consume approximately one-third of the world's total energy production. As a result, we have become increasingly dependent on foreign energy sources of gas, oil, and certain metals. The only foreseeable solution in the immediate future is to increase oil and gas exploration and increase coal, oil shale, oil sand, and uranium mining. It is, moreover, critically important that these efforts be undertaken through innovative methods calculated to protect our environmental quality. It is incumbent upon the 93d Congress to meet this challenge head on by initiating steps to remedy the problem.

Toward that end, I am today introducing legislation which I have developed from research provided by Dr. D. M. Bass of the Colorado School of Mines. The purpose of the bill is to establish Federal scholarships in the undergraduate educational fields of mining engineering, petroleum engineering, and extractive metallurgical engineering. Based on projections of the Engineering Council, the U.S. yearly requirements are approximately 400 mining engineers, 500 petroleum engineers, and 200 extractive metallurgical engineers. At the present time, educational institutions in the United States are graduating approximately half of the required number. In order to meet this pressing need, my bill contains features that will redirect the educational process toward alleviating the anticipated deficiencies in these particular areas by supplying the stimulus for able young men and women who might otherwise be attracted to other fields.

The bill would require the Commissioner of Education to each year award 200 scholarships in the field of mining engineering, 250 scholarships in the field of petroleum engineering, and 100 scholarships in the field of extractive metallurgical engineering. During the month of October of each year the Commissioner would conduct an objective test of the aptitude and abilities of all eligible applicants. By February of the following year he would select and notify qualified candidates. The scholarships must be nationally allocated by a formula that provides equal representation for the 50 States in proportion to the population of each State. However, at least one scholarship in each of the three fields would have to be awarded to a resident of each State.

The bill provides that these scholarships be for 4 years of study in an accredited program of mining engineering, petroleum engineering, or extractive metallurgical engineering at an institution of higher education selected by the student. The assurance of a 4-year scholarship will help universities plan the future of engineering degree programs. The need for such assurances is evidenced by the fact that during the past 3 years several major universities have discontinued petroleum engineering programs when forced to choose educational priorities.

To further enhance the attractiveness of a career in energy engineering, the bill would direct the Commissioner to pay each institution an amount equal to the regularly scheduled tuition and fees charged to others. Finally, a person awarded a scholarship would not become ineligible to participate in any other student assistance, award, or athletic program conducted by the institution.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot fully stress the importance of this legislation. In a recent statement, the President outlined his plan to combat the energy shortage. By Executive order he has created an Energy Policy Office headed by former Gov. John A. Love of Colorado. This office has been charged with the responsibility of identifying major problems, reviewing alternatives, and making policy recommendations for concerned governmental agencies. He has asked for the establishment of a new Department of Energy and Natural Resources whose duty would be to assure that future demands for water, timber, minerals and energy resources are met without sacrificing our environment. Further, he has asked for an Energy Research and Development Administration, a new agency that would bring together and direct research and development programs on all forms of energy. Beginning in fiscal year 1975 the President has proposed funding for research and development in the amount of \$10 billion over 5 years.

Whether all of the President's requests are realized and to the extent he proposes is a matter for future debate. I suggest, however, that the success of any new plan to cure our energy ills depends entirely on the amount and quality of minds we bring to bear on this problem. In 10 short years the United States was able to muster the energy and expertise needed to put a man on the Moon. I firmly believe that the same kind of effort will enable us to meet this new challenge.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Education and Labor Committee to take this matter up at the earliest practicable date.

SUBSCRIPTION COMMUTER SERVICE IN LOS ANGELES

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, increased transportation mobility with reduced

transportation-related pollution are common and not inconsistent goals. And billions of dollars of capital investment are not required for the accomplishment of these goals. Our currently available modes of surface transit can, if used in imaginative ways, make a considerable dent in the problems of congested traffic and pollution.

Today I want to call to the attention of the House one isolated but worthy effort at solving these problems in the home of smog—Los Angeles. The Atlantic Richfield Co. and the Southern California Rapid Transit District have joined forces to provide commuter bus service to Atlantic Richfield employees working in downtown Los Angeles. The company will subsidize the operating costs of the service, making Atlantic Richfield the first large corporation in the area to do so.

The Commuter Subscription Service will be opened to other employees in the vicinity of the Atlantic Richfield building as well. If this policy were copied by every major corporate employer in our 15 largest cities around the country, it would take us a long way down the road toward solving the interrelated problems of traffic congestion, pollution, and the fuel shortage. I am sure that the Members of the House will want to watch this experiment very closely.

NEW CLUB HOUSE FOR FLUSHING BOYS CLUB

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine progress made by the Flushing Boys Club. Years of effort have finally resulted in the opening of a new clubhouse for the boys of Flushing.

The club has a dramatic history of growth. Started in 1957 as a 1-day-a-week venture operating in the Veterans of Foreign Wars building, the club expanded to new quarters at St. Michael's Church where the club was in session three afternoons every week. The number of boys using the club increased, and the club headquarters has been moved many times to accommodate the rapid growth. The last facility the club used was at the American Red Cross where 400 boys played, studied, and found friends to talk to in only three small rooms and an office.

Last April, the Flushing Boys Club moved into a beautiful new clubhouse. This "home away from home" for the boys of Flushing now can open its doors to every individual who wants to join. There was a real need for this new, modern facility, and it stands as a tribute to all the friends of the Boys Club. The new building can accommodate 800 to 1,000 boys, but the increase in juvenile delinquency and the closing of many after-school facilities shows the need for a large facility. In the words of Franklin F. Regan, Jr., president of the Flushing Chamber of Commerce—

Without water, plants would die. Without motivation and guidance, our minds would die. The Flushing Boys Club is an elixir of nourishment for our youth.

VI SMITH—AN OUTSTANDING LADY

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I mention the name and professional accomplishments of Vi Smith, an outstanding lady journalist. Let me explain the reasons why.

Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalistic society, is the oldest and largest organization serving the field of journalism with members in every branch of the profession. Through the years, it has strongly supported the free flow of information and has consistently fought efforts to diminish the effectiveness of the newsmen in keeping the public informed.

Long strictly a men's society, Sigma Delta Chi opened its rolls to women in 1969 in acknowledgement of the growing role played by women in today's journalism. I am happy to report that the Orange County, Calif., chapter of SDX quickly followed the lead of the national convention and, at its next initiation ceremony, inducted two women members into its professional ranks.

One of those two, Vi Smith of the Los Angeles Times, already had made a place for herself with journalism firsts dating back to 1944 when she became the first woman newswriter on the staff of radio station WCAU in Philadelphia. More recently, she has served as president of the Orange County Press Club, president of the Orange County chapter of California Press Women and, in 1972, became the first woman director of the Orange County SDX chapter's board of directors.

This year, I am happy to announce, Mrs. Smith has become the first woman president of the county's SDX chapter, marking another step forward for a county which, by reputation at least, is supposedly so conservative. In that same vein, I should also mention that the Orange County Press Club had a woman president as far back as 1955, long before the rhetoric of women's liberation had swept the Nation. I also should mention that Mrs. Smith served as treasurer of the Press Club in 1962, 1963 and 1964, and, during 1963, was treasurer when her husband, Don Smith, also of the Times, was club secretary, an interesting switch in the usual male-female roles within organizations of this type.

Although Mrs. Smith ignores the usual line of women's liberation groups, she has quietly gone about improving the role of women in journalism for many years in quieter, but perhaps more positive ways. Under her guidance, the Orange County Press Club increased its membership, its position in the community and its treasury, expanded its scholarship program for deserving young

students of both sexes and all colors, and launched the first Walt Disney Memorial birthday party at Disneyland for disadvantaged youngsters, many of whom would otherwise have never had the chance to visit that famous amusement park. She also was a charter adviser for the Nation's first coeducational Explorer Scout post—in journalism and in Orange County, of course. For many years, she has been a key figure in the Press Club's scholarship program serving either as chairman or cochairman with her husband.

It is women such as this, who, after all of the rhetoric is gone and the chauvinists on both sides have subsided, can truly be praised for having struck a blow for equality in a profession that many have said is too dominated by men.

SENATOR KENNEDY ADDRESSES SPIRIT OF AMERICA CELEBRATION

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the annual Audie Murphy Award for patriotism was presented to Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama at the Spirit of America Festival in Decatur, July 4.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY of Massachusetts delivered the principal address to an assembly of more than 10,000 people who had gathered to acknowledge and remember the attributes which have made the United States the greatest Nation in history.

Senator KENNEDY's remarks have received wide attention in Alabama and throughout the Nation. Because of the interest in his comments, I would like to share the complete text of his remarks with my colleagues.

The text follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY AT THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA FESTIVAL—DECATUR, ALA., JULY 4, 1973

All of you know Governor Wallace and I have different opinions on some important issues. And there are many, in the Democratic party and across this country, who disagree with both of us. But we have one thing in common. We don't corrupt—we don't malign—we don't abuse—the trust which the people have given us. We don't compile lists of enemies whose careers and lives are to be shattered because of their disagreement. We don't use the tactics of a criminal or the power of the law, to silence those whose ideas or politics are different than our own. For if there is one thing George Wallace stands for, it is the right of every American to speak his mind and be heard—fearlessly and in any part of the country. It is in that spirit that I come here today. For that is the true spirit of America.

George Wallace almost lost his life—he sits before you in a wheelchair today—because of his belief in that spirit. Two of my brothers have been killed because they shared that belief. And I don't believe that either Governor Wallace or I—the people of Massachusetts or the people of Alabama—are going to give up that right to anyone—however great his power and however high his office.

For the Fourth of July does not commemorate some great national triumph. It marks

the willingness of men to risk their lives, their homes, their fortunes in a dangerous and uncertain struggle against the mightiest power on earth. Even as we honor their courage, let us also recall their lesson: That freedom is not a gift but an achievement—that freedom is not an inheritance but that each generation must prove itself worthy of freedom—that the God who created all men equal also assigned to each of His creations the responsibility for protecting that equality.

Our Democracy has been formed on two great principles. The first was set forth by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina during the Federal Convention of 1787. It was equality of opportunity and treatment. It was—he said—to preserve "the equality of condition which so eminently distinguishes us."

This was to be a land whose blessings would be open equally to all—where no man would be stripped of the fruits of his labor to benefit another—and that great principle is now under attack.

Let facts be submitted to a candid nation. They have imposed a heavy burden of taxation upon every working man and woman—permitting a wealthy few to withhold their fair contribution to the costs of the nation. Our ancestors took up arms against unjust taxation. Now our own government denies us that which they battled to secure.

That is not acceptable to the people of Massachusetts. And it is not acceptable to the people of Alabama.

They have forced upon this nation policies which mock the hopes and fair expectation of all who labor.

High interest rates, for example, do not damage the banks which collect them nor disturb the wealthy who deduct them. But they damage every consumer who must make higher payments for his house—his car—and his television set. They can cripple the small businessman or farmer who must borrow to finance his operation or equipment.

That will not be accepted by the people of Massachusetts. And it will not be accepted by the people of Alabama.

Not content with the depredations of unjust taxes and high interest, they are responsible for an inflation which—penny by penny—day by day—lowers the earnings and savings, the pensions and insurance, of the great majority, even while profits soar.

That will not be tolerated by the people of Massachusetts. And it will not be tolerated by the people of Alabama.

They have ignored the principles of democracy in order to grant the claims, or increase the wealth, of a favored few, but they have denied the just and simple claims of the poor and sick and old.

That does not meet the standards of Massachusetts. And it does not meet the standards of Alabama.

They have so degraded the eminence of America in the community of the world that the dollar itself is now dependent upon the goodwill or whim of those nations which under Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman—we conquered and helped to rebuild.

I can assure you that will be changed by the people of Massachusetts. And it will be changed by the people of Alabama.

They have failed to ensure black Americans that equal access to education and jobs—to all the opportunities of our society—which is their birthright as Americans. I do not come to lecture you about that racial injustice which has proven to be as deeply embedded and resistant in the cities of the North as in the counties of the South. Indeed, southerners know—even better than others—of the need for leadership to free all men—white and black—from hatred, and the consequences of hatred. We are no more entitled to oppress a man for his color, than to shoot a man for his beliefs.

Not in Massachusetts. Not in Alabama. Not

in Dallas, Texas, or in Laurel, Maryland, or in Memphis, Tennessee, or in Los Angeles, California, or in any state or county of this free, great and restless land.

They have also violated that principle which is the heart of the great Declaration itself: It is government by consent of the governed. It is government which is to be freely chosen after honorable debate; its powers confined by the laws; its leaders subjects of the constitution.

That is the creed of democracy. And they have transgressed, ignored and trampled upon that creed—in Alabama as well as in Massachusetts.

This Administration—masquerading as conservatives—has taken this most radical step towards dismembering the spirit of our revolution and the protections of the constitution. They administer the nation's business through men, hidden in the White House—men responsible neither to Congress nor the public—men who cannot be compelled to account for their actions or even to disclose them. They have transformed public institutions into instruments of intimidation and control—turning to their own benefit, not only agencies of intelligence and law enforcement, but an immense mechanism of economic sanction and reward.

They have usurped and abused power which belongs to the Congress, to the states, to the sovereign people—and, indeed, have assumed power which the constitution refuses to any man—or to any body of men.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago Thomas Jefferson warned us to strictly enforce the restraints on the Executive. He predicted that an Executive which was permitted to exceed its powers would silence and punish all those "who . . . may be obnoxious to the views of the President—or marked by the suspicions of the President—or though dangerous to his elections or other interests."

And he instructed us that "In questions of power let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the claims of the constitution."

Today we honor Jefferson's declaration. Let us also heed his counsel.

Those who violate the law—whether on the streets of Boston or in the high councils of government—shall be brought to justice. Those who are proven to have abused the people's power shall forfeit their right to exercise that power.

Some will claim that the Executive should be exempt from the judgment of others—a free people answer with George Mason of Virginia, who asked his fellow delegates to the Constitutional Convention: "Shall any man be above justice. Above all shall that man be above it who can commit the most extensive injustice."

Some will invoke the security of the nation. A free people answers with Benjamin Franklin, who said that those who give up liberty to purchase a little security will soon find they have lost both liberty and security.

Some will call upon us to respect the dignity of the Presidency. A free people asks who are those—so swollen with vanity and fear—that they claim exemption from restraints which were observed, even in the midst of mortal combat, by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower.

Some will counsel us to trust our leaders. But only slaves are forced to depend on the good intentions of rulers. Free men count on laws and principles to confine government and governed alike.

Some will assert that these lawless transgressions are of concern only to politicians. But a free people understand that they—not politicians—are the victims. It is the people's government which has been abused and perverted to the benefit of a favored few.

We must do more, however, than right the

evils of the day. To us—as to our revolutionary ancestors—freedom is more than constitutional protections. It is also the "pursuit of happiness."

No government can grant us that freedom. We must find it for ourselves. We cannot find it when the conditions of our daily life are determined by remote officials in distant places. States and communities and individuals must reclaim that power which has been absorbed by bureaucracies ignorant of their needs and interests. Government must protect the poor and oppressed. But it is not the right of government to tell people how to live, it is the duty of government to liberate them for their own pursuit of fulfillment and happiness.

In that pursuit America needs the South. Despite adversities and oppressions, there are elements of southern life which can help liberate the nation. There is the sense that life is more than the accumulation of material goods, there is a belief in the individual—not as a solitary wanderer—but as a person whose place among his fellows is to be secured and respected. And—above all—there is a fierce desire that people be able to shape their own destiny in their own way.

If we can, together, surmount the injustices of the present and the divisions of the past, those southern virtues may enrich and even save the union. Walt Whitman, writing of America, said: "The northern ice and rain that began me nourish me to the end, but the hot sun of the South is to fully ripen my songs."

And that is the hope of the people of Massachusetts—as it is a challenge to the people of Alabama.

There are some who mistake the relative tranquility of the time for submission and acquiescence—as a sign that the spirit of the revolution has left us—but they are wrong. For underneath that seeming calm is a swelling anger—a hardening determination. And it would not be the first time that American appearances had been mistaken for American reality. A century ago in a great southern song of the Civil War, James Randall summoned his entire state to battle:

I see the bluish upon their cheek . . .
But thou was ever bravely meek . . .
But lo! there surges forth a shriek,
From hill to hill, from creek to creek;
Potomac calls to Chesapeake . . .

The river Mystic, where Paul Revere stood his watch, today calls to the Tennessee, where Andrew Jackson walked—Tennessee calls to the mother of waters—Mississippi to the powerful Columbia—summoning the people to restore to themselves the principles on which freedom rests. Let us heed that call, so that two centuries hence men and women can stand in this lovely country and praise us not for our wealth, or power, or for the wonders of our science—but as the generation which, in a dark hour for the Republic, blew the breath of life back into the flickering torch of freedom.

That is a hope and that is a cause, to which all of us—Alabama and Massachusetts—people of the North and people of the South—can honorably and proudly pledge their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

VEYSEY URGES FOLLOWUP ACTION ON NEW NATIONAL BLOOD BANK POLICY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Health, Education, and

CXIX—1475—Part 18

Welfare is announcing a new national blood bank policy intended to cut back commercialism and promote volunteerism in blood banking. The policy would also seek to reach the highest standards of blood transfusion therapy, and to make adequate supplies of disease-free blood available to every person in need, regardless of his financial status.

Mr. Speaker, this new policy by the Federal Government is a step that has long been needed. In November of 1971 I introduced legislation which would have accomplished essentially what the new national blood bank policy seeks to accomplish.

Last month, I introduced with some 70 cosponsors, refined legislation with the same goal.

The problem we all seek to eliminate is serum hepatitis—a disease which, through diseased blood transfusions, kills some 5,000 Americans and renders another 50,000 seriously ill each year.

Serum hepatitis is primarily a component of purchased blood. In fact, blood which is purchased is at least 10 times as likely—and as much as 70 times as likely to carry serum hepatitis as voluntarily donated blood.

I commend the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for taking this long needed initiative, and I reiterate my firm belief that firm legal guidelines at the national level are necessary to institutionalize clean, disease-free blood for every American, regardless of his financial ability to pay for it.

Since I first introduced the National Blood Bank Act in November of 1971, serum hepatitis has afflicted 75,000 and killed another 7,500 Americans. Today, the tragic and unnecessary loss of health and life continues.

I sincerely hope, and I have good reason to believe, that when we approach legislative hearings on blood banking and serum hepatitis, the executive branch will give the Congress its total cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the information of my colleagues, a revealing article on this problem which appeared in the February 1973, issue of the American Medical News. Although it was written several months ago, it is especially timely as we observe today's announcement by HEW of the new national blood policy.

I hope it will spur further remedial action.

The article follows:

VOLUNTEER DONORS FILLING THE RISING NEED FOR BLOOD

"... and then—may you go your way knowing that even though he was a stranger, you had helped him to live again."

—A blood donor's creed.

In a number of U.S. cities last month, blood supplies were so depleted that elective surgery had to be postponed. Others were getting by in what one blood banking official called "an atmosphere of crisis." The usual holiday and mid-winter lag in donations, complicated by outbreaks of the London flu, was to blame, everyone said.

In such shortage periods, many blood banks rely heavily on paid donors.

But in a scattered number of major metropolitan areas, normal blood needs were being met—even for open-heart surgery—without paid donors. Blood banks in these areas drew national attention because they demon-

strated that regionally-coordinated, all-volunteer community blood programs can work—even on a fairly large-scale basis—during traditional shortage periods.

In Seattle and Milwaukee, and the state of Connecticut, 100% volunteer systems have been around for several years. In other cities, like Kansas City, Mo., and Pittsburgh, the all-volunteer goal was reached just last year.

Even in the largest cities—New York and Chicago—the trend is inescapable: All-volunteer blood programs are the wave of the future and perhaps the only real answer to the nation's long-term blood needs. There are some who predict the U.S. will have an all-volunteer system within a decade; some feel it may not take that long.

The impetus is coming from many directions: The medical profession, courts, blood banking organizations, state and federal governments, and even the President. While there are a variety of reasons for the increasing interest in voluntary blood donations—not the least of which is a rising need—it is clear that the overriding factor is the greater risk associated with paid-donor blood.

One state—Illinois—has gone so far as to mandate that all blood be labeled "From volunteer donor" or "Purchased." After July 1, 1973, the labeling law will also require an attending physician who orders the use of purchased blood to enter his reasons in the patient's medical record.

Although the first phase of the law, which went into effect last Oct. 1, only requires labeling of blood, Illinois physicians already have shown a reluctance to use purchased blood unless forced to by serious shortages—such as existed last month in Chicago.

"There are very few physicians who will knowingly use paid blood," says James E. Habegger, MD, chairman of the Illinois Medical Society Laboratory Service Committee. Another effect of the labeling law, according to Dr. Habegger, has been to spur physicians to give more consideration to component therapy and to be more conservative in the use of blood.

In Chicago it was argued that the city needed 700 units of blood per day. Yet for the first three months that the law was in effect, figures compiled by the Metropolitan Chicago Blood Council (MCBC) show that the average daily blood use was less than 450 units—perhaps also indicating that the first figure was inflated.

Illinois' rather drastic approach to the problem came two years after the state supreme court handed down the Cunningham vs. McNeal Memorial Hospital decision, which held physicians, hospitals, and blood banks strictly liable if a patient develops hepatitis as a result of a transfusion. Physicians and hospitals responded by getting the Illinois General Assembly, in its next session, to pass a bill affirming that blood transfusion is "a service, not a sale." Similar legal protections have been passed in about 40 other states.

But the Illinois legislature threw in a curve: It limited the immunity to July 1, 1973. However, bills are expected to be introduced during the current session seeking to extend the legislation.

No one knows what the long-term impact of the labeling law on the state's blood supply will be. Most communities outside of the Chicago metropolitan area already have a 100% volunteer donor base. During the first month that the law was in effect, 96.1% of the blood available for transfusions in the Chicago area came from volunteers, although admittedly some of that came from sources outside of the city. Prior to the law, it was estimated that half of the 200,000 units of blood used annually in the city was purchased.

"The major question facing us is whether or not we will be able to engage the sustained interest and participation of the community over the long term," Dan Helsdingen, MCBC executive director, told a legislative committee in November.

A partial answer came in December and January when volunteer blood available in the city dropped to around 75% and donations began to fall off, resulting in a critical shortage and increasing competition for volunteer donors among the 89 hospitals and non-profit blood banks in the nine-county metropolitan area.

"Potential donors were confused when they read and heard about the crisis, and then saw that so many groups wanted them to donate at their place," says Helsdingen. And the hospitals, most of which have blood banks of their own, became more reluctant to part with any of their surpluses for fear they would be caught short, he said.

Spurred by the crisis, the MCBC—an umbrella organization created by the cooperative efforts of the Chicago Hospital Council, Chicago Medical Society, and the Midwest Chapter of the American Red Cross—has launched a major effort to establish a massive unified blood donor recruitment program for the Chicago area. There are 120 donor recruitment and individual blood assurance programs in the Chicago area, according to Helsdingen. The MCBC hopes to bring the diverse factions together.

To facilitate the program, an information system to keep records on shortages and surpluses of blood by type and location has been implemented by the MCBC with funds provided by the Chicago Blue Cross and Blue Shield Plans. The service operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

But that is just a small step, Helsdingen says. "We have to unify the donor recruitment mechanism and put it on a regional basis. Utilizing the expertise and flexibility which already exist in the Chicago area blood transfusion services, I believe the MCBC could bring a truly effective, community-wide voluntary blood supply system into existence in this area within 90 days."

Charles J. Weigel, MD, president of the Chicago Medical Society, has proposed that the effort be patterned after the highly-successful Crusade of Mercy, the local community fund drive. "A Crusade for Blood should be carried to industry, schools, churches, and civic groups," he says. "A cadre of workers should be enlisted to contract volunteers on a one-to-one basis."

Further support for a nationwide all-volunteer blood program is coming from the American Assn. of Blood Banks (AABB), which has recommended that all of its 1,400 member blood banks move toward an all-voluntary system "as rapidly as possible." The AABB hopes to achieve 75% voluntary blood donations by the end of this year; 90% by Dec. 31, 1974; and 100% in 1975.

Blood Services, one of the largest non-profit organizations of community blood centers in the world—serving more than 800 hospitals in 22 states—began a vigorous effort last year to develop a public education and donor recruitment program to provide all of the blood needed in its hospitals from volunteers.

Long a leader in the all-volunteer field, the American Red Cross has a coordinated network of 59 regional centers that last year drew, processed, and distributed roughly 40% of the national wholeblood total. Connecticut's all-volunteer Red Cross Blood Bank has been effectively meeting the entire state's blood needs for 22 years. The largest blood bank in the nation, the Greater New York Blood Program established in 1968 as a result of a merger between the Red Cross and the Greater New York Blood Council, a research organization, claims a 20% annual increase in volunteer donors for the last three years, and hopes to stop using paid donors in two years.

Five Texas organizations—the Texas Medical Assn., Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Texas, Texas Hospital Assn., Texas Osteopathic Hospital Assn., and Texas Osteopathic Assn.—have joined together in a public

service program to promote the volunteer blood donor concept throughout the state.

As a public service, the sponsoring groups have prepared a brochure, radio and TV spots, and several newspaper ads promoting the volunteer effort. Also planned is a speakers bureau to tell the blood donor story.

Some groups, like the American Trial Lawyers Assn., have been pushing for federal legislation to permit blood donations to be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income, as an encouragement for Americans to give blood voluntarily.

A bill allowing a \$25 deduction for each pint of blood donated to a non-profit organization, with a maximum of \$125, was introduced in Congress last year, but drew some resistance from congressmen who thought the \$25 tax deduction was too high. The bill also would provide that all taxpayers receive the deduction, including those who use the standard deduction.

But perhaps the real answer lies in the communities themselves. Kansas City, Mo., for instance, moved in just three years from a system obtaining 40% of its blood from paid donors and commercial sources to a 100% voluntary system. It has not been an easy task, admits William L. Bayer, MD, the energetic director of the Community Blood Center of Greater Kansas City since 1969.

"We felt we had to change the concept of what a blood bank was in a community," Dr. Bayer recalls. "Essentially, people looked at this place as a grocery store. And giving blood in this community didn't have a great emotional appeal."

The first step was changing the physical appearance of the blood center on Main St. near downtown Kansas City. After remodeling the center into a modern, ultra-efficient complex, there came what Dr. Bayer calls an effort "to get the total image changed."

At the same time, the director ordered a halt to purchase of commercial blood (although the use of paid donors at the center continued), producing a tighter blood supply (commercial sources had been providing about 20% of the needs) and bringing a few angry reactions from Kansas City physicians.

That created an opportunity to educate physicians on the importance of the appropriate use of blood transfusions—an effort that has continued both through continuing education programs and seminars, and through the training of medical technicians, and pathology residents and interns at the center, Dr. Bayer says. The center also stepped up its extensive research program, both in the use of blood and in new detection systems for such things as cytomegaloviruses.

As an example of what new techniques and careful use of blood can do, Dr. Bayer cites statistics on open-heart surgery in the Kansas City area. In 1969, the center provided an average of 15 units of blood for 208 cardiac operations; last year, as the number of operations swelled to 827, the average units of blood used was cut almost in half—to about eight.

The blood center's image-building effort took on many of the characteristics of a "political campaign," according to Mrs. Ruth Austin, director of public relations.

"We used the hard-sell," Mrs. Austin says. This meant utilizing posters on buses, billboards, newspapers, special conferences, radio, and television to tell the blood center's story to the 1½ million residents of the surrounding 21 Missouri and Kansas counties served by the center. One Kansas City TV station even aired a special program, during which more than 200 new donors actually gave blood.

However, advertising alone isn't the answer, Dr. Bayer emphasizes. "Advertising gives you credibility; people are aware you exist," he explains. "But it's not going to bring many people in. You have to go to them. The person-to-person approach is the only thing that works."

The blood center concentrated on recruiting groups "under one roof," especially church and factory groups, and began to expand its blood donor club program, which along with a "family plan" assurance program, is the backbone of the Kansas City system. This provides the center with a large base of donors upon which it can call to insure a continual supply of blood for the 54 hospitals it serves. It also began going back through files of donors, some of whom hadn't donated in years simply because they hadn't been asked.

The goal, Dr. Bayer says, is to establish a large enough pool of donors that the assurance plans will no longer be necessary and the current \$19 replacement fee—a controversial subject among blood bankers—can be eliminated.

Dr. Bayer defends the replacement fee as "just one additional technique" for recruiting donors. He points out that about one-third of the Kansas City donors are recruited as replacements, but at least half of these are converted to the family plan and account for a large percentage of the new donors, which are increasing at the rate of 35% a year. About 15% of the patients who receive blood choose to pay the fee.

"Once we establish the habit of giving blood, there will be no need for the responsibility fee," Dr. Bayer asserts. "That is what we are working toward."

But Dennis M. Donohue, MD, director of the nationally-known King County Central Blood Bank, an all-voluntary program in Seattle, is opposed to replacement fees. Such fees are "only one way of collecting money, not blood," he has said. When Seattle removed its replacement fee a year ago, the volume of blood replacement was not affected, according to Dr. Donohue.

Kansas City's donor recruiting program received a boost recently when the blood center and the Greater Kansas City Chapter of the American Red Cross signed a cooperative agreement. Under the unique pact—only the second of its kind in the country—the Red Cross will supply volunteer personnel and expertise to help with recruiting and mobile operations in outlying counties. The local Red Cross unit has collected no blood since World War II.

"Our goal is to expand the blood donor base to provide total coverage for everyone in the region," says Robert H. Schuelke, executive director of the Kansas City chapter. "Eventually, we would like to have an all-volunteer system for the country because we feel that would best serve patients' need for safe blood."

Another reason for the Kansas City blood center's success is its enviable record on outdated blood.

In 1970, the center had approximately 3,200 units, or 9% of its blood outdated—a fair record compared to the estimated national average of 20%, but not good enough. In 1971, the outdated was cut to 4.4%, and last year the center achieved a record low of 1.2% of the 40,336 units it distributed.

Steve Hohn, who oversees the distribution of blood from the center, says the record was achieved through tight inventory control and by "maintaining a smooth working relationship" with the hospitals.

More uniformity and coordination of blood banking is expected to result from new initiatives by the federal government. The Food and Drug Administration plans to extend federal regulation by registering and inspecting blood collection facilities not presently operating under federal licensure and by licensing the 200 plasmapheresis centers. The intent, says FDA Commissioner Charles C. Edwards, MD, is to provide a "uniform nationwide system" to protect patients against "unsafe blood and blood products," and to protect donors from "exploitation" by blood banks.

About 530 of the nation's 4,000 blood banks

shipping blood in interstate commerce (including the Kansas City center) already operate under federal licensure. These banks account for 85% of the eight million pints of blood drawn in this country each year.

Under provisions of the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act of 1972, a federal study panel is developing a "five-year plan" for the nation's blood resources and to guide the National Heart and Lung Institute in its blood banking activities. (See related story on page 1.)

Whether the U.S. will soon join such countries as Great Britain, Japan, France, and Canada among those with nationwide 100% volunteer blood donation programs remains to be seen. But across the nation, the movement in that direction is already well underway.

GIRLS' PREPARATORY SCHOOL IN CHATTANOOGA RESEARCHES THE RECYCLING OF SOLID WASTE

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, there are times when I feel that our young people have a greater concern for the quality of their environment than their elders. I am impressed by some of the research which is now being conducted by students at the high school level such as those at the Girls' Preparatory School in Chattanooga, Tenn.

I recently had the privilege of welcoming Mrs. Gene Vredevel, science instructor at this fine school, and her student, Miss Martin Kirk, to Washington. Mrs. Vredevel and Miss Martin Kirk were guests of the Ecology Council of America at a luncheon on Capitol Hill held in recognition of the work done under Mrs. Vredevel's direction in the area of environmental protection.

Their accomplishments are most impressive and some of the ideas which the group developed have a great deal of promise. I want to share this exciting experiment with my colleagues and ask that Mrs. Vredevel's letter to me, outline certain projects, be inserted in the Record at this point. The letter follows:

GIRLS' PREPARATORY SCHOOL,
Chattanooga, Tenn., June 29, 1973.

Congressman LAMAR BAKER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAKER: Thank you very much for taking time from your schedule to meet with Miss Martin Kirk and me at the ECO America luncheon on Wednesday. At the time we were very tired from much conference and little sleep. We are happy to have this added opportunity to tell you about the project which we did this year and which won us the honor to represent Tennessee at the ECO America seminar at Catocin Mountain.

Solid waste was our area of concern for projects in 1971-1972 and in 1972-1973. The first project was entitled "Recycling Solid Waste in Chattanooga" and won for GPS first place in the Tennessee Medical Association Auxiliary Health Contest, a special award in the Keep America Beautiful contest, and publication in The American Biology Teacher magazine. Enclosed please find a reprint of that publication.

The second project won second place in the Tennessee Medical Association Auxiliary Health Contest, just one point behind the

first place paper; and first place for Tennessee in the ECO America Contest. We have submitted it for publication consideration to several magazines. The project was as follows.

Solid waste could be reduced if people would buy products in stores with biodegradable wrappings and simple wrappings, avoiding overpackaging. The LIVE (Let's Increase Voluntary Ecology) Club of GPS received permission to speak to customers who reached for non-biodegradable packaging, when there was a choice, to determine if people can be convinced of the necessity for personal responsibility in choosing wrappings safe for the environment. Our study showed that when people are questioned about environmentally safe wrappings in their homes, they are willing to choose the better wrappings; but when they are in the stores the incentives of convenience and lower price of non-biodegradable packaging seem of greater importance and they buy the environmentally poor packaging.

Our study included interviews with representatives of companies using non-biodegradable packaging. The reason for use most often given was consumer demand. Some companies were eager to prove the ecological soundness of non-biodegradable wrapping such as plastic. They presented us with numerous articles on recycling plastic.

We conclude that if consumers demand and companies produce nonbiodegradable packaging, the only help for the crowded environment is recycling. In Chattanooga it is possible to recycle paper, aluminum, and glass. The LIVE Club sponsored a Recycle Plastic Day on February 20, 1973; all Chattanoogaans were urged to return all clean plastic containers to the grocery stores so the companies who had given us the recycling articles could reclaim their containers for recycling.

During our talks to customers in the six Chattanooga stores, we discussed the aluminum containers used for bakery and frozen products and urged the buyers to recycle the aluminum. Approximately 50% appeared to be interested in recycling aluminum for energy conservation. Of the total number of customers who were contacted, 29% were willing to switch to an environmentally safer wrapping, 69% bought the poorer wrapping anyway, and 3% made no purchase.

Thank you for your time and your interest. If you would like a complete report of our project with all of the data, we would be happy to send it to you. It is our hope that man will become increasingly aware of his dependence on the environment and therefore be able to solve these problems for survival.

Ecologically yours,

MRS. GENE VREDEVEL,
Chairman, Science Department.

IRELAND ELECTS A PROTESTANT PRESIDENT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for several years now I have been following closely events in Ireland and their interpretation or misinterpretation in the United States. Last year I visited both the 26-county Republic of Ireland and the 6-county statelet known as Northern Ireland. There are two gross misconceptions prevalent in much of the American press. The first is that the conflict in those six of the divided Province of

Ulster's nine counties known as Northern Ireland is basically a religious war. It is not; it is a struggle for equal protection under law, equality of economic opportunity, and for national independence.

To great degree the misconception that the current troubles are a religious war is promoted by those who would cloud the issue in order that the truth might be obscured and the British and American peoples be intimidated from making a closer inquiry into the facts of the matter. In their current political usage in the so-called North of Ireland, Catholic and Protestant are namely labels; in fact, they are misnomers for Nationalist and Unionist, since most Catholics happen to be Nationalists and most Protestants happen to be Unionists, and since the extreme Unionist politicians use religious bigotry as a purely political tool.

The use of religious sounding labels for political purposes would seem to suggest that English policy regarding Ireland is still framed with 17th century reference points, while the rest of the world, indeed even the rest of the British Empire, is most of the way through the 20th century.

The Irish Republican movement is constitutionally nonsectarian, was inspired—in part—by the example of the American Revolution, was founded for the purpose of abolishing dissension, uniting Protestant, Catholic, and dissenter under the common banner of Irishman, and to break the connection with England, the source of Ireland's political evils. The Irish Republican movement was founded near Belfast by a Protestant man, Theobald Wolfe Tone. Most of its earliest adherents were Ulster Presbyterians. Robert Emmett was a member of the Anglican communion. Thomas Davis and Charles Stuart Parnell were Protestants, and so was John Mitchell, who also fought in the 2d Virginia Cavalry during the American Civil War.

Throughout most of its modern history the Irish Separatist movement has been led by Protestants. Robert Erskine Childers was no exception; his son, Erskine Hamilton Childers was this May 30 the second Protestant to be elected as President of Ireland, and this by a 94 percent Catholic electorate.

This brings us to the second great misconception of which I spoke, that is, that in a reunited Ireland, Protestants would be victimized by the Irish Catholic majority in a manner reminiscent of the Spanish Inquisition. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The 1973 Irish Presidential campaign, election, and inauguration alone demonstrate the utter absence of religious bigotry from the politics of Irish Ireland.

There have been, in the past, objections raised to the role of religion in the Constitution of the Dublin government. Let us take a look at the questionable article.

"Article 44.

1. (1) The State acknowledges that the homage of public worship is due to Almighty God. It shall hold his name in reverence, and shall respect and honor religion.

(2) The State recognizes the special posi-

tion of the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church as the guardian of the Faith professed by the great majority of its citizens.

(3) The State also recognizes the Church of Ireland [Anglican Episcopal], the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the Methodist Church in Ireland, the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland, as well as the Jewish Congregations and other religious denominations existing in Ireland at the date of the coming into operation of this Constitution."

The Constitution goes on to guarantee freedom of conscience and the free profession and practice of religion, not to endow any religion, not to discriminate, not to force religious education, and not to interfere in the management of religious affairs.

During the past year, the "objectionable" portion having to do with religion was repealed by a 4-to-1 ratio in a plebiscite which was admittedly undertaken for the sole purpose of facilitating the reunification of Ireland by removing any possible grounds for objections by Irish Protestants living in the "North."

For its own part the Irish Republican Movement—of which the "Provisional" Irish Republican Army, the IRA, is its legitimate military arm—proposes a new federal Ireland, not merely an extension of the 26-county state, in which there would be complete liberty of religion and separation of church and state under a "Charter of Civil Rights," as in the first article of our own "Bill of Rights," therefore finally eliminating any grounds for fear of a theocracy.

But what about the United Kingdom? First, there is a state church. The bishops of that state church are appointed by Parliament. The Head of State must be a member of that state church. Irishmen living under English rule in Ireland are denied housing, jobs, public safety, human, natural, and civil rights based on the badge of religion—though actually for political and economic reasons.

There is no state church in Irish Ireland. The powers that be in Dublin do not interfere with any church's government. The first President of the 26-county state was Dr. Douglas Hyde, a Protestant; the newly-elected fourth President of the "Republic of Ireland," Erskine Childers, is also a Protestant. And no one under Irish rule has ever been denied a job, a house, or equal justice under law because of his religion or lack of it.

The whole question of theocracy in Ireland is a red herring. But, exposed to the cold light of day, it reveals that if there be any guilt it lies with English misgovernment in Ireland.

ERSKINE CHILDERS

Erskine Hamilton Childers speaks with an unmistakably old-school accent. He has a great sincerity of poise and his philosophy of politics is more people-oriented, the party being secondary. His gentlemanly tones are full of persuasive reasoning. He was the candidate of the Fianna Fáil Party—Ireland's largest political party, launched by those of the losing, that is, Republican, side in the 1922-23 Irish Civil War who, though still rejecting the treaty ending the 1919-21 Black and Tan War and the partition of Ireland in principle, later entered into participation in the 26-county state as a matter of practical politics; Fianna

Fáil is the party of the retiring Irish President, Brooklyn-born Eamonn deValera, in the recent presidential election and was elected with a clear majority despite his party's upset in the most recent parliamentary election. He is also the heir to an honored name and tradition, being the son of Robert Erskine Childers, one of Ireland's great national heroes in the 20th century.

Robert Erskine Childers was born and raised in Ireland, son of an English father and an Irish mother. He always considered himself by birth, domicile, and deliberate choice of citizenship an Irishman. The experience of the Boer War had converted him from being a Unionist and Imperialist to being a Liberal and a Nationalist. During 1910-1914 he worked and published for Irish Home Rule and national self-determination. In response to threats of violence by certain Unionists—the illegal Ulster Volunteers; UVF—the Irish Volunteers were formed in 1913 to defend the home rule bill of 1912 which was to have gone into operation in 1914. In warm sympathy with the Irish Volunteers, he joined a small committee formed in May, 1914, to supply them with arms, and with his wife and two friends, ran a cargo of guns into Howth in July of that year.

With the coming of the Great European War, like thousands of other Irish Nationalists, Erskine Childers was misled by the idea of a "war for small nations". He joined the British Naval Air Service, afterward amalgamated with the Royal Air Force, and served with distinction, leaving it at the end of the war with the rank of major.

All efforts to constitutionally achieve dominion status within the British Empire having been frustrated in London, Childers recognized that revolution was inevitable and necessary.

The Irish Republic had already been proclaimed in arms in the blood sacrifice of the 1916 Easter Rising, ratified by 80 percent of the Irish electorate in the 1918 general election, and established *de jure* by the first Dáil Éireann in 1919.

With the formal establishment of the Republic in 1919, Robert Erskine Childers chose his citizenship once and for all. He chose that of the Irish Republic, like hundreds of other ex-soldiers—having severed all connection with the British Army. He threw himself into the work of the Irish Republican movement, and held many positions of increasing responsibility and was elected a Deputy for Wicklow and Kildare in May 1921. He was appointed by the Irish Cabinet and Dáil—assembly—as principal secretary of the delegation to London for the peace negotiations between "the Irish Republic and that community of nations known as the British Empire," and also as the responsible adviser on defense questions.

He took a strong line from the first against the British Dominion and partition scheme. He had passed through the Dominion phase years before, discarded it, and sworn allegiance to the established Irish Republic.

Under the threat of "immediate and terrible war" British Prime Minister

David Lloyd George forced a treaty on the Irish delegation—Erskine Childers dissenting—which violated their instruction—that is, denying Irish sovereignty, partitioning Ireland. The executive of the Irish Republican Army, commanded by Gen. Liam Lynch, and most of its men—together with President Eamonn deValera—had refused to accept the treaty because it compromised their oath of allegiance to the Irish Republic for which they had fought and in whose defense they had taken lives. The IRA was awaiting the convening of a newly elected national assembly, the Third Dáil Éireann, which would form a new permanent government.

At the instigation of and with the support of the British Government, the temporary Free State government attacked the IRA executive 2 days before the proposed convening of the Third Dáil Éireann, thus precipitating civil war and preserving itself in office. In that terrible civil war Erskine Childers remained steadfast in his loyalty to the Irish Republic. He was a casualty of that war, being executed by the Free State on November 24, 1922. The civil war lasted into 1923 with the Free State eventually victorious.

On November 17, 1922, Erskine Childers, Protestant patriot, told his captors and the world why he remained faithful to the Irish Republic.

The slow growth of moral and intellectual convictions had brought me to where I stood and it was and is impossible to go back. I was bound by honour, conscience and principle to oppose the Treaty by speech, writing and action both in peace, and when it came to the disastrous point, in war. For we hold that a Nation has no right to surrender its declared and established independence and that even a minority has a right to resist that surrender in arms. . . .

I have fought and worked for a sacred principle, the loyalty of the Nation to its declared independence and repudiation of any voluntary surrender to conquest and inclusion in the British Empire. That is the faith of my comrades, my leaders and myself. Some day we shall be justified when the Nation forgets its weakness and reverts to the ancient and holy tradition which we are preserving in our struggle, and may God hasten the day of reunion amongst us all under the honoured flag of the Republic.

Robert Erskine Childers is a true martyr to the cause of Irish Freedom. His son, President Erskine Hamilton Childers, shares his father's Protestant faith; he also shares his father's—and former President deValera's—faith that all Ireland will be united under the flag of the Irish Republic.

Erskine Childers has long been looked upon as the conscience of the Fianna Fáil Party; he is also a respected man who can deal capably with the mass media. He was born in London in 1905—where his father was from 1895 to 1910 in civil service as a committee clerk for the House of Commons—and received an English public school education at Gresham School, Holt, Norfolk. He had aspired to become a doctor, but was diverted from medical studies by his father's involvement in Irish politics combined with his own frequent visits

to his cousins, the Bartons of Glendalough House. In 1923, he campaigned for his imprisoned cousin, Robert Barton, who was standing in County Wicklow. He spoke in O'Connell Street along with Vivion deValera against the imprisonment of the latter's father. His politics were distinctly antitreaty and the political upheaval of the treaty disillusioned him greatly.

He went to Cambridge in 1924 and took an Honors Tripos in History and Politics. He worked for an American travel agency in Paris for awhile and returned home to Ireland for good in 1931. He became advertising manager of the Irish Press when it was founded by Mr. deValera in 1932. In 1936, he was appointed secretary of the Federation of Irish Manufacturers—a position he held until his appointment as a Parliamentary Secretary in 1944.

Because of his father's close relationship with Éamonn deValera, Erskine Childers developed a very intimate association with the leader of the Fianna Fáil—Soldiers of Destiny—Party. The execution of his father was a traumatic experience for the younger Childers and his political philosophy became more and more Republican oriented. It only became a matter of time before he found a seat in the Irish Parliament at Leinster House, in 1937.

Since 1944, he has held one junior and four senior ministries. He is generally considered by the medical profession to have been the best Minister of Health in the history of the state. He has represented the County Monaghan—one of three Ulster counties not under British rule, and containing a noticeable Protestant nationalist population; his principal electoral opponent there is Fine Gael's Billy Fox, another Protestant nationalist—since 1962, and has most recently served as Táiniste—elected second in command to the Taoiseach or Prime Minister by the parliamentary majority.

A dedication service in St. Patrick's—Anglican Protestant Episcopal—Cathedral, Dublin, prior to the oath-taking ceremony on June 25, pointed out the essential unity and religious harmony in the "Republic". William Cardinal Conway, Archbishop of Armagh—in "Northern Ireland"—and Catholic Primate of all Ireland, sat with the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, the Most Rev. Dermot Ryan, close to the Presidential pew. The service was led by the dean of St. Patrick's, Dr. Victor Griffin, with the Protestant Church of Ireland Primate, Dr. George Otto Simms. Others taking part included Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans, the Salvation Army, and the Society of Friends.

The election of Erskine Childers, a Protestant, to succeed the almost legendary Éamonn deValera is fraught with symbolism. We must assume, of course, that the majority of the Irish electorate chose him as the better man based on his many and obvious qualifications. It is also significant that he is the son of his heroic father, and bears the name of Erskine Childers who died in the service of an all-Ireland, Irish Republic. But, perhaps the greatest significance is that the 94 percent Catholic majority in the

26-county Republic of Ireland are sending a clear and unmistakable message to all their fellow Irishmen living under foreign rule in the northeast six counties known as "Northern Ireland". The message is: Let us sit down again in brotherhood; all that awaits you in a united Ireland is peace and opportunity.

On taking office, President Erskine Childers pledged to work for harmony. He read the same prayer Dr. Douglas Hyde read 35 years earlier when he became President.

It says much about the new President. Here is the prayer:

"God be in my head and in my understanding;
God be in mine eyes and in my looking;
God be in my mouth and in my speaking;
God be in my heart and in my thinking;
God be at mine end and at my departing."

OUR BEST BUY SINCE THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Today newspaper of Friday, June 27, has a recent article by Paul Harvey which goes far to describe the outstanding performance of Skylab and the numerous benefits of our national space program.

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

OUR BEST BUY SINCE THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

(By Paul Harvey)

We really didn't need all that trouble with Skylab.

With Yankee dollars shaky worldwide and shrinking stateside; with the confidence in Americanism shaken by public debt and public scandal; we really did not need any "bugs" in our prestigious \$294 million Skylab project.

Queen Isabella did not hock her jewels to finance Columbus just to prove the world was round; she wanted to claim for Spain the rumored riches of the Indies.

The primary motivation for most exploration has been monetary and it still is.

Budget-pinched Americans have sometimes construed our space budget as an "expense" rather than an "investment."

Even members of Congress whose districts lack jobs dependent on space exploration are inclined to ignore the long-term fringe benefits.

The myriad products and processes which have already resulted from our investment in space exploration have profited us economically many times over.

For example, new electrical wiring which can be stuck on a wall and painted over, batteries which can be charged 100 times faster, more accurate digital clocks, the sight-switch with which a paralyzed person can steer a wheelchair.

Each of these is a spinoff from our successes and our failures in space.

Safer automobile tires, antifogging compound for your windshield and your eyeglasses, improved lubricants and heat-tolerant ceramics for kitchenware—all have been harvested from "empty space" technology.

Space exploration has resulted in 1,892

patents for practical, usable, beneficial, productive "things" which never were before and might never have been.

And yet we invest only two cents of each federal budget dollar in this highly profitable research while 45 cents of every dollar goes to one or another form of welfare.

Last year our government spent a total of \$3 billion on space; California alone spent that much on welfare programs!

Forgetting the material blessings just the medical fallout from 11 years of spaceflight may add that many years to the life of each of us.

Illnesses are now being diagnosed and treated by remote control. Bloodless surgery is being performed now with tools developed by space medics.

Our space-bought knowledge of our own planet—its seas, its resources, its climate—is of infinitely greater ecological significance than the combined efforts of the shortsighted ecologists who would divert space money.

America has not bought so much for so little since the Louisiana Purchase.

The "bread" we spread in space comes back a hundred-fold!

OUR JUNE SALUTE: ALBERT P. CALLI

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, a man I admire and respect has recently been chosen president of the International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. He is Albert P. Calli, executive director of New Haven's Easter Seal Goodwill Rehabilitation Center, a resourceful leader and strenuous worker in the field of services to the handicapped and disabled. On June 30 of this year, in an editorial salute, the New Haven Register recognized the fine work Al Calli has done. I am inserting that article in the RECORD so that my colleagues and others, who have not already had the pleasure of working with Mr. Calli, will know more about him and his dedicated efforts in behalf of the disadvantaged. It is also my desire to assure Al Calli's many friends and admirers in the rehabilitation field, that he is, indeed, as respected in his community as he is in his profession throughout the Nation.

I would like to add my personal salute to Albert P. Calli, an innovative, persistent, and successful leader in programs for the handicapped.

The editorial follows:

OUR JUNE SALUTE: ALBERT P. CALLI

(NOTE.—This is one of a series of monthly salutes designed by THE REGISTER to recognize in terms of community service and personal dedication the sort of courage, good humor, unselfish effort, or other virtues which, in their individual or group application, enrich or improve life for all of us.)

When Albert P. Calli last month was elected president of the International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, the honor was a commentary on the importance of his work on behalf of the handicapped here in the Greater New Haven area. The executive director of the Easter Seal Goodwill Rehabilitation Center here has made contributions that are appreciated and useful thousands of miles from home.

Last year, there was striking evidence of

the waves that were being made by the Rehabilitation Center under Calli's energetic, practical, resourceful and compassionate leadership. The Center here was deemed outstanding by the executive director of the Australian Association for the Mentally Retarded. The visitor from "down under" was especially impressed with the close working relationship that had been forged between the Regional Center for the Retarded and the Rehabilitation Center here. It was an example of the many ways that Calli has discovered to help provide comprehensive services for a variety of handicapped persons.

In the past few years, there have been many inspiring stories of progress made by handicapped persons whose needs have been answered by the Rehabilitation Center. Calli has explored for new and effective methods to get results that transform dependent people into self-sufficient individuals who make normal contributions to society.

Calli uncovers programs with new potential, goes after funds, personnel, equipment and methods that open up new worlds for the handicapped. He has enlisted the aid of youth, has mounted a far-reaching inner-city program, and has even come to the aid of students who have not achieved their highest potential because of a learning problem. A residence for such students has been arranged by Calli.

Besides serving more than 2,000 handicapped people at the center in this area, Calli has carried out national programs. The Center here has been used as a major auxiliary training resource for colleges and graduate schools as far away as Wisconsin. Hundreds of college students have been trained at the Center in such fields as speech and occupational therapy, health and physical education.

So the impact of Calli's humanitarian work has had widespread influence far beyond the New Haven area. This culminated in his election to the important post of president of the International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. The organization is made up of personnel who represent more than 600 facilities in the United States and Canada.

The Register is happy to salute Albert P. Calli and to join the association in recognizing his extraordinary achievements.

RHODESIAN CHROME AND U.S. INDUSTRY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I replied to a letter on the industrial need for Rhodesian chrome from Mr. Martin Ornitz, president of the Crucible Stainless Steel Division of Colt Industries. Mr. Ornitz' letter defends the notion that the United States should continue to break international law in order to import small amounts of chromium ore from Southern Rhodesia, even though abundant supplies are available in the United States and from foreign sources. This same letter was sent to a large number of Congressmen and Senators as an expression of Colt Industries' opposition to H.R. 8272 which would restore the United States to full adherence to United Nations' economic sanctions against the Smith regime in Southern Rhodesia; that is, negate the Rhodesian Chrome Amendment of 1971.

The economic arguments in this letter

in favor of continued trade with Southern Rhodesia are rationally unsupportable. Our industrial needs for chromium can be met easily without continuing the current violation of U.N. sanctions which allows imports from Southern Rhodesia. All of us should be concerned that this country have enough chromium for its industrial purposes, but it simply does not follow that access to the Rhodesian market is in any way essential to achieving that end. Millions of tons of chromium ore are available at competitive world prices in the Soviet Union and Turkey. Chromium ore is also mined in substantial quantities in South Africa, the Philippines, Finland, India, and Brazil. Our national strategic stockpile has, for several years, been swollen with excessive amounts of chromium ore. Congress has already authorized release of 900,000 tons to the commercial market and the administration has requested release of an additional 2 million tons. As for ferrochromium, 129,000 tons has been released from the Government stockpiles and the administration has requested that 640,000 more tons be released.

The quality of the chromium ore purchased from the Soviet Union and Turkey, in particular, is at least as high as Rhodesian. Some 13 million tons of lower-grade chromium ore deposits are to be found in the United States and Canada. Considering the abundance of the high-grade chromium ore now available throughout the world, mining of the lower-grade American and Canadian ore need not be contemplated at this time. However, should there be a serious shortage in the future, the United States and Canada could do as Finland has done and make ferrochromium from the low-grade chromium ore.

Contrary to claims in Mr. Ornitz' letter that the demand for chromium ore is exceeding supply, it is obvious that the deposits of chromium ore throughout the world are being mined well below capacity.

Mr. Peter Flanigan, the President's Assistant for International Economic Affairs, has stated that access to Rhodesian chrome is not an important element in U.S. foreign economic policy since there are large surpluses of the commodity in our national stockpiles and the United States imports a relatively small amount of Rhodesian chrome anyhow.

The contention that the Soviet Union is transshipping Rhodesian ore to the United States was conclusively disproven by the U.S. Geological Survey 2 years ago. Those who persist in claiming otherwise are simply ignoring scientific evidence.

Mr. Speaker, the economic arguments in support of the Rhodesia chrome amendment do not hold up when faced with the facts. It is time for us to negate that ill-advised piece of legislation.

I include Mr. Ornitz' letter and my reply in the RECORD at this point:

JULY 9, 1973.

MR. MARTIN N. ORNITZ,
President, Crucible Stainless Steel Division,
Colt Industries, Midland, Pa.

DEAR MR. ORNITZ: Thank you for your recent letter concerning HR 8272, passage of which would restore the United States to

full adherence to United Nations sanctions against the minority regime in Southern Rhodesia.

I believe that the American economy should be assured of adequate supplies of chromium for our industrial needs at reasonable prices and that this can be accomplished without our country continuing to be an open violator of international law.

Millions of tons of chrome ore will be available to the American market without dealing ourselves the disadvantage of continuing to break the word of two US Presidents in the international community. As recently as June 26, Mr. Peter M. Flanigan, Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs, stated in a letter to me that:

"Access to Rhodesian chrome and other minerals is not an important element in US security or in our overall foreign economic policy given: 1) the substantial excess of our stockpile resources and 2) the comparatively minor amounts we actually import from Rhodesia."

If the American industrial demand for chromium imports is in fact exceeding supply, one would expect that the volume of imports from non-Rhodesian sources would have remained at least as high after the passage of the Rhodesian chrome amendment as before. However, this is not the case, since although imports from the Soviet Union have increased, Turkish imports have dropped by some 17% since the resumption of trade in chrome with Southern Rhodesia.

Should future demand exceed the availability from foreign suppliers at reasonable prices, relief could well be facilitated by the release of some 2,000,000 tons of chrome ore from the national stockpile as has been requested by the Administration to Congress.

Not only does it seem to me that US adherence to UN sanctions would not jeopardize our access to adequate supplies of chrome ore for industrial purposes, but also that continued trade with Southern Rhodesia in ferrochromium will be damaging to the US economy as well. Lay-offs and shutdowns of American ferrochromium plants are now taking place in the wake of increased imports from Southern Rhodesia and the Ferroalloys Association has petitioned the Tariff Commission for relief from imports.

I was struck by your characterization of our violation of UN sanctions as "the State Department's problem vis-a-vis its African policy". Presidents Johnson and Nixon have both stated publicly their support for peaceful change toward majority rule in Southern Rhodesia and accordingly supported economic sanctions against the minority regime there as the best feasible means of effecting that kind of change. Our adherence to the Security Council sanctions was an act entered into voluntarily by this country in a forum where we have veto power. Our violation of the sanctions is internationally illegal and in direct opposition to the democratic and humanitarian ideals we Americans cherish.

Inasmuch as access to Rhodesian Chrome is not essential to the needs of US industry, I invite you to join us in the effort to restore our country to adherence to UN sanctions under international law. I would be happy to meet with you or your representatives to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. FRASER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.

JUNE 25, 1973.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives, Longworth House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.
Re H.R. 8272.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I note that you have sponsored the subject bill, H.R. 8272,

aimed at halting the shipment of chromium ore from Rhodesia to the United States. This matter has been the subject of considerable publicity lately—some of which has been inaccurate or at the very least misleading. Since availability of adequate supplies of chromium, at prices competitive to those paid in other nations, is vital to the welfare of our country, I write to you to express concern over the effect that the enactment of this bill would have.

Ferro-chromium, an alloy of iron and chromium, is used in the manufacture of nearly all specialty steels. These include alloy steels used in making such things as farm equipment, trucks, buses, automobiles, airplanes, and machine tools. It is essential to the manufacture of all stainless steels—for dairy, hospital, and restaurant equipment, power plants, oil refineries, chemical plants, atomic energy plants, pollution control equipment and countless items used in the home, such as pots and pans, tableware, sinks, electric ranges, dishwashers, etc. It is used in making tool steels—for shaping and cutting other materials. Obviously, a shortage of chromium for steelmaking would disrupt our entire economy.

Chromium ore is mined chiefly in Russia, South Africa and Turkey, as well as Rhodesia. There are no known domestic deposits. This makes us fully dependent on foreign sources for a very vital metal for which there are no substitutes.

At present the world-wide supply and demand are not quite in balance, with demand exceeding supply. As a result, contrary to some recent statements, the price of one grade of ferro-chromium has increased in this country 13% and the much more widely used grade has increased 24%. These increases have occurred in spite of the fact that the embargo on Rhodesian chrome was lifted. If it had remained it is likely that the price increases would be greater.

It has been said that in spite of the lifting of the embargo essentially the same percentage of our chrome still comes from Russia. This is caused by two things. The total has increased due to increased demand. Also the embargo did not slow down Rhodesian production. The Rhodesians sold their chrome ore to other countries on long-term contracts. These countries merely ignored the embargo. Chemical analysis suggests some of the chrome ore we buy from Russia originated in Rhodesia.

The Rhodesian ore is considered to be of the highest quality available, contrary also to recent statements by the State Department.

The proposed pollution-control devices (catalytic converters and thermal reactors) for automobiles will result in a tremendous increase in requirements for chromium just for the production of stainless steel in this country of about 25%. Should the present projections for catalytic converters hold true, this will require the use of an additional 60,000 tons, approximately, per year of chromium for this application alone. With all the chrome ore mines in full production, including Rhodesia, and no restrictions on American industry as to sources, there is presently a serious lack of adequate supplies of ferro-chrome. This problem will be compounded by the requirements for pollution control as well as the growth of stainless steel production in the immediate future. Further, the problem of cost and viability of the industry can be seriously affected.

In spite of the State Department's problem vis-a-vis its African policy, nevertheless, I respectfully request that you reconsider H.R. 8272 from the standpoint of its effect on the vast majority of Americans. The price of imports cannot be controlled. Chromium is imported. We cannot afford, as a nation, to reimpose this embargo just for, as the State Department says, "the psychological effect."

If we do, the cost of a lot of things all of us buy is going to go up still more, with no real effect on Rhodesia.

We regard this as a most serious matter and would be pleased to meet with you at your convenience if you would like additional facts on this subject, and the importance of it to the American economy.

Sincerely,

MARTIN N. ORNITZ,
President, Crucible Stainless Steel
Division.

GAO REPORT ON RUSSIAN WHEAT SALES

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the General Accounting Office released a study of Russian wheat sales. The study was undertaken at my request and at the request of several other Members of Congress. It is an excellent report and I recommend it to my colleagues not only as an example of a fine job by GAO, but an example of how the bureaucracy functions at its very worst.

Perhaps the most succinct conclusion expressed by the report appears in its title, "Russian Wheat Sales and Weaknesses in Agriculture's Management of the Wheat Export Subsidy Program." Indeed there are major weaknesses in the Agriculture Department's management of the wheat export subsidy program, as the report so clearly illustrates.

The report sets forth four major conclusions:

First. The \$300 million of the taxpayer's money was unnecessarily paid in export subsidies. In the opinion of the GAO, these subsidy payments were excessive. Many of the sales could have been made with reduced subsidies or perhaps no subsidies at all; in the opinion of the report the Agriculture Department in paying out these subsidies clearly paid greater subsidies than the marketplace required.

Second. Very poor administration of the program by the Agriculture Department is evidenced by the fact that commercial intelligence was available indicating that the United States was, in fact, the exclusive world market for wheat at the time of the sales to the Soviet Union. Maintaining a low world target price under these circumstances was wrong and very costly to the taxpayers.

What we have here is essentially a Pearl Harbor situation. The Agriculture Department had considerable information coming in from the agricultural attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, and from the Canadian Government, indicating the severe crop failures in the Soviet Union and thus the size and the scope of likely wheat purchases by the Soviet Union. The information was there but nobody paid any attention to it or bothered to analyze it.

Third. Poor administration by the Agriculture Department is also in evidence in other areas of the program.

For example, no detailed analysis was provided to support the decision by Agriculture to continue export subsidies. The GAO found that the Department acted on intuition not on the basis of careful reasoning.

As another example, the GAO found the program lacked the administrative controls necessary to prevent excessive subsidies from being paid. The report cites just two examples in which proper controls could have saved some \$700,000 in subsidies at a minimum.

Further, no effort was made by the Agriculture Department to provide the information they had to agricultural interests in the Nation. The Agriculture Department has statutory responsibility to work for the best interests of American farmers, and in this case they clearly failed to do that.

Finally, there was no effort by the Agriculture Department to evaluate the subsidy program to see if it was necessary, to see if it was effective, and to see if it was meeting its legislative goals. Rather, a "bureaucracy as usual" attitude prevailed even though millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money were being paid out in subsidies.

Fourth. A major finding of the GAO study was that if the program is to continue, it is most important that it be reevaluated from top to bottom. The GAO recommends some specific steps to be taken to accomplish this.

In summary, the major conclusion of the GAO study is that the United States was "had" in the Russian wheat transaction—"had" to the tune of at least \$350 million in unnecessary subsidies that kept the price of wheat low for the Russians. Responsibility for that lies in the lap of the Agriculture Department. The tunnel vision of Washington's finest bureaucrats resulted in a \$300 million windfall—a windfall not for the American farmer, not for the American grain exporter, not for the American people, but for the Government of the U.S.S.R.

Considering the level of administrative ability evidenced within the Agriculture Department as outlined in the GAO report; we are perhaps fortunate that it was not worse. But a \$300 million hornsawing is bad enough.

It seems to me that our Government ought to be able to do better than that.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the summary of the GAO's report at this point in the RECORD:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE CONGRESS: RUSSIAN WHEAT SALES AND WEAKNESSES IN AGRICULTURE'S MANAGEMENT OF WHEAT EXPORT SUBSIDY PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

Several members of the Congress requested that GAO examine the implications of the massive wheat sales to Russia in the summer of 1972 and the Department of Agriculture's management of the subsidy program, including its system of gathering and disseminating foreign agricultural information.

The President announced the signing of an agreement with Russia on July 8, 1972, making credit totaling \$750 million available over a 3-year period for purchasing various U.S. grains. By then Russia was already purchasing U.S. wheat.

Within a few weeks, cash and credit wheat sales to Russia, heavily subsidized by the

U.S. Government, approximated \$700 million, the largest private grain sales in U.S. history. Because of the size the sales were historic, but they also focused national attention on Agriculture's administration of the wheat export subsidy program.

Basic information

The wheat export subsidy program began in 1949 to help the United States meet its obligation to export wheat at prices agreed to under the International Wheat Agreement.

The program's major objectives are to generally insure that U.S. wheat is competitive in world markets and to reduce Government wheat inventories.

The Secretary of Agriculture, as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC), decides whether subsidies should be paid. Exporters enter into agreements with CCC to export wheat and, after shipment, submit documentation to support the subsidy claimed. The Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs makes policy decisions affecting subsidy rates.

The Export Marketing Service establishes daily subsidy rates for five classes of wheat according to protein levels, costs of export, and export periods. These rates apply to all export destinations. The Service has maintained a zero subsidy rate for all types of wheat since September 22, 1972, allowing wheat prices to seek their own levels, but, during the preceding 4 months rates ranged from a few cents to as high as 51 cents a bushel for Hard Winter wheat.

Before its suspension, the program incurred about \$4.3 billion in subsidy costs for the export of about 10.5 billion bushels of U.S. wheat.

There is little doubt that the program has been instrumental in competitively pricing U.S. wheat moving into export markets.

FINDING AND CONCLUSIONS

The large sales of U.S. wheat to Russia and other exports in the summer of 1972 caused a dramatic rise in the price of U.S. wheat.

Agriculture claims that the U.S. Treasury will accrue net benefits totaling about \$457 million as a result of the wheat sales to Russia in addition to the following benefits:

Increased prices that farmers are receiving for their crops.

Creation of new jobs.

Improved balance of trade. (See pp. 14 and 16 and app. V.)

Agriculture is committed to pay over \$300 million in subsidies on the Russian and other export sales. GAO believes many of these sales would have been made even with reduced subsidies and that Agriculture should have responded more rapidly to the available information and reduced or eliminated the subsidies sooner.

Wheat export subsidy program

After October 1971 the key determinant in establishing daily wheat subsidy rates was the export target price. The difference between the target price and the domestic price was the daily export subsidy rate.

Maintenance of a low target price throughout the period of the Russian sales and for several subsequent weeks was a crucial factor in obligating the U.S. Government to pay excessive subsidies. (See pp. 17 to 24.)

GAO questioned the maintenance of a low target price in views of available intelligence reports and analyses indicating adverse Russian crop conditions. Agriculture also knew that the United States was the dominant wheat supplier and that purchasers of large supplies had to come to the United States. (See pp. 18 to 22.)

Agriculture officials recognized the changing world wheat situation early in 1972 but decided against increasing the export target price for several reasons. GAO expected to find a detailed analysis to support such a major policy decision, but it seems to have

been based largely on intuitive judgments made by Agriculture officials. (See pp. 22 to 24.)

The Russian sales magnified imperfections in the management of the wheat export subsidy program. U.S. grain exporters negotiated their sales to Russia at fixed prices below the \$1.63 to \$1.65 target price for Hard Winter wheat. Exporters sold large quantities at these prices with Agriculture's assurance that the subsidy program would continue to maintain export target prices. (See pp. 25 and 26.)

The massive amount sold to Russia and other buyers raised the domestic price of wheat. Hard Winter wheat sold at gulf ports for \$1.68 a bushel in July brought \$2.49 a bushel in September and even more later.

An export goal of 650 million bushels and a fiscal year 1973 budget estimate of \$67 million in subsidy mushroomed to 1.1 billion bushels in exports and over \$300 million in subsidy. (See p. 14.)

Agriculture needs to establish rules and procedures for transactions involving unusual purchases by state trading monopolies. The unequal bargaining power that exists when a single, fully informed buyer (the Russian state trading agency) confronts several partially informed sellers calls for greater Government-industry cooperation. (See p. 63.)

Speculating in subsidy registrations

Changes made in 1967 to the basic wheat export subsidy program, permitting subsidy registrations at exporters' options, and other program features in effect at the time of the wheat sales to Russia tended to minimize risks and created an environment whereby exporters could make substantial profits. Although Agriculture sought to increase the flexibility for exporters to price U.S. wheat competitively in international markets, the program lacked appropriate administrative controls.

Some exporters making sales in August 1972 registered sales several weeks later at higher subsidy rates. In five examples, CCC paid a total subsidy of about \$604,493. Had exporters been required to register on the dates of sales, the subsidy would have been \$286,188, or \$318,305 less. (See p. 32.)

Export Marketing Service officials contend there is no evidence that the program had allowed excess profit because of intense competition among exporters.

GAO tested the possible profitability of 50 cases under the subsidy registration procedures. These comparisons, for other than sales to Russia, showed an average differential of 29.8 cents a bushel. GAO's calculation is based on using estimated purchase costs against sale prices plus subsidy on 5.7 million bushels registered. GAO tests indicated that unusual margins were possible under the subsidy registration procedures. (See pp. 33 and 34.)

In another test of 430 September 1972 registrations totaling about 160 million bushels with a subsidy entitlement of \$36 million, GAO's examination of sales contracts showed that most of the sales for which data was available were consummated well after the export subsidy had been suspended. Because the nonsubsidized U.S. export price was competitive in world markets, subsidies were not needed. (See pp. 36 and 37.)

Other management considerations

Carrying-charge payments are intended to cover the estimated costs of owning wheat for future delivery. The subsidy registration date, instead of the sale date, is used to calculate subsidy entitlement. In 28 instances totaling about \$360,000, had the sale contract dates rather than the registration dates determined the carrying-charge subsidies, the payments would have been about \$350,000 less. (See p. 39.)

Until August 1971 Agriculture prohibited export subsidy payments on certain types of

sales to affiliate companies. Under special ground rules affecting subsidy registrations during the last week of August 1972 (System I), the Export Marketing Service disallowed \$650,500 of these registrations because an agency relationship existed between the exporter and importer and therefore the registrations did not qualify for subsidy payments. The Export Marketing Service decision raised a question concerning the legality of other System I registrations and subsidy payments made under similar circumstances on registrations prior to August 1971. (See pp. 40 to 44.)

Better program coordination between Agriculture activities is needed to preclude undue profits from accruing to exporters on wheat sold from CCC inventories. (See pp. 44 and 45.)

Intelligence gathering and dissemination

Although Agriculture has fairly reliable data on general crop conditions and significant changes in worldwide supply and demand, farmers generally were not provided timely information with appropriate interpretative comments to help them make sound marketing decisions.

Legislation directs Agriculture to acquire foreign agricultural information to help farmers, processors, distributors, and exporters adjust their operations and practices to meet world conditions. However, Agriculture has not surveyed the specific intelligence needs of the agricultural sector. (See pp. 46 to 52.)

Program evaluation needs

Despite annual subsidy outlays of millions of dollars, Agriculture has not comprehensively evaluated the wheat export subsidy program. Limited evaluations indicating that the subsidy program was not fully effective were dismissed by operating officials. (See pp. 53 to 56.)

GAO examined several pertinent statistical relationships indicative of program effectiveness. It concluded, on the basis of making U.S. wheat competitive in international markets, that Agriculture seemed to have paid greater subsidies than the marketplace required. Other agricultural economists questioned the need for subsidy payments and suggested that the program needs to be completely reevaluated. (See pp. 56 to 58.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

GAO recommends that the Secretary of Agriculture take the following actions:

1. Because of the weaknesses observed in the wheat export subsidy program:

Review the wheat export subsidy program in its entirety and predicate its reinstatement on a meaningful justification for its existence.

Devise a better system of coordinating with private exporters on sales of agricultural products to such nonmarket economies as those of Communist countries, other Government-directed procurements, and large-scale procurements.

Review the legality of export subsidy payments involving sales to foreign affiliates, especially registrations under System I and those recorded before August 1971.

2. For disseminating foreign agricultural information:

Form a joint Government-business committee representing farmers, processors, distributors, and exporters to identify information needs.

3. If the program review concludes that subsidies are needed:

Determine the most effective and efficient ways to use subsidies to compete in world markets.

Provide for periodic evaluation of program effectiveness and efficiency.

Document the basis and reasoning used in establishing daily subsidies.

Direct that sales and cost data on wheat transactions be used in establishing and checking the reasonableness of subsidy levels

and consider flexible subsidies according to geographic locations and circumstances.

Better coordinate commercial sales, concessionary credit sales, and sales from CCC inventory into a cohesive wheat export policy having appropriate safeguards on subsidy payment amounts.

Consider revising the basis for computing entitlement to the carrying-charge increment.

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The Secretary of Agriculture advised that the GAO study will prove useful in helping the Department make program improvements for the future. The Secretary agreed with GAO's major recommendations but took issue with GAO on some other observations and conclusions. The Secretary's comments and GAO's evaluations are presented in appendix I.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

U.S. agriculture's productive capacity has traditionally resulted in surplus stocks which were stored at great expense or exported with subsidy. Although exports are important to achieving U.S. trade objectives, they can have an adverse effect. Recent dramatic changes in the world supply-demand situation surfaced a need for assessing agricultural exports in a broader national context.

Congress should consider requiring that agencies develop definitive ground rules so that expected benefits from exports can be appropriately weighed against their impact on various segments of the domestic economy.

ELMER F. BUDLOVE, INDIANA'S MOST PUBLICIZED PHOTOGRAPHER RETIRES

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana and particularly the Calumet industrial region in northwest Indiana regrets that Elmer F. Budlove, photographer, military commander, friend of Presidents, mayors, Governors, policemen, firemen, and untold thousands of people in all walks of life is retiring.

Elmer Budlove has been in charge of the photography department of the Gary Post-Tribune and is now terminating 36 years of active service in the newspaper field. His wide acquaintance and reputation in the newspaper coverage has not been confined to Indiana, but he has been present at national conventions, both political and industrial, business, military, chamber of commerce, and other organizations over a quarter of a century.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks excerpts from a newspaper article in the Indiana Gary Post-Tribune of Sunday, July 1, 1973, under the heading "Bud" Retiring After 36 Colorful Years":

MANY PHOTOGRAPHIC, MILITARY LAURELS: "BUD" RETIRING AFTER 36 COLORFUL YEARS

"Bud," as he is best known, has amassed high awards in both his photographic work and military service during his long career.

His work with The Post-Tribune was interrupted only by a three-year stint in the Army in World War II, and he continued to reserve military duty until only 1½ years ago.

The 63-year-old Budlove, born in Chicago, was graduated from Chicago's Parker High School, "the only high school in Chicago that was integrated at that time."

He broke into photography while still in high school as his sister owned a photo studio in Chicago. He also gained a knack for music and learned to play the trombone. He played while still young in Chicago for the Buddy Fisher Orchestra and Frankie Masters Band.

Budlove attended Denis College, Granville, Ohio, with a four-year grant to study theology. When he returned he joined his father in Hammond, where his father had opened a restaurant. There Budlove and his wife of 39 years, Rose, first met.

He came to The Post-Tribune to fill out an application for employment one day and the next day he was taking pictures for the paper. His starting salary was \$15 for a seven-day work week and he can remember many days that he put in 18-20 hours when there was no such thing as overtime pay.

In 1944 Budlove joined the Army and was assigned to just what he wanted—a unit that took pictures. Later, however, he was transferred to officer training school, and he rose to second lieutenant from buck private in less than a year.

Soon Budlove was assigned the command of all day shift photographers of the Army. But even more important assignments were ahead.

He eventually became the personal photographer of President Roosevelt and he covered the Roosevelt funeral, which he says was one of the saddest days of his life.

He moved on to be personal Photographer to President Truman.

Winston Churchill and French President Charles de Gaulle were among international dignitaries Budlove met and photographed. De Gaulle was so impressed by Budlove that he made the photographer an honorary second lieutenant in the French Army, and Bud still wears the patch on his reserve uniform today.

He covered the Manhattan Project in Oak Ridge, Tenn., while in the Army, taking pictures of installations for two weeks and never finding out until much later that he was actually taking the first pictures of the atom bomb.

Budlove also covered the first atomic blast in Nevada and recalls that although he saw and photographed the mushroom cloud from 35 miles away, neither he nor any one else there knew what it was at the time.

Budlove had been in the Army three years when he was discharged. He joined the Army Reserve the same day.

Describing his entry in the reserves, Budlove now notes: "I love this country. I always have. I love all it stands for. I'd fight for it until death. There are only two things I place above this country, and that's my family and my religion."

Budlove is currently a full colonel in command of the 1st Battalion, 1st Brigade of the Indiana Guard Reserve. If a National emergency were to occur in this area, Budlove would be in command of all the troops that would replace the National Guard in most of Northern Indiana.

Among the highest of his numerous honors from the reserve, (from which he retired in 1970) and the guard, is a citation for Exceptional Meritorious Service from the State of Indiana Military Department.

Budlove won numerous awards while with The Post-Tribune. In 1951 he won 14 of 17 national awards he was vying for and received the grand sweepstakes trophy as the best photographer in the United States working on a daily newspaper with a circulation under 50,000.

He has won a total of more than 200 national and state awards for his photographic accomplishments.

Budlove's Army pictures of Truman and Roosevelt were the same pictures used by the artist to paint both men's official portraits. The Truman picture was later used for the Truman commemorative stamp.

Budlove won a photographic award while

covering a series of gas explosions at Standard Oil Refinery in the 1950s. One explosion knocked him completely across the street and while still in the air the shock forced him to click his camera. He escaped with many bruises.

But Budlove was best noted for his arty and scenic pictures, and annually he has donated such a picture to a charity auction. His pictures have brought in as much as \$250 apiece at the auction.

A CHRONOLOGY OF HYPOCRISY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, "in our own lives, let each of us ask—not just what will government do for me, but what can I do for myself?" This twist on President Kennedy's famous words was contained in the second inaugural address of President Richard M. Nixon.

In that same message, the President went on to say:

Government must learn to take less from people so that people can do more for themselves; and "Let us remember that America was built not by government, but by people—not by welfare, but by work—not by shirking responsibility, but by seeking responsibility."

Within 10 days after the delivery of these words, the General Services Administration paid \$293.50 for 8 mylar window shades for the President's Key Biscayne residence, \$1,322.00 for 27 electrical outlets, and \$88.50 for a flue for the heater at the residence.

This kind of discrepancy between word and deed might be ignored if it did not occur with such regularity.

On January 26, 1970, President Nixon vetoed the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, claiming the funding in the bill was excessive. Contained in the bill was funding for the National Institutes of Health, Office of Education, Medicare, hospital construction, the Manpower Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration. In vetoing the bill, he called it "the wrong amount for the wrong purposes and at the wrong time."

The next day, the General Services Administration authorized \$417.15 of public funds for the purchase of a Monarch sofa for the Key Biscayne estate and \$206 for two matching side armchairs. During the 10 days preceding the veto announcements, the GSA spent \$1,370 at San Clemente for landscaping and new shrubbery, and spent \$1,448.43 at Key Biscayne for desks, tables, and chairs.

One New Year's Day, 1971, President Nixon vetoed a pay raise for Federal blue-collar workers. He claimed Federal workers were already making too much money—4 percent more than workers in the private sector. Within 2 months, one Federal employee—although not a blue-collar worker certainly—had the weeds removed from his San Clemente home's yard, \$1,100; had a Sears air-conditioner installed at his Key Biscayne residence, \$88; and had \$1,153 worth of furniture

provided for his Florida home. Few, if any employees in the private sector are provided with this kind of service from their company.

On June 29, 1971, President Nixon vetoed a public works and regional economic development bill. He claimed it would create "insistent demands for marginal, hurriedly planned, environmentally damaging and uncoordinated projects." But on that same day, at least one public works project was started—the Army Corps of Engineers allocated \$2,000 to correct some beach erosion on Mr. Nixon's private Key Biscayne shore-front.

On August 17, 1971, the President vetoed a bill which would have increased retirement benefits for D.C. firemen and policemen who had been totally disabled during their period of public service. In his veto message, Mr. Nixon castigated the bill, saying it would "grant an unwarranted benefit to a small, special group of retirees." That same day, a non-disabled, and distinctly unretired Federal official had a \$180 air conditioner installed in his Key Biscayne retreat. Less than 1 month later, the GSA installed a \$6,275 new driveway at this same employee's west coast retreat.

In December, 1971, President Nixon vetoed the Child Development bill. He called the program of child care and assistance "fiscally irresponsible." In January, 1972, \$1,950 of public funds were used to prune the trees at San Clemente.

On March 27, President Nixon vetoed a bill to provide handicapped Americans with job training, so that they might have the means to become self-supporting. In his veto message, the President stated:

My decision to disapprove S. 7 should be seen by the Congress as more than just an isolated rejection of a single piece of unwise legislation. It is part of my overall commitment to hold down taxes and prices. I remind the Congress of that determination, I ask the Congress to consider carefully the implications of spendthrift actions, and I urge the Congress to be more reasonable and responsible in the legislation it passes in the future.

Only 1 week before, the GSA spent \$523 to remove debris from the San Clemente beach.

Finally, and the irony is fitting, on March 4, 1973, the President vetoed the rural water and sewer grant program. The money was voted to begin to deal with what has become a national disgrace—the condition of our increasingly polluted water supply. Just 3 months previous to this veto, the President did his own little bit to clean up our waters—the GSA installed a swimming pool cleaner at the Key Biscayne estate.

Neither has the White House distinguished itself in dealing with the matter once it became public. Although the public improvements for the President's private residences raise serious legal questions, Mr. Nixon called the Attorney General in an outrage after media reports circulated that Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox might investigate the President's homes. Mr. Richardson then called Cox who issued a statement denying the stories. I believe, however, that the legal issues should be looked into by

Mr. Cox and have sent letters to both the Attorney General and Mr. Cox asking what they intend to do about the matter.

Meanwhile, the President's Press Secretary, Ronald Ziegler, has returned to his favorite game of attacking the press.

After having been caught no less than four times dissembling about the scope of the work done on the President's property—on May 26, when it announced that only \$39,525 had been spent; May 28, when the total rose to \$109,385; 2 weeks later when it rose to \$414,000 and then to \$456,352—the White House reversed course and began attacking the press, and once again, the Washington Post in particular, for having the audacity to challenge these "security related" expenditures.

Finally, Mr. Ziegler, who once dismissed the Watergate break-in as "a third-rate burglary," has assured the press that the President never ordered, and was not aware of, any of the improvements. Mr. Nixon, who was unaware of the activities of Mr. Dean, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Ehrlichman, and Mr. Colson, over the last year, was equally unaware of the desks, sofas, trees, shrubs, cabanas, driveways, flagpoles, and other nonsecurity items that mysteriously appeared at San Clemente and Key Biscayne.

John Mitchell once said about the Nixon administration that we should not judge them by what they say but instead, to judge them by what they do. They have certainly established an interesting record for judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I include, at this point, the text of my letters to Attorney General Richardson and Special Prosecutor Cox:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 9, 1973.

HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
The Attorney General, Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Recent reports in the media indicate that the President called you concerning reports that Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox was investigating the purchase and improvements of the President's San Clemente and Key Biscayne residences. The reports also indicate that you called Professor Cox who then issued a statement denying that an investigation was underway.

I am concerned about the legal implications of federal agencies, such as the General Services Administration and the Secret Service, authorizing the improvement of what is, and will continue to be, a private residence. I do not quarrel with what are clearly security-related expenditures, but do not understand how such expenditures as \$3,490 for a swimming pool filter, \$1,081.20 for storm shutters, \$1,853 for a flagpole, \$45,346.72 for landscaping, and \$13,312.01 for furniture can be paid for out of public funds.

The recent hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury-Postal Service-General Government have not clarified the issue of the legality of the expenditures. Certainly, the White House itself has not been at all helpful in the matter. On May 26, Gerald L. Warren, deputy White House press secretary, admitted to public expenditures at San Clemente of only \$39,525. Two days later, the total was raised to \$109,385. Two weeks later it rose once again to \$414,000 and then again to \$456,352. The latest GSA figures total \$703,367 for San Clemente and \$1,180,522 for Key Biscayne.

In order to shed some light on this par-

ticular situation, I would like to be apprised of any steps the Justice Department is taking to examine and deal with this situation.

I look forward to your early response.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 9, 1973.

MR. ARCHIBALD COX,
Special Prosecutor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COX: Recently, you issued a statement denying that your office was formally investigating the circumstances surrounding the purchase and improvements of the President's Key Biscayne and San Clemente residence. It is my understanding that your denial followed a phone call on the subject from Attorney General Elliot L. Richardson, who, in turn, had been called by the White House.

I am concerned about the legal implications of Federal agencies, such as the General Services Administration and the Secret Service, authorizing the improvement of what is, and will continue to be, a private residence. I do not quarrel with what are clearly security-related expenditures, but do not understand how such expenditures as \$3,490 for a swimming pool filter, \$1,081.20 for storm shutters, \$1,853 for a flagpole, \$45,346.72 for landscaping, and \$13,312.01 for furniture can be paid for out of public funds.

The recent hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury-Postal Service-General Government have not clarified the issue of the legality of the expenditures. Certainly, the White House itself has not been at all helpful in the matter. On May 26, Gerald L. Warren, deputy White House press secretary, admitted to public expenditures at San Clemente of only \$39,525. Two days later, the total was raised to \$109,385. Two weeks later it rose once again to \$414,000 and then again to \$456,352. The latest GSA figures total \$703,367 for San Clemente and \$1,180,522 for Key Biscayne.

In my opinion, the loss of confidence in government that Watergate has inspired can be reversed only if all areas of questionable conduct by public officials and agencies are thoroughly investigated. I would appreciate it if you could inform me of what steps you are taking to examine, and deal with, the controversy surrounding the purchase and improvements of the San Clemente and Key Biscayne estates.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,
Member of Congress.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

MR. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly expressed my concern over this country's need for a consistent, long-range international trade policy. My disappointment over the administration's trade reform proposal is a matter of public record. It is long past time for a complete reappraisal of the U.S. position in the international marketplace, and a reevaluation of the statutes and institutions which determine our role in this economically vital arena. The Congress must recognize and accept its responsibilities in this area.

In this regard, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the state-

ment of David J. Steinberg, executive director of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, before the Senate Commerce Committee on June 7, 1973. Mr. Steinberg says:

I want to invite the attention of both the Congress and the Administration to a serious void in export policy planning both in government and business. Government has not established a clear, consistent, dependable trade policy for business to crank into its decision-making. Without such a policy,

1. U.S. manufacturers cannot be sure how freely and reliably they can draw on foreign materials and components as useful, often essential inputs for optimum competitiveness at home and abroad, and

2. U.S. industry and agriculture cannot be sure how much access they will have to foreign markets, and to what extent investments in export promotion might be undercut by government policies restricting trade, hence by forces for which they have no responsibility.

These uncertainties, added to all the other uncertainties of doing business, pose particularly serious problems for smaller businesses, lacking the resources with which to hedge or ride out such problems.

Mr. Steinberg continues:

The nation's effort to strengthen its international competitive and payments positions cannot be the all-out effort it has to be unless we mount a deliberate, dependable free-trade strategy that will dramatically stimulate business interest in export promotion—indeed make export expansion a matter of company survival in an increasingly open world economy.

Every industry, every business, should be gearing for this contingency. Each should be reassessing what it must do to adjust to and benefit from the freest flow of imports and the reciprocally freest access to the markets of other industrialized countries (ultimately the world as a whole). Each should be reassessing what government might do, and in some cases must do, to facilitate this adjustment. Government should be reassessing the adequacy of the entire range of policies that materially affect the competitiveness of U.S. industry and agriculture in today's world, ultimately in a truly open world economy. Tax policy, transportation, anti-trust, research and energy are only a few of these policy areas. We need a trade policy that inspires and instigates this kind of reassessment, looking toward a coherent, credible, well-coordinated and dependable strategy in foreign economic policy and the domestic policy needed to backstop it.

We need a trade policy that instills a greatly needed sense of national purpose, national mission, and national determination. We need to reform the world trade and monetary system to make fairer and freer the international movement of goods, capital and services. But we must also reform our own national attitude toward expanding two-way business with the rest of the world. Nothing less than a deliberate campaign to program the complete removal of all trade distortions by the industrialized countries can stimulate these reforms of the world economic system and of domestic attitudes toward exports, imports and world interdependence.

Today's policy rhetoric and legislative proposals do not adequately answer these needs. There is little reason for confidence that the Congress and the Administration, business and labor, the intellectual community or any other sector of our society clearly understands what needs to be done. In fact, there is grave danger that the Congress—this Congress—may pass legislation that will set the country back in this policy area at a time when we need to move quickly and resolutely forward to an open world economy.

Export expansion would be one of the sacrifices.

I hope my colleagues heed Mr. Steinberg's warning about the need for careful study of proposed trade legislation. Our decision could have a devastating effect on our economy for decades to come. It must be the right one.

"PLASTIC GNOMES" IN WASHINGTON

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member will read Rebecca West on Watergate in the following article which appeared in the New York Times of Monday, July 2, 1973:

THERE ARE "PLASTIC GNOMES" IN WASHINGTON

(By Rebecca West)

LONDON.—Conscious though I am that the American political structure is as different from the British political structures as chalk from cheese, the Watergate inquiry terrifies me when I watch it on my TV here in London. It confirms all my suspicions that there are too many men in the world, and that this is not a good thing.

I think I know what the scandal is about. Mr. Ehrlichman and Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Dean all look the handsome, grown-up grandchildren of the plastic gnomes that ornament certain gardens, bright young fellows who go to the city and make good, but who never forget that plastic is thicker than water and come home at Thanksgiving and Christmas with masses of plastic goodies for the plastic old folks. There is something ghastly about their neatness and their abstinences and their small-scale successes; and ghastlier still that we need such men.

For we do. Who but such men are going to enjoy handling the dreary routine of the modern administrative organization. The top jobs need intelligent men; but such are obstinate in their eccentricities, unpunctual and apt to seek God in their own ways. But there are jobs without number to be filled to perfection by the men who do not lose their files, do not send their chiefs to Chicago when they ought to be at Detroit, and get the crank from Cato, Ill., back home without the interviews he seeks.

Plastic gnomes do this magnificently. But they are not very good at working out systems of morality for themselves. They are apt to regard authority as the master they must serve loyally, but as the master who is the final voice, the be-all and the end-all. But they are human. They conceive ambitions. And at that point they learn to read the mind of their master and see what service he wants them to perform for him and jump the gun by performing it, thus relieving him from the responsibility of ordering them to do it.

By this time the problem of who is guilty and to what degree becomes a trifle too complicated for human understanding. Someone ought to revive that film, "Becket," in which Richard Burton and Peter O'Toole starred. It concerned the murder of Thomas a Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, and at first friend and then enemy of King Henry II. The murder was done by some plastic gnomes of the day who believed (no, not quite right) that the King wanted Becket murdered. That film and the play it was based on were timeless and without limita-

tion to one place. What they said is true of Washington today.

So when we British sit down in front of our TV sets and watch the Watergate investigation we know you are dealing with a real problem, and maybe we feel some envy at the nature of the problem. Not only is our own Lambton scandal humiliatedly silly, P. G. Wodehouse gone wrong, but if we employed miscreants to eavesdrop on the equivalent meetings at which either our Tory, Labor or Liberal party planned its strategy and tactics, the miscreants would never stay awake. But all the same your scandal leaves me feeling that there are too many men in the world, and they have got out of hand.

God help them, many of them are enjoying it. They sit back and laugh aloud when they are amused, and they are that quite often. But they should not laugh at all, for the prestige of the United States is involved. Not its prestige as a great power, for that has gone down the drain. The conception was based on the idea that a nation can make itself so strong that it can stretch its arm across the world and make the distinct peoples do as it wants; and we all know the day for that is over.

What is at stake in the Watergate investigation is the other kind of prestige, appropriate to our time, belonging to those nations which make it possible for their people to live civilized lives, dealing honestly with each other and the Government, and being dealt with honestly by the government—and together exploiting the resources of their land for the purpose of happiness. This is the kind of prestige that America is losing through the Watergate scandal. What makes it damaging is your mock air of desperation.

It is conveyed on the screen and in the press that it is vital for the United States to find out if President Nixon had knowledge of the Watergate buggings, and as if it were also vital, were it discovered that he had, to get rid of him by the drastic step of impeachment. But it may be impossible to find out the degree of President Nixon's knowledge of Watergate; and even if he were proved stark innocent it would be just as necessary to get rid of him because of those plastic gnomes. He should not have had them around but it is not necessary to impeach him.

At the end of three years, thanks to your Constitution, Richard Nixon will be out. And surely during those three years he will be sitting very still. And surely you need never think of him again after three years are up. You will in fact never think of him again, just as I do not think of Neville Chamberlain, a British Prime Minister who was more objectionable than Mr. Nixon in quite a different way. Surely you had better resign yourself to the end of the Presidential term as your way out, because it will take you all that time to have got out of the investigation committees and into the law courts all the suspected persons, on whose guilt or innocence your view of President Nixon must depend; and you will need the precision of the law courts to establish that guilt or innocence beyond all doubt.

GUN PERMISSIVENESS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the average citizen is the most frequent victim of gun crimes, and the victim about which we in the Congress should be most concerned. But it usually takes a gun assault

upon a prominent person to remind us of the permissiveness in our society toward private possession of handguns and how that permissiveness contributes to the continuing rash of gun crimes.

The latest such incident was the gun murder last week of the Israeli air attaché in a Washington suburb. The National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, the major gun-control lobby in this country, charges that the Government and people of this country were an accomplice in this murder and must accept a degree of responsibility for it in view of the permissiveness of U.S. laws regarding handguns.

Despite incidents like the despicable and tragic murder of the Israeli air attaché, and dozens of other less celebrated gun assaults that occur throughout the country every day, the gun lobby continues its efforts to keep a gun within easy reach of every American and to try to silence anyone who dares suggest that access particularly to handguns ought to be carefully limited and controlled. A recent editorial which appeared in the Washington Post illustrates the point.

In a related development, it is also reported in the Washington Post that lethal handguns are now available for rent to anyone who wants one in New York.

The statement of the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, and two Washington Post articles, follow:

U.S. GUN PERMISSIVENESS CALLED ACCOMPLICE IN MURDER OF ISRAELI COLONEL

Another statistic has been added to America's tragic toll of murder by gunfire. The shooting of the Israeli air attaché is the first involving a foreign diplomat in the United States. Other weapons could have been used in the attack, but none as effectively and decisively as the gun. Whether it was political assassination or just another street crime, Americans should be shocked and shamed by this assault on an official visitor to their country.

But America itself is not completely free of blame. The easy accessibility of guns and ammunition, the most destructive of personal weapons, to anybody who wants them, including assassins and run-of-the-mill criminals, facilitates violence against diplomats and our own countrymen. Our government's permissiveness thus gives America itself a share of the responsibility for this violence. Such negligence is not about to be corrected, not even on the special priority of strictly controlling the possession and transfer of handguns. The President and Congress refuse to face up to what urgently needs to be done.

Not even the assassination of a President 10 years ago was enough to evoke reforms—going as far as government reasonably and responsibly can—to deny guns and ammunition to the likes of President Kennedy's assassin. Not even the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King and Senator Robert Kennedy in the awful spring of 1968 were enough to move government to protect our leaders, indeed all our people, from criminal use of the most violent of weapons. Nor were the recent attacks on Governor Wallace and Senator Stennis. Nor the gun attacks, year in and year out, on tens of thousands of lesser known Americans.

What statistic are we waiting for?

A national firearms policy requiring licenses for the possession of guns and ammunition, and requiring the personal responsibility of each licensee for each of his guns, will not by itself stop violence, even violence with guns. But it is essential to the

answer that must be found. It is indispensable to an effective campaign for a safer America—safe for Americans, safe for foreigners, safe for democracy.

The U.S. government has voiced righteous indignation at the murder of the Israeli colonel. It has commendably offered to tighten security for foreign diplomats, just as it commendably offers compensation to the families of policemen killed in action. But these cosmetics cannot hide its failure to stop or at least minimize the flow of guns and ammunition into hands not likely to use them responsibly. This failure makes government itself an accomplice in the tragedies that too often result.

GUNS AND BLACKMAIL

Some of the nation's riflemen are up in arms, so to speak, over something that the Young Women's Christian Association, of all organizations, has done. It seems that at its national convention in San Diego this year, the YWCA had the temerity to take a position regarding the control of the flow of firearms in this society. As a result, the National Rifle Association, through its journal, *The American Rifleman*, the Sportsmen's Alliance of Michigan and other gun loving groups around the country have come out swinging.

Now, what the YWCA did in this instance is not the main point, although this newspaper happens to agree generally with the stand the organization took. Their resolution supports federal legislation licensing all gun purchasers, users and owners, the registration of all firearms—including ammunition—and "the banning of all handguns not used for such purposes as law enforcement, military and licensed guard use, sporting shooting and hunting." That is very close to the position we have long urged upon the Congress and we are pleased to see this major national organization join in the effort to check the unsafe flow of guns through America.

But a more significant point about all of this is that the organizations of sportsmen seem to have forgotten how to play fair, at least in the arena of public debate on major issues in this country. The Sportsmen's Alliance of Michigan has urged its members to withhold financial support from United Way organizations which support, among other organizations, their local YWCA's. There has also been such a strong effort to dissuade industrial workers in large plants from contributing to united community fund community fund raising efforts which support the YWCA that the AFL-CIO has been moved to issue a biting counter attack against "the gun lobby." Other sporting groups around the nation have followed the lead of their Michigan brethren.

Then, in its June issue, *The American Rifleman* ran an editorial attacking the YWCA. In the course of the editorial, the magazine made it appear that the YWCA position would bar the use of handguns even for sport shooting and hunting—a position the organization clearly did not take. There follows a description of the Michigan tactic and a suggestion that "others may follow suit." Finally the editorial raises a lament about "worthwhile movements" embroiling themselves in "debatable causes."

Somehow, all of that just doesn't strike us as very sporting or very smart. If "worthwhile movements" refrained from expressing views on issues of great national importance, the quality of public debate in the United States would become strained and insipid and the character of our national life would be substantially altered. Over the past 60 years, for example, the YWCA has contributed significantly to our national discourse. It was one of the first major national organizations to speak out for desegregation and moved to implement the policy in its

own house. At that time, that surely was a "debatable," though quite healthy, proposition.

But the real point is that the sportsmen's attack is not simply unfair, it's un-American. It is one thing for the sportsmen to debate vigorously the YWCA's views and quite another to exert muscle on united fund operations for helping to finance groups which merely express views which they don't like. The tactic smacks of thought control and blackmail. It seems to us that sportsmen who follow this course are demeaning their cause and detracting from values far more important than the specific issues of any particular debate about gun control.

RENT-A-GUN

NEW YORK.—A parttime robber, unwilling to invest in a potentially incriminating weapon, can now rent a .22-caliber handgun, pull a job, and return it on Monday morning, according to a police ballistics expert.

"In many areas of New York, you can rent a 'Saturday night special' for the weekend for \$50 to \$100, and get ammunition with it," Lt. Charles Luisi, head of the New York police department's ballistics section, said yesterday in a television interview.

DECEPTIVELY HAPPY DAYS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate scandal has caused, in the eyes of some observers, a dramatic strengthening of the Democratic Party. I do not think that it is a healthy or constructive position to expect good policy to come from political misfortune. An article by Alan L. Otten in the *Wall Street Journal* clarifies this issue, pointing out that Watergate has clouded the weaknesses of the Democratic Party just as it has battered the Republicans.

The challenge presented by Watergate to all elements of government clearly begs for reform to eliminate corruption from election campaigning and the formulation of policy. We must safeguard the integrity of government. But, as Mr. Otten argues, Democrats in particular must seize upon this temporary advantage to design imaginative new solutions to nagging old problems.

The article follows:

DECEPTIVELY HAPPY DAYS

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—Republican Party fortunes are badly battered by the shock waves of Watergate and, as an almost inevitable corollary, Democratic prospects seem particularly promising.

Yet the current Democratic outlook may be deceptively bright, deriving far more from Republican woes than Democratic strengths. The fact is that the Democrats still have mammoth problems of their own, problems momentarily obscured by the happy fallout from Watergate. In fact, the gains from Watergate may lull the Democrats into paying far less time and thought to these problems than, for their own sake, they really should.

This isn't to say the Democrats aren't doing anything right. They've shrewdly kept a relatively low profile on Watergate—letting the courts, the press, and outspoken

Republicans carry the attack; they clearly recognize that too many Democratic charges or too much Democratic crowing might be counterproductive.

Nor would it be quite accurate to indicate the Democrats have little going for them other than Watergate. The administration's economic policies, its budget cutbacks, and its continued bombing in Cambodia—all give Democratic orators plenty to talk about. Party Chairman Robert Strauss works diligently to win back last year's defectors; the party debt is down; incoming funds provide pay-as-you-go financing.

Beneath these surface appearances of success, however, Democratic difficulties remain deep and numerous. The lack of strong leadership and broad programs are painfully apparent.

Senate Leader Mike Mansfield and House Speaker Carl Albert make occasional stabs at leadership, but for the most part they let things drift, often disastrously. The Democrats' seesawing on economic control legislation was *opera bouffe* at its most farcical, and the leaders are doing little better on tax reform, mass transit, housing, and other subjects that might highlight Democratic differences with the GOP.

The congressional collapse merely reflects a broader bankruptcy. As has been widely noted of late, the party's liberal wing, traditionally the source of new Democratic dogma, remains in a state of shock, apparently paralyzed by the lack of success of so many of its more recent efforts.

Not only are Capitol Hill Democrats failing to advance creative alternatives to the Nixon administration's New Federalism, but so are the Democrats in the state houses, city halls, and universities. The most they seem capable of offering is more of the old Great Society; not surprisingly, there's not much popular enthusiasm for that.

The Democrats' common enjoyment of Watergate serves to paper over continued differences between older, labor-led liberals and the newer grass-roots McGovernite forces. Last year's guerrilla warfare between these two groups continues now only slightly less nastily—over the role of Chairman Strauss, the power to be assigned to elected officials, a proposed mid-term national convention, changes in delegate selection rules. Organizations representing the two camps trade blasts on a regular basis, and the battling will surely intensify as the jockeying for 1976 position grows more serious.

The Democrats' difficulties with major voting blocs remain unresolved. The South grows less reliably Democratic each year. John Connally is the most notable recent defector, but many other influential Democrats have also deserted to the GOP, more will follow, and rank and file desertions are even more widespread.

Virginia will probably elect as governor this year a former Democratic governor now running as a Republican. A post-election survey in North Carolina by well-respected political scientist Walter DeVries underlines the erosion of Democratic strength in Dixie. It shows the 1972 results not just as aberration traceable to the McGovern candidacy but a well-established, long-term trend as the South becomes more urban, more white-collar, better educated.

Straight-ticket Republicans, the survey found, were the largest single voting bloc in 1972, better than one out of three North Carolina voters. Nearly one out of three voters split their ticket in State and local races, favoring Republican candidates more often than Democrats. Only one of four Tarheel voters went straight Democratic. Nearly twice as many 18-to-21-year olds voted straight Republican as straight Democratic.

"And the same thing is happening in other Southern States," Mr. DeVries believes.

Outside the South, those Catholics, ethnics and other Democrats who supported Mr.

Nixon last year are still far from any permanent return to the Democratic fold. They may not like Watergate or inflation, but that doesn't guarantee their support of the 1976 Democratic nominee. The issues that unmoored them from the Democrats—street crime, drugs, school busing, housing integration—may be momentarily out of the headlines but they'll be back, again plaguing Democratic candidates far more than Republicans.

The Democratic presidential crop isn't all that exciting, either. If the GOP has its old familiar faces with Rockefeller and Reagan, the Democrats match them with Humphrey and Muskie, still itching for one more chance. Another disruptive Wallace race is more than possible.

And so much Democratic hope centers on Sen. Edward M. Kennedy. He's looked to as the one man who can unify the liberal ideologies, the machine-polls like Mayor Daley, the Wallaceites. Yet Mr. Kennedy could be a far weaker reed than many Democrats think, particularly if the 1976 voter is demanding candidates of unchallengeable moral rectitude.

Certainly Republican troubles may be ample to get the Democrats through the 1974 mid-term election in very good shape. Watergate, inflation, and other current GOP handicaps may even remain weighty enough to give the Democrats a strong leg up for 1976, too.

But experience over the last 20 years documents how fast the political picture can change. Democratic difficulties are many and profound. They suggest that if the Republicans could somehow successfully put Watergate behind them—not just in terms of current events but also in the public memory—the Democrat's happy days might not be here again for too much longer.

MELVIN R. LAIRD TACKLES YET ANOTHER CHALLENGE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, due to the 1972 congressional redistricting, Wisconsin's Sixth District now includes three counties which for many years were part of the old 7th District. I am finding it a special challenge and privilege to represent the people who, for some eight Congresses, were represented by the Honorable Melvin R. Laird.

Since the appointment of Mel Laird as Chief Domestic Counsellor to the President, a number of newspapers in our part of Wisconsin have commended the appointment of this man they have known so well. I have selected two recent editorials, one from the Eau Claire Leader-Telegram and another from the Marshfield News-Herald, in the thought they are of special interest to my colleagues.

LAIRD TACKLES TOUGH JOB

Wisconsin Republicans are whistling in the wind if they really think Melvin R. Laird is still to be considered a serious candidate for governor of Wisconsin.

Mel Laird did not come out of retirement after a grueling four-year stint as Secretary of Defense and take a new position as top aide to President Nixon in order to enhance his standing in Wisconsin.

He took it because he knows his country, his party, and his President need him. And in just about that order. He also took it no doubt because he is aware that if he can succeed as well in marching the Administration out of the Watergate swamp as he did in helping United States troops crawl out of the jungles of Southeast Asia he may become eligible for one more job the nation has to offer... the presidency.

At 50 Laird combines youthful vigor with the veteran savvy of a man who cut his political teeth in duty in the Wisconsin legislature before being elected to Congress from Marshfield and serving with distinction for 17 years.

He accepted appointment to the top Pentagon post reluctantly, as he must have accepted appointment this week to the chair formerly held by John Ehrlichman. No one knows better than Laird the political hazards which attend moving into an area so recently in need of fumigation.

But if anyone can fumigate it, Laird will.

The challenge he faces is the greatest of his career. But the extreme high risk is matched by the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to take on a monumental task under the suspicious eyes of an alarmed public and a probing press.

A month ago the thought that Mel Laird might be a candidate for president some day foundered in the knowledge that he had dropped from national attention when he left the Pentagon.

Now, when the next Republican convention rolls around no delegate is apt to say "Mel, who?" when the name Laird comes up.

In the final analysis in a democracy it is a man's record which provides the best platform in seeking higher office. Laird has already established a superb record of honest public service in both legislative and administrative posts. Now he just has time to hammer in a few more planks that could make him an eminently attractive candidate the next time there is a Republican national convention.

Mel Laird for governor of Wisconsin? It's a possibility but a remote one.

Mel Laird for President?

Don't bet against it.

WASHINGTON WITCH-HUNT

The frenetic attempt of the wolf pack to bring down the Nixon administration and all its works led it this week, as might have been expected, to the door of Melvin R. Laird, who on Monday became the President's top White House assistant.

The Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times, who also peddle their pickings to other papers throughout the country, have been busily sniffing the wind since they learned that one of Laird's former Pentagon aides telephoned the Securities and Exchange Commission last fall to ask the status of an inquiry into the affairs of one Edward Ball, an acquaintance of Laird.

The sniffing revealed the startling(?) information that Ball's sister, the late Mrs. Alfred I. du Pont, once made contributions (while Laird was a congressman) to the Marshfield Clinic Foundation and the Laird Youth Scholarship Foundation.

The inference is that there was something wrong about this. And the amounts of the gifts are greatly exaggerated, although this really has no bearing on the matter except to reflect the inaccuracy of the reporting.

The clinic foundation, of course, engages in medical research, utilizing the talents of some local clinic physicians, in addition to its own staff, in its work. Most of its funds have come from the National Institutes of Health, but it welcomes private contributions.

The scholarship foundation was set up by Laird while he was Seventh District congressman and was originally financed by fees

paid to him for public addresses—a welcome source of personal funds to many federal officials, but never pocketed by the meticulous Marshfield congressman. The Laird Foundation provides seminars in government operation for high school students.

Now, it is the function of newspapers to ferret out instances of wrongdoing and the public interest is well served by such vigilance, as the Watergate incident attests. But it is not in the public interest to pillory competent and conscientious public servants when there is no evidence of wrongdoing.

Madison's Capital Times, for example, blazoned a headline across its front page proclaiming, "Laird Admits He Ordered Help for Tycoon." Nowhere in the story beneath the headline was there any indication that Laird had made any such admission or done any such thing.

The lead in the Los Angeles Times story declared that Laird "acknowledged that he ordered his Pentagon aides to intervene in a private Securities and Exchange stock fraud investigation." But nowhere else in the story was there the slightest substantiation that Laird had done anything but ask an aide to make a routine inquiry regarding a complaint and "see if there was anything he could appropriately help with."

Senate hearings and court actions will bring out the facts in the Watergate case in due time and place the stigma of proven guilt wherever it belongs. But meanwhile the desperate attempts to discredit everyone associated with Richard Nixon, comical as they may seem in such instances as the endeavor to smear Melvin Laird, portend consequences even more tragic for the country than for their immediate individual targets. The nation has trouble enough without a political witch-hunt.

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION IS WORTH A POUND OF CURE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, my summer intern, Steve Smith, is a student at Auburn University. On his own initiative he has done some indepth thinking on a nonparochial, national problem. His conclusions are fairly basic but are direct and to the point after considerable thought and study on the many ramifications involved when the horror of "fire" strikes a high-rise building.

Steve's sense of responsibility toward matters other than those assigned to him is becoming, reflecting credit upon the entire intern program. The contributions of young people can be quite meaningful and this paper serves as a good example for others to emulate:

HIGH-RISE, SKYSCRAPER FIRE PREVENTION

(By Steven D. Smith)

I'm writing this short piece on fire prevention in skyscrapers to try and promote action to defuse this dangerous "time bomb" of the cities. Now I realize that at first this subject might seem to be a little foreign and irrelevant to the third district. However, I believe that with two multi-story buildings, the Government Center and the American Family Life Assurance building, and with other skyscrapers certain to go up in the future, the subject demands our concern.

In the following paragraphs I will try to point out some of the more pungent points in an article entitled "Holocausts Above the

35th Floor", by Michael Cussen (noted architect). He is simply relating the dangers of a modern high-rise and how a fire in one can produce death and destruction.

The problem of controlling fires in tall buildings is not new. Skyscrapers have been around since the early 1900's. However, these early buildings were built almost exclusively of steel and concrete, virtually fire-proof. But times have changed and with cost efficiency and modern technology, flammable plastics came into the building industry. Considerations of fire safety took a back seat to cost accounting.

These are our major high-rise fire hazard problems:

1. High-rise fires are inaccessible to fire-fighters.
2. The new high-rises are furnished with plastics that make the interiors extremely combustible.
3. The fireproofing requirements are inadequate—jeopardizing not only the lives of the people living or working in the building but also its structural integrity. High-rise fires are so hot some engineers wouldn't be surprised to see steel frames bend in the heat of a blaze.
4. The vertical arteries—stairwells, elevator shafts, and air ducts—serve to contaminate other parts of the building with smoke, gas, and heat.

We know the causes and we have the technical know-how to prevent and/or control high-rise fires. However, measures to reduce fire danger in the building industry are not followed. The reason lies in the fact that economics seem to have more to say than fire control policy science.

The best way to extinguish a fire is to throw water on it. So a simple solution to the fire problem would be to install a total automatic sprinkler system in every building. But the simplest solution is also the costliest.

Other fire prevention measures such as control of air systems, smoke towers, and vertical spacing are not foolproof and at best can not achieve the certain efficiency of the sprinkler system. Installation of the system called the automatic fire suppression system is first on the lists of most city fire departments as a recommendation for fire code changes.

I believe that this sprinkler system is the only answer. The objection of excessive cost is not really substantial. Large corporations who take on the tremendous cost of building the high-rise towers should be willing to absorb the responsibility of fire protection and be willing to bear the economic burden. Human lives can not be valued, the system is a must.

I have little knowledge of what procedures are used in building and fire codes. I really don't know if codes of this nature can be made into a national law. However, I believe in any case, that a law, state, national or local as the case may be, needs to be enacted to require the installation of the automatic sprinkler system in any building whose height exceeds the unstrained reach of modern firefighting equipment in the access of the structure.

THE CONTINUING DIALOG ON VITAMINS

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration's regulations governing dietary supplements have gen-

erated a great deal of mail for all Members of Congress. Undoubtedly this is a most complicated and controversial subject and, in order to deepen the understanding of the issues involved, the position of all concerned groups must be aired and studied. As part of this effort, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the formation of a new vitamin industry group, the Council for Responsible Nutrition, and the stand they have taken with respect to this controversy.

This organization, concerned with providing natural, nutritional alternatives to the standard American food supply, endorses the basic concept of optimum nutrition as contrasted with adequate nutrition. In explanation, compared with the standard American diet, optimum nutrition involves educating the individual to his specific nutritional needs and making available to him natural foods and food supplements which meet those needs. To support and enlarge this concept, the council plans to act as a clearinghouse for scientific information that will increase public knowledge of optimum nutrition and how to achieve it, for the council believes that a definite link exists between better nutrition and better health. They further believe the Federal Government can and should become much more active in examining this role for optimum nutrition.

The Council for Responsible Nutrition generally supports the Food and Drug Administration's efforts to provide consumers with better nutrition and more nutritional information, but they are disturbed by some of the FDA's proposed actions on food supplementation. Specifically, the council supports FDA's position regarding vitamins A and D to the degree that any potential danger is posed to the public. However, they believe that proposals to limit other supplements cannot be shown to involve an issue of public health and, in fact, are strongly contradicted by a large and growing body of nutritional research and discovery.

Charter members of the council and its present board of directors include: W. T. Thompson, Jr., president, W. T. Thompson Co., Carson, Calif.; George Crawford, vice president, Archon Pure Products, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Nolan Draney, executive vice president, Plus Products, Los Angeles, Calif., and Marshall Ackerman, executive vice president, Rodale Press, Emmaus, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the position paper of the Council for Responsible Nutrition in the RECORD at this point:

FOOD NUTRITION AND HEALTH: REEXAMINING A NEGLECTED AREA

"Vitamins have at least one distinguishing feature. About no other health substance is there today so much public certainty and so much scientific argument," began an article in a national magazine.

The nature of this argument concerns not only fundamental approaches to research in biochemistry, physics and the practice of medicine, but also philosophies underlying basic lifestyles and cultures.

However, considering the force and depth of the disagreement, there is a surprisingly large body of information concerning nutrients and nutrition accepted by almost everyone, scientist and layman alike.

ADEQUATE AND OPTIMUM NUTRITION

The controversy really boils down to one of definition and degree. But leading to this essence are many varied and complex issues involving economics, agriculture, industrial methodology, transportation, education, government and the behavioral sciences, as well as the physical sciences mentioned.

But, at base, the questions are: What are the body's food requirements? And just how serious are today's food-related problems?

The importance of finding the exact answers to those questions, it would seem, no one would doubt.

Yet, a very recent major study undertaken by the respected Daniel Yankelovich concern for a group of large food companies, discovered that one out of five women admitted to being "casual" about nutrition for themselves and their families. The term "casual" was defined for them as "Other things often seem more important than food decisions on any given day. With just a little care, cost and healthfulness balance out in the end anyway." Nutrition will "take care of itself."

While another 29 percent—a total of 49 percent—put nutrition as no more than a secondary consideration, feeling that with "just a little judgment, you can be sure of a healthful diet."

Another way of measuring the state of nutritional concern as well as the actual state of nutrition of a population might be through the perceived messages from its major institutions—the government, the schools, science and medicine. An examination of these messages reveals confusing signals. There are reports of serious inadequacies in the food supply and poor eating habits throughout America, while some government- and health organization-sponsored pamphlets and public statements seem to mirror the assumptions of the "casual" approach to nutrition above.

Item: Panels of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, held in December 1969, noted several times that studies show "a surprising degree of under-nutrition among even relatively high-income families." One panel even concluded, "Among the affluent it is clear that we have developed a society that is characterized by overconsumption of calories with food choices that are not necessarily the wisest on the basis of available nutritional information."

Item: In the U.S. Department of Agriculture studies of 1955 and 1965 (long considered the definitive nutritional studies available in this country) a higher percentage of households studied in 1965 showed nutrient content of purchases which fell below the recommended daily allowances (RDA) for all nutrients except iron. The 1965 report stated that a lower percentage of households had "good" diets in 1965 than in 1955—60 percent in 1955 and 50 percent in 1965. Over the 10-year period, the proportion with "poor" diets (defined by USDA as diets which provided less than two-thirds RDA for one or more nutrients) increased from about 15 percent in 1955 to 20 percent in 1965.

Item: A 10-state survey undertaken during the 1968-70 period by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare—planned to be the new definitive nutrition study but subsequently limited, reportedly for budgetary reasons—concluded: "The results of Ten-State Nutrition Survey indicated that a significant proportion of the population surveyed was malnourished or was at a high risk of developing nutritional problems. However, malnutrition in different segments of the population varied in severity and in regard to the specific nutrients involved. An outstanding example of this variation was the high prevalence of low vitamin A values among Mexican-Americans in the low income-ratio states as contrasted to the absence of vitamin A problems in Puerto Ricans in the high-income-ratio states, primarily New York City.

The findings show that the characteristics of malnutrition are often unique to the local situation and to the specific subsegment of the population being surveyed. Nutritional solutions to the different types of malnutrition encountered will vary among different segments of the population having different social, cultural, and economic characteristics."

But how serious is "undernutrition"? Is good nutrition just a matter of some undefined "rosy-cheeked glow" or well-muscled appearance—attributes all good mothers would like to see in their children when they bother to think about it? Or is it something that needs more definitive treatment?

Item: Dr. Roger Williams, Professor of Biochemistry at the University of Texas, and one of America's most distinguished biochemists and nutritionists, says: "... at every stage I have found this concept to be wholly applicable and verified by laboratory experiment. That malnutrition—unbalanced or inadequate nutrition—at the cellular level should be thought of as a major cause of human disease seems crystal clear to me."

Item: In an evaluation of research on human nutrition prepared by a joint task group of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State Universities and the Land Grant Colleges, the report on "Benefits From Nutrition Research" states categorically: "Most all of the health problems underlying the leading causes of death in the United States could be modified by improvement in diet. ... Death rates for many of these conditions are higher in the U.S. than in other countries of comparable economic development." And what are some of these causes of death and disability which could be modified by improvements in nutrition? Heart and vascular disease, infant mortality, early aging, arthritis, dental health, diabetes, kidney disease and cancer, to give only a partial list.

The sad fact is that even the darkest pictures painted by these nutrition surveys are probably underestimating the seriousness of the problem. For they are based on a concept of adequate nutrition designed to protect only against the most extreme known effects of vitamin deficiency.

This concept was formalized over fifty years ago when a group of doctors meeting at Cambridge University concluded that it "must be regarded as definitely established" that deficiency diseases may result from diets low in certain vitamins and that these diseases can be prevented "by the addition of articles containing these vitamins."

This admission effectively marked the dawn of the science of nutrition as we know it, and that it was such a relatively short time ago gives some indication of why the science and the information that emanates from its established practitioners is in such a state of confusion, if not chaos.

For nutrition is truly an infant science that has not yet found a home. It hangs somewhere along the tenuous line running from the brilliant and explosive discoveries of modern biochemistry and molecular physics to the somewhat nebulous, but utilitarian arts of "home economics" and "dietetics."

Where the physician and the practice of medicine fits on this line has been in flux for many years. In fact, to a great extent, the medical profession's position, attitudes and store of knowledge on nutrition today is both a microcosm and a first cause of the state of this country's health and eating habits.

OPTIMUM NUTRITION

The present standard of adequate nutrition, as espoused by doctors, nutritionists and others—although no two experts agree in detail on what constitutes even this low standard—is, in fact, inadequate. What is

emerging is the need for a new standard of optimum nutrition.

There is increasing concern that faulty nutrition lies at the root of most major disease syndromes to one degree or another. There is ample evidence that the American diet is in need of radical change.

Not only is the "average American diet" deficient in many respects but there is strong evidence that there is no "average" diet, but a wide variety of real meals, which because of habit, cultural bias, food industry advertising, and many other reasons vary widely in nutritional value. There are also no "average" Americans, but a wide variety of real men, women and children whose nutritional needs vary even more widely than their diets. Among laboratory animals, which are carefully inbred to make them as similar to each other metabolically as possible, nutrient levels which provide for good growth and optimal health vary by as much as twenty to thirty fold from individual to individual.

Since human beings are not nearly as homogeneous a group as laboratory animals, there is every reason to believe that their requirements for particular nutrients may vary even more extremely from individual to individual. Each person's metabolic machinery is as individual to him as his fingerprints. Each of us requires somewhat different amounts of the same nutrients in order to enjoy the best possible state of health for the longest possible period of time.

Since the indications are strong that very few of us regularly consume a diet which is likely to contain the optimal levels, for us, of each of the various nutrients, and since medical science has not yet developed diagnostic procedures which would fully reveal our individual biochemical profiles so we would know exactly how much of what we should consume, there is no rational alternative to allowing each person to decide for himself how much, if any, supplementation of his diet is necessary to make him feel his best.

Since most vitamins and other micronutrients are both harmless and absolutely necessary to life, it seems that regular supplementation of the diet is an act of simple prudence which an informed government and an informed medical establishment would encourage.

WHAT ARE VITAMINS?

Vitamins are complex organic substances essential to human health and well-being. Originally termed "accessory food factors," the word "vitamin" was later coined to describe a number of unrelated substances which share in common the fact that they are essential to normal human metabolism.

More than 25 vitamins have been identified, and it is believed more will be discovered as science probes further into the complexities of man's body chemistry.

Abundant scientific research shows that normal nutrition cannot be maintained with a diet consisting only of purified proteins, carbohydrates, fats and minerals. Not only are vitamins essential, but the human body lacks the ability to manufacture many of them and man is dependent on obtaining them from food. When circumstances prevent maintenance of a balanced diet, vitamin deficiencies result and can lead to diseases and/or debilities ranging from night blindness, rickets and scurvy to psychiatric syndromes and general malaise.

Since the original discovery of vitamins, a great deal has been learned not only about the metabolic role of specific vitamins, but also about natural food sources for them. (For example, sources of vitamin A include yellow vegetables and fruit, leafy green vegetables, plus milk, fat, liver and kidney.)

Due, at first, to the seasonal availability of such sources, and later due to discoveries revealing additional nutrient needs, an industry has developed to extract specific vitamins from natural sources or synthesize

them from chemicals and provide them economically to the public in the form of concentrated supplements. These supplements, as well as the mineral supplements marketed, make available the necessary nutrients which may not, for a variety of reasons, be included in an individual's normal food intake.

The need for supplementary sources is indicated by the following statement in the "Merck Manual of Diagnosis and Therapy," Twelfth Edition—a medical handbook widely used by medical professionals: "... appropriate nutritional supplements are indicated ... when the diet is inadequate because of such factors as allergy, GI [gastrointestinal] disease, dietary fads, business preoccupation, or habit, or when there is impaired utilization of, or abnormal demand for, one or more nutrients. ..."

Nutrient supplements can be particularly crucial for the very young and old (in the former, nutrient lacks may result in abnormal growth; in the latter, disease), the poor, and pregnant or lactating women.

Science has determined that the human body makes some vitamins itself, but often in amounts too small to meet its needs. Other vitamins are not made in the body at all and must be supplied. While the best source of needed vitamins is in a "proper" diet, what is "proper" for one individual may not be "proper" for another. Also, given the types of food available today, which often have a high calorie-to-nutrient ratio, and given the subjective nature of appetite, an unplanned diet may not contain the nutrients necessary to an individual's health and a diet planned may not necessarily be a diet followed.

In the same national magazine article quoted earlier (Look, June 1, 1971) Dr. Bernard T. Kaufman, a well-known vitamin-metabolism researcher of the National Institutes of Health, expressed "amiabile skepticism" about health claims for vitamins, then casually remarked that he and his family take multi-vitamins regularly.

"They can't hurt," he said.

THE FDA VS. VITAMINS AND OTHER FOODS

After more than two years of formal hearings, the Food and Drug Administration in January 1973 published proposed regulations aimed at restricting the public's use of vitamins, minerals and other food supplements.

These were part of an extensive set of regulations related to the labeling and advertising of all foods that could bring about significant changes in marketing practices of the entire food industry and the nutritional attitudes of the American consumer.

The regulations, for the most part, require full compliance after December 31, 1974. There have been some abuses in the promotion of vitamin and mineral products and it is commendable on the part of the FDA to be concerned over the problem of unscrupulous manufacturers who have from time to time made indefensible claims for their products.

But these regulations are puzzling in that they go much beyond controlling such excesses—if, in fact, they would control the unscrupulous at all. It would seem that certain provisions would work *against* better nutrition at either the optimum or adequate level, rather than improving it. For instance, the regulations would:

1. Establish a standard of identity for dietary supplements of vitamins and minerals which sets minimum and maximum limits of potencies.

2. Prohibit the sale of any product exceeding permissible ranges as a dietary supplement and require that it be approved, labeled and marketed as a drug. As such, the product is subject to the procedures for the over-the-counter review and may be ruled a by-prescription-only product.

3. Prohibit any claim that a diet of ordi-

nary foods cannot supply adequate nutrients.

4. Prohibit the claim that transportation, storage or cooking of foods may result in an inadequate diet.

Two quotes from Dr. Williams are pertinent in light of the second provision. At a Food & Drug Law Institute conference on vitamins, he said:

"A basic distinction between nutrients—minerals, amino acids and vitamins—and typical drugs lies in their mode of action.

"Nutrients enter into metabolism by furnishing building blocks for the construction of the enzyme systems which make metabolism possible. Drugs do not do this, and if a substance acts constructively it must be a nutrient (or possibly a hormone) not a drug.

"Unlike nutrients which act as a team, drugs act individually by entering into and interfering with metabolic processes. This interference, hopefully, brings about changes that are favorable to man and unfavorable to his enemies.

"Another basic distinction between nutrients and typical drugs is the fact that nutrients are native to our bodies while drugs in general are foreign or alien substances."

And in his book, *Nutrition Against Disease*, he said:

"The Food and Drug Administration is, in one sense, an enemy of bad weapons, because it scrutinizes new medicines to determine if they are judged safe. If not, the FDA prohibits their use. Unfortunately, in its zeal to restrict the use of what we have called 'essentially bad weapons' the FDA has not always differentiated between nonbiological drugs and the natural nutrients that are needed by the cells of our bodies. Doubtless some exploitation is taking place in the sale of vitamins, amino acids, and minerals; and abuses obviously need to be corrected. But there is a world of difference between potentially harmful non-biological drugs and innocent—if sometimes misapplied—nutrients. A few nutrients taken in grossly inappropriate amounts, can be toxic; but when taken in reasonable quantities, they are solely constructive. This cannot be said of drugs that are foreign to our bodies. Alien chemicals and natural nutrients should NOT be treated alike, and if medical education were on the ball, they never would be."

In issuing these regulations, the FDA seems to be supporting several assumptions that are in opposition to findings by the vast majority of the scientific community and, in several cases, by the very government of which it is a part:

- (1) That American eating habits and state of nutrition are such that the value of food supplements should be downgraded, an attitude inherent in the issuing of the regulations.

- (2) That significant nutrients are not lost in transportation, storage, and cooking of foods.

- (3) That there is such a thing as an "average or ordinary" person, and, therefore, an average nutritional need allowing the establishment of recommended daily allowances as limits on the potencies of dietary supplements.

- (4) That the FDA should limit the consumer's right to purchase foods in the quantities he wishes when no question of a danger to his health is at issue.

It is expected that the forthcoming regulations will severely restrict the consumer's right to select whatever product he or she wants. There is clearly no basis for such action. If the consumer believes that there is a correlation between good health and proper diet he should be able to buy such products which help assure that proper diet as long as they are clearly and truthfully labeled.

Granting the FDA's contention that there is much "confusion" in the marketplace over nutrition—as well as in the scientific com-

munity and the government we might add—it must be said that this is the result of lack of scientific knowledge and must be solved by continued extensive research and information rather than government edict.

IMPROVING TRAIN SERVICE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Public Works Committee, I have been doing my utmost to get funds for mass transit. Upgrading train service instead of highways is a matter of top priority—especially when we see the whole east coast blanketed with smog, as it is today.

Yet the person who chooses to leave the car at home and take the train, sometimes regrets the decision. A letter received from a constituent illustrates the frustration:

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 21, 1973.

Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG,
New York, N.Y.

THE EDITOR,
New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

AMTRAK,
Regional Sales Office,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ABZUG: This letter is first being drafted at 3:40 pm, the above date on the floor of car 5457 which is part of the New York to Washington, D.C. Amtrak. The train is between Newark and Trenton. We, like other coach passengers paid \$11.25 for "transportation" to Washington. The only difference is that we and many others do not have seats!

I should tell you that we made a conscious decision to go to Washington by train. Normally we would have driven. However, as we have a lot of reading to do we felt we would be more comfortable on the train. We could read on our way and thus not lose the time we would lose if we drove.

I now understand better why the Penn Central is bankrupt. Even if the financial manipulation had not occurred (a tradition in the history of U.S. railroads) that organization would not be able to meet its costs, if this train is any example. First, the 3 pm train left at 3:15. Second, there was not enough equipment so that all the passengers could have seats. Third, the airconditioning equipment was not working.

In New York City, as in most major U.S. cities, there are strong fire codes. Movie theatres are not allowed to seat people in the aisles. Restaurants may not cater to more than so-and-so many people at one time. Why is it that Amtrak permits both of this car's exits to be blocked by passengers who do not have seats? Why do they permit the aisles to be filled with passengers?

We regret not having driven to Washington. It would have been, contrary to our expectation, much more comfortable. Modernization of railroad service is a must both for the short distance commuter and in the longer distance heavily traveled corridors. The Metroliner must not push out the medium and short distance commuter! Here are a few suggestions: reservations on all trains except short distance commuter trains; nonstop long distance equipment; general use of trains in which each car has its own motive power so that length of train can easily be varied; proper scheduling of equipment for all points (we were told that

this train has the same problems every week); continuation of the relatively low non-Metroliner rates.

In fact, we have paid doubly for this trip: once through taxes used to subsidize the railroads, and again in the buying of our tickets. That double payment bought us the opportunity to stand all the way to Washington, or to sit on the floor, in a dangerously over-crowded train. [Actually we both got seats in Philadelphia which is about half way.]

It is obvious that railroad subsidies do not work. They do not provide service. A mass transit system that is so poorly run that it encourages people to use their cars is the opposite of what is needed in a polluted society. A joint public-private venture like Amtrak (National Railroad Passenger Service Corp.) merely encourages irresponsibility on the part of the private bondholders. Now that they have profited nicely through accountants' juggling of the bankruptcies, the railroads should be set free from their indolent and incompetent control.

Efficient, inexpensive, railroad service, both short (commuter) and long distance is a vital link in the improvement of the quality of life in our cities. We cannot afford to let vested interests continue to influence railroad service. Subsidies must be used to upgrade the track and equipment. Debt service must be terminated. Travelers and commuters must be encouraged to use railroads as opposed to their private vehicles. If this goal is to be achieved, experiences like the one we are having on this train must not continue to occur.

Very truly yours,

MAARTEN DE KADT.

PUTTING THE WATERGATE SCANDAL IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1973, Mr. John H. Johnson, president of Johnson Publishing Co., addressed the Washington Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi journalistic fraternity. Although I was unable to be present at this important meeting, I have heard nothing but praise for Mr. Johnson's eloquent statement, in which he examined the Watergate and related scandals in the context of recent American history.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that all of us have been inundated with a barrage of editorial comments about the meaning of these scandals. But Mr. Johnson's remarks stand head and shoulder above anything that I have yet encountered.

His central thesis was that "freedom is indivisible and so is repression." In other words the injustices that black Americans and black journalists have experienced, without opposition from blacks and whites together, paved the way for the same repression to be perpetrated upon whites. What is happening today was foreshadowed a long time ago in the forceful limitations placed upon the civil and human rights of America's minorities.

Rather than do an injustice to Mr. Johnson by paraphrasing him, I include his remarks below. I also want to share

with my colleagues Ms. Dorothy Gilliam's column about the event, which appeared in the Washington Post of June 2, 1973:

POLITICS AND BLACK FREEDOM

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

Repeated denials of the rights of the poor, the black and the disadvantaged paved the road to Watergate, America's most successful black publisher charged last night.

John H. Johnson, publisher of Ebony, Jet and other Chicago-based magazines, spoke at the 41st annual national awards banquet of Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalistic society, at the National Press Club.

Addressing the crowd of about 200, Johnson said knowledge of the ancient injustices of political disenfranchisement of millions of black Americans, the denial of equal protection of the law, sometimes with the sanction of our highest courts, and the apathy of the press related to the "crucial problems of this, our period."

"There is a reciprocal relationship between black freedom and white freedom," he said. "In other words, an increase in the amount of freedom available to blacks increases the amount of freedom available to whites and the converse is also true: A decrease in the amount of freedom available to blacks leads to a decrease in the amount of freedom available to whites."

"This is the larger meaning of Watergate: Freedom is indivisible, and so is repression."

Johnson said a tendency exists in this country to put the rights of blacks and the rights of whites into separate compartments: "black crime and white crime, white poverty and black poverty; white morality and black morality. The same tendency existed to separate public from private morality."

"Each day brings new evidence that white people are suffering injustices which blacks have endured for more than 200 years," he said.

The Washington professional chapter presented gold keys and plaques to three new Sigma Delta Chi fellows: Katharine Graham, publisher of The Washington Post Company, the first woman to be honored as a fellow; syndicated columnist Mary McGrory; and ABC news anchorman Howard K. Smith.

The presentations to Mrs. Graham and Smith had been voted in 1971, but were delayed by the recipients' busy schedules. Miss McGrory was voted the honor at the group's convention last fall in Dallas, Tex.

THE PRESS AND AMERICAN FREEDOM

(By John H. Johnson)

It's nice to be able to come to Washington these days and to speak into a microphone you can see.

In all seriousness, I am very happy to be here tonight. For I believe all Americans are indebted to the press and that all members of the press must continue the unfinished work before us by demanding free speech, free assembly and an open and responsive government.

This is, as we all know, a very exciting time.

Every morning, millions of Americans rise from their beds much like the ancient Romans—in fearful anticipation of the bouts between the Christians and the lions, torn between the exhausting excitement of new revelations and the hope that the long list of secret acts against the American people will end. This sense of excitement has created a climate of emotional confusion and moral crisis in the land.

No brief discussion of the causes and ramifications of this crisis can do justice to the subject. But we must try, with all the vigor that we possess, to get at the whole truth. For the cherished ideals of our nation are in danger. And we find, as we approach the 200th anniversary of the found-

ing of the Republic, that the very foundations of our way of life are crumbling.

This is not a new development, for this process has been going on now for a long time. And to fully understand today's headlines, it is necessary for us to look back at some of the historical injustices which created the contemporary climate.

We must look back at centuries of institutional racism, the political disenfranchisement of millions of black Americans and the denial of equal protection of the laws with the sanction of the highest court in the land.

We must look back on an era of lynchings, when the guilty investigated themselves and brought in reports that the victims were murdered by "a party or parties unknown."

We must look back at an American press, which out of apathy or fear—or both—failed for so long to man the ramparts when freedom was being denied to millions of Americans who happened to be black or red or brown.

We must also look back on the evolution of our judicial system which has made it easier to put a man in jail for stealing a loaf of bread than to jail a man for stealing a bank, or a railroad.

The bill of indictment is long and varied. America stands accused today of tolerating racism with the sanctions of high officials.

America stands accused today of failing to use its vast resources to aid the aged, the poor, the sick, the black.

America stands accused today of failing to respond when the phones of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and others were tapped.

This is the background of the current crisis. And we will mistake its true meaning if we do not see it against that wider context and if we do not understand that repeated denials of the rights of the poor, the black, and the disadvantaged paved the road to Watergate.

It is very important to us to understand the relationship between these ancient injustices and the crucial problems of this hour.

The late Jackie Robinson used to say that no black man can be free in America until all black men are free. And we can paraphrase him today and say that no white man can be free in America until all black men are free. Nor, to extend the phrase, can any white reporter be free until all black reporters are free.

And what this means is that there is a reciprocal relationship between black freedom and white freedom. The two concepts are opposite sides of the same coin, and when one changes the other changes. In other words, an increase in the amount of freedom available to blacks increases the amount of freedom available to whites. And the converse is also true: a decrease in the amount of freedom available to blacks leads to a decrease in the amount of freedom available to whites.

This is the larger meaning of Watergate: *Freedom is indivisible and so is repression.*

Police repression in the ghetto requires police repression outside the ghetto. The arrest of black reporters leads inevitably to the arrest of white reporters. Breaking and entering against a poor civil rights group leads inevitably to breaking and entering against the powerful Democratic party.

Freedom is indivisible, and so is repression

There is a tendency in this country to put the rights of blacks and the rights of whites into separate compartments. There is crime, and then there is black crime. There is poverty, and then there is black poverty. There is morality, and then there is black morality. And these phenomena are frequently interpreted in different lights.

There is also a distinct tendency in this country to separate public morality from private morality. And any treatment of blacks in accordance with the basic tenets of our religious heritage is left for the "great be-

yond." This dual standard of morality generates a climate of ambiguity which prevents this nation from dealing with its most serious problems.

Because of this dual standard, the polluted waters of injustice have finally backed up to the front doorsteps of America. Each day brings new evidence that white people are suffering injustices which blacks have endured for more than 200 years.

In this connection, I call your attention to the Collinsville, Illinois affairs. On a recent night in that town, terror knocked at the doors of peaceful, law-abiding white citizens—much like the Klan of old. Remember? But this time, *white families* were assaulted, cursed and abused by government agents.

It is encouraging to note the national reaction to this event. But I ask you, in all sincerity, where was the indignation when similar acts were being perpetrated upon thousands of American families who happened to be black? Where was the creative reporting when illegal reports were compiled on Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph Abernathy, and Jackie Robinson?

Let us also note, in passing, that it is ironic that the Watergate incident was triggered by the alertness of Frank Wills, an eighty-dollar-a-week guard who was working as a watchman because he could not find work in his field of training, the construction industry.

It is instructive in this general connection to note that the black press has always understood the close connection between black freedom and white freedom. The first black newspaper—*Freedom's Journal*—understood clearly that a threat to the rights of any man was a threat to the rights of all men. And *Freedom's Journal* was in the forefront of the fight against slavery. Since that time, black newspapers and magazines have been in the front ranks of the fight for free speech and free association. When Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, the black press was the first to point out the international implications. When Hitler turned on the Jews, the black press opposed him. The black press also condemned the internment of Japanese-Americans in World War II. In the same conflict, the black press fought for integration in the effort to defeat the Axis powers. And during the decade of the sixties, the black press was the cutting edge of the movement for social justice.

What I am concerned to emphasize here is that freedom for all men and women is the guiding principle of the black press, which has always understood that freedom is indivisible, even in the press.

This is a point of great importance, for we are witnessing what appears to be an effort to contain the free press. Some reporters have been jailed for refusing to divulge confidential sources and for refusing to give their notes to governmental agencies. Others have been threatened and intimidated, and still others are on their way to jail.

In deference to that old adage, "Physician, heal thyself," I say, "Press, protect thyself." I believe that if the press had mobilized a long time ago, when blacks and students were being attacked, it would be in a better position today to defend its own rights. I believe that if the press had drawn the line a long time ago when black reporters were being attacked—if it had put all its resources behind Earl Caldwell, for example—it would be in a better position today to protect white reporters. And I would like to emphasize here the very obvious fact that the movement to contain the white press grew, in part, out of the movement to contain blacks and other minorities.

For that reason, and for others as well, I believe, the white press is obligated—out of

its own self-interest—to speak for the oppressed in this country. I believe also that the black press and white press must wage a coordinated struggle to extend the boundaries of freedom in America.

The white press can make a real contribution to this effort by crossing the very visible walls of pigmentation that divide us. By the same token, the black press has a responsibility to continue to tell black Americans the truth about their lives, their achievements, aspirations, and obligations in a free society.

The black press and the white press must also agree on the means necessary to achieve freedom in America. The black press and the white press I believe, can and should support national social programs for the elimination of poverty, discrimination, and urban blight. We can also work together for the restoration of public confidence in public institutions and for a sensitive and informed citizenry.

Our form of government—in fact, the very foundations of our society—rests upon an informed citizenry. To participate effectively in the decision-making processes and to maintain a watchful eye over public officials require access to information. This is truer today than it was two hundred years ago, because of the increasing centralization of the government and because there is a growing acceptance by the public that secrecy in government is necessary.

I sincerely hope that this state of mind will change in the light of current events and that legislators, with the prodding of the press, will repeal laws which stifle the free flow of information and threaten the rights of citizens. This is one area in which the black and white press can work together. The repeal of "Stop-and-Frisk," "No-Knock," "Preventive Detention," and "Gag" laws are clearly in order at this time.

This is the responsibility not only of newsmen but also of all men and women who love truth.

In the Italian film, *General Della Rovere*, there was an interesting scene that dramatized this whole problem. Some of you may remember it. It was during the occupation of Italy and the Nazis rounded up a group of people caught in a frantic effort to crush the Resistance Movement. Some of the people caught in the dragnet were members and leaders of the Resistance, but some were not. The officer in charge tried to identify the Resistance leaders and failed. So he decided to execute them all—leaders and innocent bystanders. On a dark cold morning, the men were taken to a room to await their execution. And one man cried out in anguish: "I'm innocent. I didn't do anything." A Resistance leader approached him and said: "You didn't do anything?" The man said: "No, I didn't do anything." The Resistance leader said: "I don't understand. Our whole way of life was being destroyed. Minds were being warped; institutions were being subverted; and you didn't do anything?" The man said: "No, I didn't do anything." The Resistance leader said: "Then, you deserve to be punished."

We face a similar dilemma today. Minds are being warped; institutions, including the press, are being threatened; and men and women are being humiliated, degraded and excluded.

What have you done?

What are you prepared to do?

This is a personal question and it requires a personal answer. For in the final analysis this struggle will be won or lost by men and women who accept a personal, a *private responsibility* for righting the wrongs in our society.

Let me say in conclusion that we are witnessing only the backwaters of Watergate—water that has been rising for a long time. And every man and every woman is being issued a subpoena to appear as a witness at the trial of freedom. We are called upon in-

dividually to confirm or deny whether this nation or any other nation committed to freedom, justice and equality can endure—not forever—but for a mere two hundred years.

This is the challenge, and we must meet that challenge by rededicating ourselves to the values of our craft and by remembering that the press will survive to pay homage to the truth only if it protects the truth and uses the truth.

This, I believe, was the deeper meaning of the creed of Abraham Lincoln, who said once: "I believe in the American people. . . . Let them know the truth and the country is safe."

DR. ROBERT COOKE, NEW VICE CHANCELLOR OF MEDICAL AFFAIRS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished physician, Dr. Robert Cooke, has completed a most significant phase of his career, as Given Professor of Pediatrics at the Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, and president of the board of directors at the John F. Kennedy Institute for the Rehabilitation of the Mentally and Physically Handicapped Child. He is about to begin a new career as the vice chancellor of medical affairs at the University of Wisconsin, and I feel particularly proud that the University of Wisconsin is fortunate enough to attract this remarkable physician and humanitarian.

Dr. Cooke was the prime mover behind the creation of the John F. Kennedy Institute. At a testimonial dinner on the occasion of his resignation from that institute, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY was, appropriately, the keynote speaker. He spoke of Bob Cooke's work—as a teacher and administrator, academician and research scientist, policymaker and writer, ethicist and physician. He is an exceptional man. His energies moved in the creation of the National Head Start program, the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development and the University Affiliated Clinical Facilities; in 1962 he assumed the most prestigious pediatric chair in all of American medicine, the Given Foundation Professor of Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins. And always, behind his impressive professional credentials is his warm, human understanding.

In his moving address, titled "The Gorks Are Gone," Dr. Cooke explained what he felt to be his most important accomplishment at Johns Hopkins, bringing about a real understanding of the handicapped as people, not as "gorks," so-called poor protoplasm, but human beings with the rights of any other person. He says:

The Gork is gone because we believe that the value of a person is more than just his utility, more than just the consequences of his actions. . . . the gorks are gone because our institutional moral development has matured. Our principles have surfaced.

To Dr. Cooke:

The Kennedy Institute is a symbol that children of all ages and all capabilities and parents of all walks of life are worthwhile in themselves, whether they bring joy or sorrow, happiness or grief, good or bad. They are our responsibility. That is humanity, and that is, I hope, my real contribution to these institutions.

This idea is universal; it is the faith and determination that Dr. Cooke will carry with him to the University of Wisconsin.

I am happy that Dr. Cooke has chosen the University of Wisconsin, and I am certain that he will bring to the university and to the people of Wisconsin the gifts of service and the commitment to the needs of all people that he has demonstrated during each stage of his life.

Mr. Speaker, the following remarks from the proceedings of Dr. Cooke's testimonial dinner in Baltimore on May 8, 1973, include an introduction of Dr. Cooke by Dr. Robert Haslam, director, John F. Kennedy Institute for the Rehabilitation of the Mentally and Physically Handicapped Child, as well as Dr. Cooke's address:

REMARKS BY DR. HASLAM

At this time, I would like to introduce Robert E. Cooke. Machiavelli wrote in 1513, "It ought to be remembered that there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more powerless to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things, because the innovator has for enemies all those who have done well under the old conditions, and lukewarm defenders in those who may do well under the new. This coolness arises partly from the fear of the opponents, who have the laws on their side, and partly from the incredulity of men who do not readily believe in new things until they have had a long experience for them." Robert Cooke has undeniably introduced a new order of things.

During his initial years at Hopkins, a quiet change took over the Harriet Lane Home. Even though the building was dreary and antiquated, many significant contributions under his guidance and tutelage toward the understanding of the retarded began to take place. Research directed toward the elucidation of many inborn errors of metabolism and diseases, including the Lesch Nyham Syndrome, Sydamegalic inclusion disease, Hyperglycemia, Hyperthyroidism, and brain damage due to precise detail and inquisitiveness in seeking a solution to a difficult clinical or laboratory problem, are what stand him apart. His ability to immediately perceive loopholes in thinking, and ask important questions, always produce an exciting teaching experience for house staff, faculty and students alike.

In 1963 the late President John F. Kennedy said in an address to Congress, "Because care of the mentally retarded has traditionally been isolated from centers of medical and nursing education, it is particularly important to develop facilities which will increase the role of highly qualified universities in the improvement and provision of services and the training of specialized personnel." Thus the birth of the university affiliated concept. As a member of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, and later participating in a Subcommittee on Construction of University Affiliated Facilities for the Mentally Retarded, Dr. Cooke played a dominant role in the planning and function of these important centers. There are currently in excess of 30 University Affiliated Facilities throughout the country, most of them, of course, on the Eastern Seaboard. The University Affiliated Facility at Johns

Hopkins, the John F. Kennedy Institute, was dedicated in 1967, and was the first center completed to provide a clinical setting for the training of professionals dedicated to the betterment of the disadvantaged child.

Dr. Cooke's gentle guidance and firm example have provided an opportunity for many of us to develop careers in a field much in need of such firm devotion. Dr. Cooke has not been satisfied with the old conditions, but continually introduced a new order of things. As is the case with some leaders, his ideas and perceptions at first glance are oftentimes difficult to conceptualize. To some, they may seem futureless. History has shown that his contributions have been exceptionally significant and most relevant. He remains an advocate and counselor for the retarded and handicapped. His proposal for the 'Free Choice Principal', whereby parents of the handicapped should be given the means and freedom to choose the most appropriate setting and program to best accommodate the needs of their children, thereby providing an upgrading of facilities by open-door competition, is widely acclaimed. His participation in numerous conferences and committees, such as the White House Advisory Committee on Mental Retardation, the Committee on Area-Wide Planning of Facilities for the Mentally Retarded, the Committee to Study Maryland's Needs for the Mentally Retarded, the National Steering Committee Head of Project Head Start, and the President's Committee on Mental Retardation, attests to his advocacy role. While recently, Dr. Cooke has organized an Ethics Study Group at the Johns Hopkins Institutions, as you heard. Physicians, clergy, lawyers, students, and community personnel regularly meet to discuss important issues relating to the moral duties and obligations of those in constant contact with the sick and dying. As a result, many lectures and workshops responsible to the professional, as well as the community, have been organized to discuss important issues, such as the rights of the retarded.

I cannot let the evening pass without sharing with you Dr. Cooke, the man. I remember the quiet way in which he and a colleague, who happens to be in the audience tonight, Dr. Bill Gross, completely overwhelmed two young upstart interns in a tennis match. I must admit the money and beer was on the side of the younger physicians. Nor shall I forget the role he played in the annual House Staff picnics. Not only was he pitcher of the faculty baseball team, but in addition he doubled up at first, second, third and behind the plate if the catcher would allow him. His team always seemed to win. I recall the first official summons I had to his office as his Chief Resident of Pediatrics. I was confident he wished to share a new piece of medical information with me, or at least charge me up for the coming year's onslaught; instead he suggested that I call Mr. Zanvyl Krieger, the owner of the Baltimore Clippers, and inquire after the possibility of borrowing some hockey equipment and the use of the Civic Center so that we could have a house staff vs. faculty game—at no charge. Sometimes Bob Cooke finds time to relax, and sometimes with his beautiful wife, Nancy, I would point out to you that even when relaxing he is continually searching for new knowledge.

Bob's leadership, dedication, gentleness, imagination, and fairness will be sorely missed by the staff of the John F. Kennedy Institute. I would ask you all to rise in toasting Dr. and Mrs. Cooke, now, please. On behalf of the staff and faculty, medical board, Kennedy Council, Board of Directors of the John F. Kennedy Institute, and friends, I should like to extend our sincere appreciation to you, Bob, for your contributions to the handicapped child during the course of the past 17 years, and we all wish you and Nancy happiness and success in

Madison. To Bob and Nancy. And as a memento, Bob, we of the faculty and staff and personnel at the Kennedy would like to present you with this plaque, which says 'Robert Edmund Cooke, M. D., an avowed advocate of the handicapped child, presented with esteem and affection by the John F. Kennedy Institute for the Habilitation of the Mentally and Physically Handicapped Child, May the 8th, 1973.'

THE GORKS ARE GONE

(By Dr. Robert Cooke)

Various people may judge my contributions to Hopkins quite differently. Some may cite the people we've trained, others the buildings we've built, some the programs nationally or locally that we've started. I do not believe that is what I should be remembered for and this is in no way false modesty. I honestly believe that considering the times, considering the availability of funds, private and governmental, considering the prestige of Hopkins and the Kennedy name, I believe a dozen or more people in pediatrics could have accomplished as much or more. With the friendship of staff and house officers, with the backing of America's greatest family, many people could have accomplished these actions. I consider those accomplishments significant, I am proud of them. Yet none compare with what I think my real accomplishment is, and what I would like to be remembered for.

My heritage to Hopkins, my heritage to the Kennedy Institute and possibly to pediatrics or even medicine in general, is best summed up in one sentence. 'The Gorks are gone.' I'll repeat so that everyone here will know exactly what I said. 'The Gorks are gone.' For those of you who are not house officers or who are not medical students, the term 'Gork' has been used for a long time by many young members of the medical profession. Harassed by illness and suffering and death which they cannot rationalize, I am sure they used the term 'Gork' defensively to describe the profoundly and severely retarded, the maimed and handicapped, so-called poor protoplasm—the 'Gork'. It is a term that was used everywhere, including Hopkins, when I came. Looking back I can now say that as a parent of two profoundly retarded little girls, Robin and Wendy, it was hard to take to hear that term used so widely. I resented it but tried rather hard, and I think successfully, not to prohibit its use or to show any obvious reaction. I did not want people to change their attitudes out of courtesy to me because that effect would not outlast their contact with me. As soon as I or they departed, back would come the 'Gorks'.

Now, what has happened to the 'Gorks' over the last 15 years? Where have they gone?

In the last five years where have they been hiding? Have they stopped being born?

Unfortunately not, but somehow, almost by magic, they have been transformed. Transformed into little or big children, into boys and girls, into adolescents and into grown-ups. Strange looking many times, severely handicapped, distorted faces, shriveled arms or legs, slanted eyes, little heads, many not walking or talking, even in adulthood, yet they have been transformed from 'Gorks' to human beings, from 'Gorks' to patients—just like the other infants and children and adults at Hopkins. I've noticed this happening—this transformation—over the last several years. Not suddenly, not overnight. I thought at one time the transformation was a result of my personal example. But I now realize that it was much more than that. It was a profound change in the morality of the Hopkins Institutions. Exactly what change and why the change I still understand only vaguely, after a year of study of ethics. Yet I believe I understand in part at least the principles underlying the changes in attitude.

'The Gork' is gone because now we, you and

I, think of him or her as a person with the rights of any other person, which is the very meaning of justice. He counts as one just as you and I do, and we as the more fortunate have responsibility for him and for his rights.

'The Gork' is gone because we believe that the value of a person is more than just his utility, more than just the consequences of his actions. We believe that consequences, whether measured in benefit to cost ratios or measured in beneficence or love, are not the sole determinants of what is right or wrong, or what is good or bad.

'The Gork' is gone because we believe that there are absolutes, that all ethics are not relative. That one man's principles are not different from another's. Our absolutes are other people's absolutes. If we surface our moral principles, and examine them as we would our patients, we believe in truth, we believe in gratitude, we believe in self-improvement, and beneficence, and justice if we view them in the abstract. As scientists, as physicians, we tell the truth. That is an absolute. If one does not, he is not a scientist. Unfortunately, so frequently we lose our morality quit innocently, quite unconsciously. We submerge it in our science. The mongoloid baby, with duodenal atresia, here and elsewhere, was looked at scientifically. To operate or not operate on such a child, I was told in another medical center a short while ago, is a clinical decision, a professional decision. Not at all. What kind of life saving surgery, what kind of incision, what kind of anesthesia or intravenous fluids, what kind of antibiotics—those are clinical, professional, scientific, nonmoral decisions. To do a life saving surgery—that is a moral decision based in a fundamental moral principle, a 'prima facie' obligation the formalist, ethicist would say of non-injury. 'Don't let die if you can save'—a moral decision. Unfortunately, none of us are experienced in bringing our moral principles to the surface and using them just as we use our scientific principles.

Finally, the 'Gorks' are gone because our institutional moral development has matured. Our principles have surfaced. Blacks are treated as people. The poor are cared for as people, not as subjects or cases. The retarded are people and deserve as much love and consideration as the normal. The moral development of this Institution has moved at least at times beyond reward as the main motivator, beyond expedience, beyond utility, to a far more just approach to society. There has developed a conscious moral policy for this Institution that there is no bias, regardless of age, regardless of color, regardless of religion, regardless of intellect, regardless of material value.

Obviously, these beliefs did not begin with me at Hopkins. There have been far greater men before me. There are many individuals throughout this institution whose personal actions conform to such a moral policy. But I believe as a conscious moral policy for this Institution, for the whole of the Johns Hopkins, the Kennedy Institute has played a very significant part. I do not mean to imply that we are the only people kind and considerate to patients, the only group who make every effort regardless of status. Not at all. But I think there is a new moral policy, consciously conceived and consciously expressed in such things as our Child Life Program, in comprehensive care for the poor in East Baltimore, in the Parent and Child Center, in the Kennedy Council, in the whole attitude of the Kennedy Institute that has served as an example to the rest of the Institutions, and has changed these Institutions as well.

What do I really mean by this change in moral policy? I mean that we owe the Black residents of East Baltimore a good deal. We owe the retarded everywhere a good deal. Not for what they can do for us, but because we believe as an Institution in reparation as a basic moral principle. We give care to the

poor in East Baltimore, normal or retarded, not to get them off our backs, not to make the hospital run more smoothly, or be less dangerous for our white patients, but because we owe the poor a good deal for the neglect and callousness of years ago. Reparations in ethical terms. Our prior neglect of the retarded demands reparation—back payment—for what we owe them for years of neglect.

As a great Institution of learning, we have a responsibility also to transmit our beliefs to our students, and from them to the medical and professional community at large. That is the charge that I hope that the Kennedy Institute will consider as its most important mission, the teaching of the ethical principles underlying its dedication to the handicapped and the training of its staff and students in the process of moral development. Indeed, I cannot imagine a greater heritage to leave behind than significantly raising the level of moral development of each one of our students and residents and fellows.

Finally, I would like each one of you to consider why moral principles seem important to us when we view them, when we bring them to the surface. Why is justice of such consequence? Why do we try to improve ourselves? Why do we try to better our society? For ourselves alone, selfishly? Probably not, or we would cease when we have acquired security and prominence in position. A few rare and truly wonderful people do so because of a love of God. A few equally rare do so out of a secular love for mankind. Most of us, however, do not attain such grandeur. But try to follow the moral principles which I have described out of love for children and family. Our concern for the future indeed stems from our love of children and family. Without family, without children, absolutes have no importance. There is a loss of the importance of justice, fairness, of good for others, only concern for utility—for one's self.

My son, Chris, who has always stood beside me as a friend, and taught me far more about justice, my son, Robbie, who could not be here, as he tries to be independent financially, my daughter, Kim, who I am so proud of, their mother, Gwen, who struggled beside me through very difficult years, and Nancy my wife whom I love very much. Each one of us has family and children like these whom we are proud of, whom we are dedicated to. They are the difference between a caring and a non-caring society. They are what the Kennedy Institute is all about.

The Kennedy Institute is a symbol that children of all ages and all capabilities, and parents of all walks of life are worthwhile in themselves, whether they bring joy or sorrow, happiness or grief, good or bad. They are our responsibility. That is humanity, and that is, I hope, my real contribution to these institutions."

SOUTH CAROLINA TEXTILE STUDY COMMITTEE

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the committee to make a study of the textile industry in South Carolina, a committee officially created and constituted by the South Carolina General Assembly recently presented to our Governor and to the general assembly a splendid report. The textile industry is the very backbone of our State's fantastic progress, and the entire State is grateful to the members

of this special study committee for their superb and timely report.

Members of the committee are Senator John D. Long III, chairman, Senator Robert C. Lake, Jr., vice chairman, Senator Frank L. Roddey, Senator W. Howard Ballenger, Senator David S. Taylor, secretary, Representative T. W. Edwards, Jr., Representative Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., Representative Caldwell T. Hinson, Representative Patrick B. Harris, Representative Joe S. Holland, Hon. Marvin Watson, Hon. A. J. Head, and Dr. Wallace Trevillian, dean of the college of Industrial Management and Textile Science of Clemson University.

Mr. Speaker, we commend to the attention of the Congress the recommendations of the committee to make a study of the textile industry in South Carolina:

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That farm legislation be adopted as soon as possible in this session of the Congress that will provide incentives for growers to produce an adequate supply of cotton and, that will continue one price cotton. Failure to act on this legislation will mean a return to the Agricultural Act of 1958. This would mean two price cotton. Under the two price cotton system that was in existence in this country from 1956 to 1964, American textile mills had to pay a higher price for American cotton than our government charged for it in International Sales. Obviously, neither the raw cotton industry, the textile industry or the United States economy can afford a return to such folly.

2. It also is imperative that the administration give strong support to the general effort to negotiate a new multi-fiber, multilateral agreement to replace the present long-term arrangement for cotton that expires on September 30. The new arrangement should provide the same sort of tools as the current long-term arrangement, that is, the unilateral rights of the United States to restrain imports from any country when it determines that its markets are being disrupted.

The Committee also notes with some concern that the Trade Reform Act of 1973 contains the broadest delegation of authority and power to the President in connection with International Trade matters. We respectfully urge Congress to view this legislation with great care due to its far reaching delegation of power to the executive branch.

3. That copies of this report be sent to the President of the United States, members of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation, the Governor, the Lt. Governor of South Carolina, industry leaders and others.

JUDICIAL POWER OVER THE PURSE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, during the July 4 recess, the Washington Post had an extremely thoughtful editorial concerning the lack of legislative control over budgetary matters. It goes without contention that the Congress has dismally failed properly to oversee the appropriations process. This must change, for the American people have made it clear that they are tired of unbalanced

budgets and spiraling inflation. Those of us who were privileged to serve on the Joint Committee on Budget Control, and others who have followed its work with interest, are hopeful that the completed plan for reform can be implemented without unnecessary delay.

I respectfully request that the Washington Post editorial of July 5, 1973, be included in the *Record* as further evidence of the need for Congress to face up to its fiscal responsibility.

JUDICIAL POWER OVER THE PURSE

Whatever its other distinctions, fiscal year 1973, which ended Saturday night, will go down in history as the first year in which major parts of the federal domestic budget were controlled by the courts. In the latest defeats for President Nixon's policy of impoundment, four federal judges last week issued eleventh-hour reprieves to keep alive appropriations which had been frozen by the President and would otherwise have reverted to the treasury at midnight Saturday.

Two of the judicial rescue missions were temporary. District Court Judge Joseph P. Waddy ordered the government to reserve \$380 million in elementary-secondary education funds, and District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell directed HEW to earmark more than \$51 million in grants for community mental health centers, simply in order to preserve the funds until the judges could rule on the merits of each case. But there was nothing tentative about the other two decisions. In Newark, District Judge Leonard I. Garth ordered the government to release at once \$239 million in impounded Neighborhood Youth Corps funds, enough to provide summer jobs for about 600,000 youths. The previous day, Judge William B. Jones, who has almost single-handedly kept the Office of Economic Opportunity alive for several months, told OEO to process some 600 grant applications before Saturday night.

Obituaries for impoundment would be premature, since no test of the issue has yet reached the Supreme Court. Even so, the thrust of lower court decisions is unmistakable. There has not been a single judicial ruling this year in support of what President Nixon has called "the constitutional right for the President of the United States to impound funds and that is not to spend money." The judges have not reached the contrary extreme, which would be the flat proposition that under the Constitution every penny appropriated by Congress has to be spent. Instead, each case has turned on the particular statutes involved. Thus various courts have found that Congress intended water pollution monies to be allotted to the states, welfare grants to be paid, highway aid to be provided, and a veterans' education program to be carried out. But if these holdings stop short of a constitutional conclusion, their message is still powerful. It is that acts of Congress should be carried out.

All this judicial firmness contrasts sharply with the timidity and indecision of the Congress itself. While the courts have been sustaining the legislative power of the purse as expressed in acts of previous congresses, this Congress has been unable to carry through much of anything to bolster its own institutional grip on the budget processes. Despite loud protests about executive impoundment of everything from housing subsidies to REAP, Congress has so far actually passed only one bill mandating spending, for water and sewer grants. And when President Nixon vetoed that measure, the House failed to override. The White House has conceded a few dollars from time to time, but its highly advertised "compromise" on health programs last month has turned out to be a deception. The big struggles over urban aid and HEW funds for the coming year have just begun.

And the two vital institutional reforms begun on Capital Hill, the anti-impoundment legislation and new budget control plans, have become snarled in power squabbles in the House.

Thus the government entered a new fiscal year in legislative-executive stalemate, with the courts overseeing the uses of the budget much like referees in a political bankruptcy case. It is no way to run the country. There is waste and disruption when public programs are suddenly, arbitrarily suspended; there is also waste and confusion in sudden spurts of last-minute money, as OEO's frenzy of belated activity has shown. There is something terribly wrong when groups of citizens, and state and local governments, have to march into court time and again to obtain funds and programs which Congress intended them to receive. And there is something equally wrong when the people's representatives on Capital Hill cannot muster the will—indeed, the sense of institutional self-preservation—to regain the power of the purse and exercise that power effectively.

VERDICT ON SKYLAB'S MISSION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, man's contribution to space exploration and utilization has never been more clear than in the recent Skylab mission. Astronauts Charles Conrad, Joseph Kerwin, and Paul Weitz not only operated the Skylab with great precision and expertise but more importantly were able to repair and alter it on the spot, so that a near failure became an outstanding success. Soon Skylab will be used by a new crew of astronauts to extend, for another even longer mission, the usefulness of Skylab. The July 9 issue of U.S. News & World Report summarizes well the importance and success of the first Skylab mission. The article follows:

VERDICT ON SKYLAB'S MISSION

Space experts agree: It is now safe to call the first Skylab mission a resounding success.

Initially, physical problems that developed after the astronauts returned to earth on June 22 raised serious questions. There was concern that their 28 days in space had taken a toll that might prevent further extended space exploration.

After several shaky hours, the crew began a steady recovery from their grueling adventure. Doctors said they apparently had no lasting physical problems, and their health was considered excellent.

The next three-man crew has been given a preliminary go-ahead for a full 56-day mission, exploring still further the limits of man's endurance in a world of weightlessness. Blastoff for Alan Bean, Owen Garriott and Jack Lousma is set now for July 28, a day later than originally planned.

Skylab's first crew of Charles ("Pete") Conrad, Joseph Kerwin and Paul Weitz experienced widely different reactions after splash-down.

Dr. Kerwin, the first medical man in space, had the most severe readjustment problem ever suffered by a U.S. astronaut. He had to be helped from the command module, and experienced prolonged dizziness, nausea and one incident of vomiting.

Veteran astronaut Conrad on the other hand, had little trouble. The mission com-

mander emerged unassisted from the command module and a few hours later walked the deck of the recovery ship *Ticonderoga*.

Doctors said Mr. Conrad had adjusted fully to the earth's gravity in about two hours. Mr. Weitz took about seven hours and Dr. Kerwin felt rocky for several days.

As expected, the men lost weight—Mr. Conrad dropping nearly 4 pounds, Dr. Kerwin 6½ pounds and Mr. Weitz losing just over 8 pounds.

All in all, space physicians were well satisfied with the recovery of the men. Evaluation of photographs and other data will go on for months, but consensus is that the 2.5-billion-dollar Skylab project is off to a good start.

A LITTLE GIRL ASKED HER PASTOR IF THERE REALLY IS AN UNCLE SAM

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, there is a small frame church by the side of State Highway 36 between Carrollton, Ky., and Milton, Ky., which overlooks the mighty Ohio River. St. Peter Evangelical Lutheran Church serves this rural community well. The pastor, Roger G. Imhoff has remained solid in his patriotic beliefs while divergent forces have moved some of our churches and church leaders off the solid footing they were nurtured and raised on.

I would like to share with my colleagues an insert in the Sunday Bulletin of St. Peter's:

A LITTLE GIRL ASKED HER PASTOR IF THERE REALLY IS AN UNCLE SAM

(By Pastor Roger G. Imhoff)

"Yes, Virginia, there is a Spirit of Uncle Sam. It was a spirit of freedom, under God, which began with the Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July, 1776, nearly 200 years ago."

A painting of "Uncle Sam" was published in Red, White and Blue in 1917 and the United States Congress voted in 1962 to make "Uncle Sam" the official Symbol of our country.

Most of us, Virginia, believe that all citizens should stand for the high ideals of integrity, brotherhood and goodwill, which we learn in Church. Unfortunately not all Americans hold high these ideals of "Uncle Sam" which include honesty and generosity. But we pray, Virginia, that more people will remember what our ancestors declared in 1776, a "decent respect for the opinions of mankind cause us to remind the world that all men are created equal." That is indeed, Virginia, the spirit of Uncle Sam.

In that Spirit, Virginia, our founding fathers wrote a Constitution, beginning with a preamble "We the people, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and provide the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity."

The spirit of Uncle Sam was beginning to rise in their hearts, Virginia, as they informed the world, "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

And the Supreme Court once said that ours was a "Christian Nation", Virginia. This really means to us that in the Spirit of Good-

will, we believe in religious freedom for all Churches and all people.

President Abraham Lincoln once said, "With malice toward none, with Charity for all." Sounds like the Spirit of Uncle Sam which is a good Spirit for all Americans. So Uncle Sam isn't just one person, he represents the spirit of wholesome freedom for all Americans, here and all over the world.

Finally, Virginia, do you remember the great Hymn, "America the Beautiful"? It contains the Spirit of Uncle Sam. We sing it in school and in Church. It closes: "America, America, God shed His Grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood from Sea to shining Sea".

Yes Virginia, so long as you and I and all Americans hold high the banners of honesty, honor and dignity, our "Uncle Sam" can live forever.

EDITORIAL OPINION ON THE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, in his June 8, 1973, remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my colleague from Florida, Congressman BENNETT, implies the presidential decision to halt construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was based solely on reports from the Florida Times-Union.

Mr. BENNETT contends the order was the work of his hometown newspaper—"a newspaper owned by railroads which have traditionally always opposed the canal."

Well, let me say, the Times Union is in good company in its opposition to the canal. The vast majority of the daily and weekly newspapers in the great State of Florida have gone on record as opposing the canal.

The Miami Herald, in an editorial printed June 8, 1973, likened the canal to the phoenix, the great bird of Egyptian legend saying the project "keeps coming back to life, threatening horrendous environmental degradation in return for questionable economic benefit."

The Herald, in the same editorial, condemned the canal as "one of the worst monsters ever conceived by the dredge-and-fill gang."

The Fort Pierce News-Tribune has also called for deauthorization of the barge canal, blasting the project as a "multi-million dollar boondoggle."

"It has already done irreparable damage to much of the affected area," said the News-Tribune in a May 20, 1973 editorial. "The boondoggle deserves to remain buried."

The Orlando Sentinel Star feels the same way. In a May 23, 1973, editorial the newspaper condemned the canal and noted, "the voters, if they had an opportunity to express themselves, would certainly not approve another \$200 million or more to complete an environmentally destructive boondoggle."

"Let Congress get the message," the newspaper said.

Again on June 4, 1973, the Orlando

Sentinel Star called for repeal of the 1942 authorization of the canal. "Congress would do well to cancel the old canal commitment," the newspaper said. "Although the door has been closed by the President (in his January 19, 1971 order halting construction), repealing the 31-year-old authorization would be like installing a night latch to see that nobody pries his way inside."

The Palm Beach Post-Times, in a May 20, 1973, editorial said:

It is hard to believe that the battle to rescue the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is still raging, despite the colossal waste of taxpayers' money involved and the serious threats the project poses to vital water resources in central Florida.

And, the newspaper added:

It's clearly past time to take whatever action is needed to formally renounce the project and bring appropriate efforts to restore as much as possible of badly damaged watercourses.

"It is time to kill it (the canal) for good," said the Stuart News in an editorial printed June 7, 1973. "Ever since January 1971, when President Nixon ordered an end to construction of the North Florida boon-doggle, there have been attempts in the Congress to circumvent that decision and keep the canal alive. It is time to kill it once and for all."

The Fort Myers News-Press has attacked the "diehard promoters of this \$220 million boondoggle" for attempting to revive the canal, while praising the deauthorization effort as "this eminently sensible move" which would be "the most effective step ever taken by anyone to settle its hash."

And those are just the most recent editorials in opposition to the big ditch, as many have dubbed the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

There were many others in previous years. In fact, editorials opposing the canal began appearing in Florida newspapers almost within minutes after the first appropriation for construction.

The Winter Haven News-Chief wrote in 1965:

To lose a river valley of such recognized rarity and beauty, for whatever reason, is a tragic loss to all Floridians. But the tragedy takes on the dimensions of folly when this unique and irreplaceable natural asset is destroyed for the sake of an industrial canal that is said to be not economically sound and will not benefit the general taxpayer, has negligible value for national defense and will encourage the development of industries not in keeping with the widespread desire for Florida to remain a pleasant environment for both tourists and residents.

And the Jupiter Courier Highlights condemned the canal as "the greatest boondoggle of modern politics, a scandal and absolutely unnecessary."

By 1969, as canal construction moved along, more newspapers were opposing the canal. The Sarasota Herald-Tribune called the canal, "an ill-conceived project for which Florida's fishermen and naturalists have already paid too heavy a price."

The Coral Gables Times editorialized against the canal as a "107-mile boondoggle whose chief beneficiaries so far

seem to have been landowners who sold right-of-way."

And the Miami News likened the canal to a glacier "eating its way across the State, threatening such natural wonders as the Oklawaha River and the Silver Springs."

In 1970, the voice of opposition grew even louder. Today blasted the canal as a "pork barrel project" which threatened much needed fresh water sources. "What we are concerned with is survival, for that is what the real issue remains," the newspaper said. "We don't need the barge canal to cut the throat of Florida."

The St. Petersburg Times also called for a halt in construction, saying "one of the Nation's few unspoiled wild rivers is being ruined by this canal."

The Times was joined by the St. Petersburg Independent which proclaimed, "The cessation of the canal should prove to be a boon for all, save a few special interests."

And the Gainesville Sun called the whole idea of a canal economically unsound and a threat to the environment.

"No need to engage in the prolonged debate about destroying the Oklawaha River," said the newspaper. "It will be obliterated."

"Or the fishing or the wildlife or the forests. These will be drastically altered, perhaps for the worse."

But the newspaper editorial said the deeper fears concern the canal's effect on the area's fresh water supply. "Will the canal affect the Floridan aquifer, perhaps drying up wells or permitting the infusion of salt water?" the editorial asked. "And it will not affect Florida's water supply, why has the Corps of Engineers stamped 'secret' on its survey of ground water?"

However, editorial opposition to the canal hasn't been limited to Florida newspapers.

Even the New York Times, certainly not a proponent of President Nixon, hailed his decision to halt canal construction, saying:

The canal would have been an ecological disaster destroying the Oklawaha River which, as we noted in an editorial opposing the canal as far back as June, 1965, was "one of this country's most beautiful, free-flowing streams" and still, for much of its length, is dark, peaceful and untamed.

And the New Haven, Conn., Register hailed the presidential order as a "bold step necessary to rescue about 81 miles of Florida river area."

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that opposition to the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is not the work of a single newspaper—or even of a single area.

The truth is, very few people want the canal.

It would seem ridiculous for Congress to appropriate another \$150 million plus to build something only a handful of people want.

With this in mind, I have asked the House Committee on Public Works to proceed with hearings on my bill, H.R. 7904, to deauthorize the canal and give the people what they want—a beautiful river and an untainted source of fresh water.

NEW ATMOSPHERE, SAME SOVIET
AIMS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me imperative that we keep in mind the accuracy of the point made about the policy objectives of the Soviet Union in the following column by Crosby Noyes which appeared in the Sunday Star and Daily News of July 8, 1973:

NEW ATMOSPHERE, SAME SOVIET AIMS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

If one could muster any degree of confidence that the giant conclave of nations that met last week in Helsinki actually would contribute anything substantial to European security, it would be an event to be loudly hailed by all hands. Unfortunately, however, the results are far more likely to serve the long-range objectives of the Soviet Union, quite probably at the expense of real security in Western Europe and the United States.

A good deal, to be sure, has changed since 1954, when Vyacheslav Molotov, then the Soviet foreign minister, first floated the idea of an all-European security conference. At the time, I wrote from Berlin:

"It took no lengthy study of the Molotov plan, of course, to see that it was booby-trapped from the beginning to end. It was clear at first reading that buying it would mean, among other things, the dissolution of NATO, the death of EDC (the European Defense Community which eventually died anyway), the permanent division and neutralization of Germany and withdrawal of the United States from the defense of Western Europe." The Western allies, needless to say, rejected the Soviet proposal forthwith.

For all the changes since 1954, however, the really impressive thing has been the unflinching tenacity of Soviet foreign policy toward its long-range objectives. It is no exaggeration to say that the Russian aims at the present conference at Helsinki are precisely the same, in a different international context, as they were in Berlin 19 years ago.

The all-European security system which they envisage today would, indeed, imply the dissolution of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. It would work against the unification of Western Europe, militarily, politically and economically. It most definitely encourages the withdrawal of American power from NATO and the neutralization of the entire area.

The major difference is that the Molotov proposal in 1954 was made at the height of the Cold War, in the immediate aftermath of the Berlin blockade, when many people believed that full-scale war in Europe was not only possible, but imminent. Today the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is being held in an atmosphere of carefully orchestrated detente, in which the possibility of any unpleasantness seems remote and almost everyone apparently is prepared to accept Soviet good will and benevolence as foregone conclusions.

It is an atmosphere which already has done much to help a new generation of Russian leaders to achieve what was denied to their predecessors. Through his recent treaties with the government in Bonn, Leonid I. Brezhnev has virtually assured the permanent division of Germany, general recognition for the East German regime and the ratification of all Soviet territorial gains resulting from World War II.

The current Russian peace offensive also has done a great deal to further the growth of a neutralist spirit in Western Europe. While it may not succeed in preventing some

further development of the European Economic Community, any real progress in the military and political areas seems highly improbable within the foreseeable future.

Soviet policy cannot claim full credit for the evolution of political sentiment in the United States. It is possible that an American retreat from its global commitments—including those to Western Europe—was ultimately inevitable. But quite certainly Russian policy at this point, including the Helsinki meeting, is geared to the full exploration of a growing isolationist sentiment in the United States. And with or without an agreement on a mutual reduction of power in Europe, the Soviet leaders have every reason to expect that American power will be substantially reduced in the reasonably near future.

In these circumstances, Western policymakers continue to nurture some odd illusions about the "era of negotiations" that is now reaching full flower. In spite of ample evidence to the contrary, they apparently believe that it will be possible, as a result of Helsinki, to loosen the iron grip of the Soviet regime on its East European empire and somehow improve the lot of millions of Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Romanians and Bulgarians—and even possibly Russians—as the result of increasing "human contacts" across Europe's ideological frontier.

It is, to say the least, a forlorn hope. The Soviet leaders and every responsible spokesman for the regime have made it perfectly clear on countless occasions that they have no intention of dismantling the ideological barriers. They believe, on the contrary, that it is both natural and inevitable that the Soviet Union should become the dominant power in Western Europe, as it is in the East. This has been the unflinching objective since the end of World War II. And they are considerably closer to achieving it today than ever before.

WATERGATE—PROOF THAT
SYSTEM WORKS?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it would be an understatement that there has been a sufficient amount of coverage in the media of the Watergate case.

One of the most objective articles that I have seen, one that reflects in-depth historical insight, appeared in the New World, of Chicago, on June 29, and was authored by Father Andrew M. Greeley:

WATERGATE—PROOF THAT SYSTEM WORKS?

(By Father Andrew M. Greeley)

The Watergate affair is one more example of a fascinating phenomenon of American history: Presidents with landslide majorities usually get into trouble.

Franklin Roosevelt was reelected in 1936 with an overwhelming vote. Shortly thereafter he began his disastrous attempt to pack the United States Supreme Court, and while he was elected twice more, his political power was never the same. Dwight Eisenhower was reelected by a landslide in 1956, and the steam promptly went out of his never very dynamic administration—complete with such disasters as the U2 and the abortive Paris summit with Khrushchev.

Lyndon Johnson had a mammoth victory in 1964, and scarcely was the campaign finished before he was presiding over a disastrous escalation in Vietnam. Within a few months of his second inaugural, Richard

Nixon is well on his way toward becoming the most unpopular President since Harry Truman, and perhaps the most unpopular since Andrew Johnson.

Is it just coincidence, or does this phenomenon say something important about American politics?

A President with a large popular mandate usually forgets that for all practical purposes a win by 60% of the popular vote does not significantly alter patterns of power. Since Congressional voting patterns are relatively stable, presidential landslides rarely change the patterns of Congressional representation decisively.

The alignment in Congress may be slightly different, but still the power structures, the veto groups, the alliances in the Congress are substantially the same. The federal bureaucracy is unchanged, and the social, political and economic structure of the country is unchanged.

The President may have a mandate (though it may equally be only a non-confidence registration against his opponent) but, as we say in Chicago, his mandate and 45¢ will get him a ride on the Chicago Transit Authority. It carries with it no extra political power (as a landslide would in a parliamentary system) and only a transitory amount of political prestige.

James Madison and his colleagues designed a constitutional system for this country in which the leadership could govern only if it was capable of building coalitions. Whether you have 52% of the popular vote of 60%, the system is still such that you need to have a coalition to be able to govern effectively. But a man who permits himself to be deceived by overwhelming mandates—and most Presidents seem incapable of resisting the temptation—is going to neglect the difficult, tiresome, thoroughly unsatisfying task of tending to and maintaining his coalition.

Franklin Roosevelt thought that he could dispense with the Supreme Court; Dwight Eisenhower seemed to think he could dispense with government altogether; Lyndon Johnson thought he could govern without bothering to inform Congress or the American people what he was up to; and Richard Nixon apparently thought he could dispense with the courts, the Congress, the bureaucracy, the Cabinet, and even the Republican party. He imagined that he could control the country with the aid of a ruthlessly loyal clique of unpolitical technicians with whom he surrounded himself in the White House.

In each case the mandate led to a disaster, and how great the disaster was depended in substantial part on how resilient the President was. Franklin Roosevelt, at least, had a way of bouncing back.

There is considerable question in the present mess as to whether the American system has stopped working. My own guess is that if James Madison were around to be interviewed (off the record, of course) by the Washington Post, he would be delighted with the way the system had worked. He built in two checks and balances to restrict presidential power: The Congress and the court in the persons of Sam Ervin and John Sirica did exactly what Madison would have expected them to do.

The informal check, the press, legitimated not so much by the Constitution as by the Bill of Rights, also functioned as Madison would have hoped—though even he might have been embarrassed by the unholy glee with which the press is demolishing Nixon and his cronies.

Did we "luck out" then, or did the system work the way it was supposed to? I must prefer the latter explanation, but it still ought to be clear that a heavy price has been paid and will continue to be exacted in the years ahead. The checks and balances system may be the only way that a country the size of ours can be governed, but when the

brakes have to be slammed to the floorboards, the machine grinds to a halt for a time. The system survives, indeed, but the trauma is severe. Even a system as resilient as the one Madison designed cannot absorb too many such traumas.

Hopefully, future Presidents will learn that no matter what their plurality is, they govern a country that was designed for something like 55-45% elections in which the governing President has only a very thin edge over the opposition. The man who thinks he has more than that is headed for trouble.

REMOVE THE STIGMA OF THE "ADMINISTRATIVE-BAD-DISCHARGE"

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there is a large group of scattered, unrepresented, maligned former servicemen who need our help to reform a system of discharge which no longer meets the needs of our times and is intolerably inequitable.

The Congress ought to promptly review the policy which permits "less than honorable" discharges in certain petty cases of experimental drug usage.

Every Member of Congress has dozens of constituents who now carry the lifetime stigma of a discharge for "unfitness"—often for petty reasons totally irrelevant to civilian life.

As one example, I have a constituent who, when 19 years of age, experimented with drugs, off duty, with no effect on his work or assignments. He turned himself in at the suggestion of his commanding officer who told all aboard his ship that those who voluntarily confessed any drug involvement would be treated favorably. Large numbers aboard this ship were experimenting. He required no treatment, caused no trouble, and no longer uses drugs. Nevertheless, he was given a "less than honorable" discharge which was modified slightly to a "general discharge under honorable conditions for reasons of unfitness." Code markings on the discharge certificate indicating drug abuse are known to employers and college admission departments. This lifetime stigma harms the former serviceman far in excess of the misconduct. The punishment grossly exceeds the offense.

On all appeals the Review Board and the Secretary of the Navy practically rubberstamped the bad decision and conduct of the commanding officer.

The commanding officer and the discharging officer had little accurate knowledge about drugs. They simply tried to carry out a policy which the Navy adopted years ago under public pressure and an old-fashioned mentality concerning drugs.

Officers in the Navy who are alcoholics and whose inebriation adversely affects their official duties are seldom discharged and, if so, may be given a preferential disability rating, but certainly no discharge with an "unfitness" classification.

This double "double standard" between

officers and enlisted men and between marihuana and alcohol misusers is doubly wrong and ought to be corrected. The Navy is functioning in another world, but discharged personnel must function in normal society.

Our discharge system is outdated, unfair, and discriminatory; it desperately needs reform. The record of armed services shows little initiative in personnel practices improvement. The Congress will have to act.

Raymond P. Boulanger tells a bit about this problem in a feature article in the July 8, 1973, issue of the Washington Star-News, which I urge all Members to read:

STIGMA ON 500,000 MEN: RETHINKING THE "BAD DISCHARGE" SYSTEM

(By Raymond P. Boulanger)

Bad discharges from the military are one of the many bitter legacies of the Vietnam war. As it is, Vietnam era veterans with honorable discharges must contend with high unemployment rates, inadequate veterans benefits, and public indifference to their sacrifices and needs. The veteran with a bad administrative discharge, either a general or the even worse undesirable discharge, suffers further from the potentially disabling stigma associated with such a discharge.

It is ironic that public attention has focused on proposals of amnesty for a handful of draft evaders (most of whom could adjust easily to civilian life because of their middle-class backgrounds) while ignoring the one-half million former soldiers from the Vietnam era, often black, uneducated, or poor, many of whom because of a bad administrative discharge may find civilian life filled with bitter frustrations and hardships.

(The administrative discharge is a category separate from punitive—"bad conduct" or "dishonorable" discharges. This article does not address itself to punitive discharges.)

Since 1961, more than 200,000 individuals have received an undesirable discharge from the military services—either in lieu of court-martial or as a result of administrative proceedings for "unfitness," which encompasses such things as drug abuse and an established pattern of shirking duty. A disproportionate number of these discharges was issued to blacks, the uneducated, or the poor. For example, in fiscal year 1971, blacks received undesirable discharges at twice the rate of whites. In the last decade, 300,000 more individuals received a general discharge, granted usually for "unsuitability," a term of art covering such things as character and behavior disorders.

In addition to a discharge certificate, all veterans receive a Report of Discharge (DD Form 214) which carries a coded number (SPN) indicating the reason for the individual's discharge. Some of these—for example, SPN 384 which indicates drug abuse as the basis for discharge—can have disastrous consequences to the future opportunities of the veteran.

A study by Maj. Bradley K. Jones recently published in the *Military Law Review* confirmed that bad administrative discharges adversely affect employment opportunities. He concluded on the basis of the results of a survey of employers, educators, and professional licensing authorities that "less than honorable discharge obviously hampered an ex-serviceman's employment or acceptance prospects." In fact 20 percent of all surveyed employers automatically disqualify any job applicant with an undesirable discharge. Many others treat the characterization of service as the most important factor in determining whether the individual is employable, especially when he is being evaluated for a position where moral character may be

important—law enforcement, for example, or where a security clearance is needed.

This is unfortunate. The often extraordinary demands of the military, especially in a combat situation, are not the same as those experienced on an assembly line or in an office, and the individual's inability to cope with military service, especially when he is only 18 or 19 years old, is not a valid predictor of his future job performance even in a sensitive position.

There is also something quite unfair about this entire characterization system in that those who escape military service, generally the more affluent members of society, are not subjected to the possible consequences of a bad administrative discharge. And if they do flunk out of Yale or are fired by Ford, they are not branded for life as "undesirables."

If rebuffed in obtaining a job, the veteran with an undesirable discharge may seek to better himself by applying for GI educational or training benefits. Again, he is likely to be rebuffed. Although the Veterans Administration adjudicates questionable cases to determine whether the service satisfies the requirements of the VA, the usual result is to deny those with undesirable (but not general) discharges, VA benefits, a substantial economic loss for many individuals.

Most of the criticism of the military's discharge system has been directed toward the due process protections afforded the individual subject to administrative separation. For example, Senator Sam Ervin (D-N.C.) has introduced bills in the Congress which would impose additional procedural safeguards on the administrative separation of servicemen under other than honorable conditions. This approach, however well-intentioned, is largely misguided. Except for certain rules of evidence regarding the introduction of hearsay and illegally obtained evidence and certain problems with compelling the attendance of witnesses, the current procedures for awarding undesirable and general discharges afford the individual a substantial measure of due process, including the right to legal counsel and a broad hearing. Layering still more due process on the system is not really going to help.

Many individuals waive their right to contest their separation. Although the serviceman is advised by his legal counsel on the consequences of an undesirable or general discharge, it is too much to expect an 18 or 19-year-old to understand or appreciate what this would mean to him in personal terms.

Many of the servicemen may also have been misled by "barracks lawyers" into thinking that their bad discharges ("bad paper") could be automatically recharacterized after a short waiting period. In truth, it is extremely difficult to obtain a recharacterized discharge from the two review boards established by Congress for this purpose. For many servicemen even if they had some understanding of the consequences of an undesirable or general discharge and knew it could not be changed, they would probably not resist it. For many it is an easy way to end hassles with the military. Even if a man has a good case in his defense, he often wants "out" regardless of the nature of the discharge.

In any event the result in most cases is foreordained. The officers ruling on these matters reflect an understandable bias in favor of protecting the powers of the commander. And even if the criteria for administratively discharging individuals were severely restricted (as some should be because of their overbreadth and vagueness) or more due process were afforded the individual, there would still be sufficient justification to separate many individuals who for one reason or another failed to observe the expected standards of discipline and order.

Finally, many servicemen charged with a

court-martial offense—often AWOL or drug charges—request and are granted an administrative discharge, usually an undesirable discharge, in lieu of court-martial. In the process, the soldier avoids a possible period of confinement and gets what he wants most of all, out of the service. He may later regret this decision, especially if he is black, uneducated, or without any valuable skills.

As suggested by the Black Congressional Caucus and certain members of the Defense Department's Task Force on the Administration of Military Justice in the Armed Forces, we ought to end altogether the hoary and sanctified practice of characterizing the service of military members; instead, we should issue only certificates of service, uncoded and uncharacterized. We ought also to recharacterize or at least decharacterize all previous bad discharges.

Aside from the fact that the honorable discharge has been granted to millions of veterans and has secured a vocal constituency, there is little reason to retain the present characterization system.

The present system provides little, if any, incentive for good conduct on the part of the serviceman. Many of the "bad performers" are so immature and troubled psychologically that they are totally oblivious to the consequences of the discharge they receive.

More importantly, there are other deterrents, such as Article 15 non-judicial punishment, which are more effective. The present system also cannot really be justified by the way it dispenses punishments and rewards. The punishment it exacts is often excessive; it may foreclose future job and educational opportunities to the detriment of not only the individual but also society in general. In any case, it is not really necessary to "reward" anyone with an honorable discharge, especially since military service has been traditionally viewed as an obligatory part of citizenship.

A new system might even prove beneficial to the military services. They would still be able to eliminate individuals for cause, but they would be relieved of the onerous task of characterizing the individual's service.

Hopefully, Congress and the Executive Branch will have the compassion and common sense to declare an amnesty on bad administrative discharges. After all, it is only a matter of time before some form of amnesty is granted to draft evaders and deserters. Can we be any less charitable to those who encountered difficulties in their service to their country and received bad administrative discharges?

NIER STATUS REPORT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, late last year it came to my attention that the National Industrial Equipment Reserve of machine tools, which is under the Department of Defense and maintained by the General Services Administration, had received no fiscal 1973 funds because of a difference between the administration and the Congress as to whether this should be under the GSA or DOD budget. As a consequence, the GSA was forced to discontinue its operation of NIER last December which included closing down its two main storage facilities at Terra Haute, Ind., and Burlington, N.J., and terminat-

CXIX—1476—Part 18

ing the popular "tools for schools" loan program which makes available NIER machinery to schools for vocational training purposes.

In response to this impasse, I introduced a \$1.8 million urgent supplemental appropriation bill to restore NIER funds under GSA, and the Congress subsequently adopted this as an amendment to the first supplemental appropriation bill which was signed into law by the President on April 28. Despite this congressional mandate to continue the NIER program, the Office of Management and Budget issued a directive to the Department of Defense on May 24, 1973, ordering the dismantlement of NIER by declaring all NIER machinery excess and making it available to schools through the HEW surplus property donation program. A copy of that directive and my exchange of correspondence with OMB appears in the June 1, 1973, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 17806.

I have since contacted the chairmen of both our Armed Services and Appropriations Committees urging a review of this OMB decision, both with respect to its legality and advisability, and I have been informed that the Armed Services Committee staff is currently investigating this matter along with possible alternatives to the OMB proposal. In the meantime, the Department of Defense has taken the OMB directive under advisement, but has not proceeded to implement it. OMB has released approximately half of the \$1.8 million supplemental funds to reimburse GSA for its operation of NIER during the first half of fiscal 1973 out of its contingency fund; but no money has been released to reactivate the dehumidifiers in the two storage facilities and, according to a letter I have received from GSA, machinery valued at \$46 million in those two facilities "are showing signs of rust." Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse for permitting such substantial damage to this costly machinery; while OMB is trying to save less than \$1 million, it is, by its parsimony, permitting millions of dollars worth of machinery to fall into disrepair. I, therefore, am urging immediate release of sufficient funds to preserve and protect this machinery until the final disposition of NIER is resolved.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include an exchange of correspondence with Chairman MAHON, a report on NIER from the GAO, and an exchange of correspondence with GSA as well as a copy of a letter sent to Director Ash of OMB from the vocational director of the Brooklyn, Ohio, school district:

JUNE 7, 1973.

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I wish to call your attention to a recent decision by the Office of Management and Budget to abolish the National Industrial Equipment Reserve (NIER) despite congressional action in the first supplemental appropriation bill to restore funds for the program.

I am attaching for your information my recent floor remarks on this decision and an exchange of correspondence with OMB on NIER. I would hope that your committee could carefully review this situation in view

of the OMB decision and give careful consideration to continuing NIER in fiscal 1974 pending further study.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 12, 1973.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Thank you for your letter of June 7, 1973, expressing your continued interest in the National Industrial Equipment Reserve (NIER) program.

During its consideration of the Urgent Supplemental Bill of 1973, the House adopted your proposed amendment to all \$1.8 million for the continuation of NIER. I discussed with you at that time a study of the NIER program, which the General Accounting Office had under way at my request.

For your information, I am attaching a copy of a letter to me from the Comptroller General of the United States in which he sets forth the findings of that study.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman.

MAY 31, 1973.

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your March 5, 1973, letter requested us to study the National Industrial Equipment Reserve established under the "National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948," (Public Law 883, 80th Cong.). We agreed with a member of your staff that we would obtain information that is readily available from the agencies concerning the value of all industrial plant equipment owned by the Department of Defense (DOD), the age and type of equipment assigned to the national reserve, and the distinction, if any, between the national reserve and DOD's general reserve. We also agreed to furnish information on the use of national reserve equipment during the Vietnam buildup and in the school loan program.

Because of the short time we had to comply with your request, we agreed with a member of your staff to provide this information without conclusions or recommendations as to the need for maintaining a separate national reserve and a general reserve.

BACKGROUND

The act established a reserve of machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for immediate use to supply the needs of the Armed Forces in a time of national emergency. The act authorizes the Secretary of Defense to determine which excess industrial properties should become part of the reserve and which should be disposed of. The Secretary was also authorized to lend property to nonprofit educational institutions or training schools when he determined that the programs proposed by these organizations would contribute to national defense and the equipment would be properly maintained and returned, if required, without expense to the government.

CRITERIA FOR ASSIGNING EQUIPMENT TO THE NATIONAL RESERVE OR GENERAL RESERVE

The Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Center (DIPEC), Memphis, Tennessee, assigns equipment to the national reserve or the general reserve. DIPEC directly manages the general reserve. By agreement between DOD and the General Services Administration (GSA), GSA stores, maintains, leases, and disposes of equipment in the national reserve and operates the school loan program. Each reserve consists of unassigned equipment held for general mobilization.

Both reserves have basically the same types of equipment, according to DOD officials,

DOD usually assigns to the general reserve newer, more sophisticated equipment with a clear potential for reuse in future defense production. Equipment considered marginal for use in defense production but useful for the school loan program is assigned to the national reserve. Since DOD is responsible for both reserves it occasionally assigns equipment with a clear potential for reuse to the national reserve rather than the general reserve to take advantage of the GSA storage space. According to DOD officials, the quantities in both reserves are still short of mobilization requirements.

DOD-OWNED EQUIPMENT

DOD owns approximately 460,000 pieces of industrial plant equipment costing nearly \$3.9 billion. The following table shows its active and reserve inventory as of December 31, 1972:

INDUSTRIAL PLANT EQUIPMENT		
	Number of items (thousands)	Cost (millions)
Active:		
Contractor locations.....	109	\$1,394
Government locations.....	279	1,517
Total, active.....	388	2,911
Reserves:		
Plant equipment packages.....	36	625
General reserve.....	23	333
Total, reserves.....	59	958
National reserve.....	11	84
Grand total.....	458	3,953

Location, age, and condition of national reserve equipment

Of the 11,400 tools in the national reserve, about 7,900 costing \$39 million were on loan to schools. GSA and DOD are storing another 3,500 tools costing \$45 million. About 2,300 of the 3,500 tools are stored in a GSA depot at Terre Haute, Indiana.

Most of the equipment was manufactured in the 1940s and early 1950s. For the most part it is general-purpose equipment, such as lathes, grinding machines, milling machines, and other types of metal-working equipment. From what we could observe at the GSA facility at Terre Haute, the equipment is in good condition.

Value of the equipment and maintenance cost

It is difficult to estimate the value of the equipment in the national reserve. However, GSA and DOD officials estimate that the cost of replacing such equipment with new equipment would be from 2 to 2½ times the acquisition cost. On the basis of the acquisition cost of approximately \$84 million, it would cost between \$168 million and \$210 million to replace this equipment.

With respect to maintenance costs, GSA budgeted about \$572 thousand for fiscal year 1973 for shop operations, which included analytical testing, repairs, and preservation. Schools maintain tools loaned to them.

EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN FOR USE IN VIETNAM CONFLICT

During the Vietnam conflict DOD withdrew equipment from both reserves for defense projects. DOD data indicates that from 1964 through 1968 the Department withdrew 1,190 pieces of equipment costing about \$28 million from the national reserve. Most of this—960 items costing \$25.5 million—was issued to about 100 defense contractors. During this time other agencies, such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission, withdrew 867 items costing \$6.6 million. All the equipment came from storage facilities. Equipment on loan to schools was not called back for this purpose. During this same period, DOD withdrew equipment costing about \$627 million from its general reserve.

SCHOOL LOAN PROGRAM

The program has grown considerably since it was started in 1958. Each year an average of 565 pieces of equipment are loaned to schools. The 7,921 pieces on loan at December 31, 1972, were located in 394 schools in 44 States. A number of additional schools expressed interest in the program in late 1972 when the program was terminated for lack of funds. Actions pending at that time are as follows:

Category of activity and number of schools	
Loans approved by DOD and shipping orders forwarded to GSA.....	40
Applications approved and tools offered by DOD accepted by applicants before the program was terminated.....	5
Applications accepted and offers made to applicants to view the equipment.....	39
Applications received from new schools since program was discontinued.....	36
Requests from participating schools for additional equipment.....	30
Inquiries on the loan program.....	136

We trust this information is responsive to your request. We plan no further distribution of this letter unless you agree or publicly announce its contents.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MAY 29, 1973.

Commissioner, Property Management and Disposal Service, General Services Administration, General Services Administration Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have received the attached letter and memorandum from the Office of Management and Budget relating to the decision to eliminate the National Industrial Equipment Reserve (NIER) which is under your custodianship.

Because I was the principal sponsor of legislation to restore funds for NIER in fiscal 1973, I would appreciate being apprised of the procedures which will be followed in disposing of this machinery so that I might in turn answer any questions which are directed to me both from within and without the Congress.

It is stated in the OMB letter that the tools in NIER will be donated to educational institutions under GSA/HEW's existing donation program. At one point in the memorandum to the Secretary of Defense, it is stated: "... we have determined that, rather than reactivate the NIER program, the tools should be declared excess so that they might be donated to schools for vocational training purposes." At another point, it is stated: "Manpower training objectives would be met if the tools were surplus since they could then be donated on a priority basis to educational institutions."

It is my understanding that the terms "excess" and "surplus" are not interchangeable. Under your Personal Property Utilization and Donation Program, Federal agencies have first access to excess property. Property which is not needed by any Federal agency may then be declared surplus and donated to the States for educational, public health, civil defense and other purposes. Is this an accurate understanding of the procedures followed?

I am also interested in knowing if schools may apply directly to GSA or HEW for the surplus machinery, or if the States must first obtain the machinery and then allocate it? Would the machinery only be available to schools in States which now have NIER storage facilities or would it be available nationwide?

I am also interested in knowing approximately what percentage of the NIER tools in storage are of the type which might be of use to schools in vocational training courses. And, in your opinion, are the tools in the Terre Haute, Ind. and Burlington, N.J. facili-

ties which have not been maintained since last December still of value to schools in their present condition? If not, are the schools capable of having the proper restoration and repair work done in order to make the machinery operable? Is GSA under any obligation to properly prepare this machinery for disposal and delivery, and, if so, are funds currently available for these purposes?

It is stated in the OMB letter that: "Such action would not place a significant additional burden on the donation program and would not require additional Federal funds." In your opinion, will it be possible for GSA to "assure an effective and orderly transition" in the "disinvestment of the tools now in reserve" without incurring any expenses beyond that which has been appropriated in this fiscal year for the Property Management and Disposal Service?

Finally, although the Congress appropriated no funds for NIER in fiscal 1973 (until enactment of the first supplemental appropriation act in April of this year), GSA did manage to keep the NIER going until December 31, 1972. How much did this cost GSA? Were these expenses reimbursed by DoD? If not, where did the funds come from to operate NIER for the first six months of fiscal 1973? Have any of the funds appropriated in the first supplemental been released to GSA to reimburse it for the expenses incurred during that six month period (assuming that DoD has not reimbursed GSA).

Thank you for considering this rather lengthy list of questions; your early response will be greatly appreciated.

With all best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 12, 1973.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This is in response to your letter of May 29, 1973, concerning the National Industrial Equipment Reserve (NIER).

Implementation of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) plan for termination of the NIER program, would require, first, that the NIER tools be declared excess to the needs of the Department of Defense (DoD). They would then be screened among the Federal agencies for possible Federal utilization. If no further Federal need for the tools were determined, the equipment would be declared surplus and be made available for donation by the General Services Administration (GSA) through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW).

Under existing DHEW procedures the tools would be allocated to State Agencies for Surplus Property, not directly to schools. The distribution to schools or other eligible donees within each State would be accomplished by the State Agency. Tools located in depots would normally be offered nationally, not simply to the States in which the depots were located.

Approximately 25% of the NIER tools in storage are of a type which could be used by schools for vocational training. Although the tools in storage at Terre Haute and Burlington are showing signs of rust, they can be restored. Most schools would be capable of having the proper restoration and repair work done.

The OMB plan for disinvestment of the NIER tools does not appear to envision that restoration or repair work will be accomplished before the tools are donated. In any event we have not received an apportionment of funds for this purpose from OMB.

Additional funds would not be required by GSA to handle the normal offering of these tools for further Federal use or for donation. However, to the extent the tools now stored in depots were transferred or donated, funds

would be required for out-handling from these depots. These amounts could be recovered from the recipients. In addition, out-handling funds would be needed should any of these tools, not required for Federal use or donation, be sold by GSA.

The cost of operating the NIER program through December 31, 1972, was \$701,000. Since that date additional disbursements have been made to cover severance pay and allowances, bringing expenditures for FY 1973 up to a total of \$817,500 as of April 30, 1973. The DoD did not reimburse GSA for these expenditures. Funds to conduct the program during FY 1973 were made available by a reprogramming of our operating expense appropriation. OMB has apportioned \$830,000 of funds appropriated by the first supplemental (Public Law 93-25) to reimburse our operating expense account for FY 1973.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

ALLAN G. KAUPINEN,
Assistant Administrator.

JUNE 13, 1973.

Mr. ROY L. ASH,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Executive Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. ASH: Correspondence with Congressmen John B. Anderson and James V. Stanton advises me that the Office of Management and Budget, on May 24, 1973, sent a directive to the Department of Defense ordering a dismantlement of NIER.

We at Brooklyn City Schools are asking you not to dismantle the NIER program and attempt to channel the material through GSA's disposal program. This may sound good in theory, but its practical application leaves something to be desired. There are many disadvantages to the school systems.

It has been my experience that equipment acquired through surplus properties is often incomplete and/or broken from careless handling. Last month we purchased a lathe from surplus properties for \$500.00. Before we could use it, we had to purchase a tall stock center, a tool holder, a tool post, and a three-jaw chuck at a cost of \$739.00. We also had to repair those parts that were damaged in transit.

There is another problem which I think is of greater importance. Equipment is not supplied upon justification of need, but rather by a hit or miss fashion of first come, first served. Schools closer to the surplus center that can keep a close check on incoming or current equipment have a very great advantage over schools at a greater distance and end up acquiring the more valuable equipment. Some schools in the past have purchased surplus equipment, held it unused for four years, and then sold it at a great profit. This does not serve the purpose of the program—but it is the reality of the situation.

I sincerely urge you to take another very careful look at the entire picture before any further steps are taken to dismantle NIER. We are convinced that we and other vocational training schools would be the losers.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM G. PEARCE,
Vocational Director.

FREEDOM AND CONTROLS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as we concern ourselves with finding ways to stem

the mounting tide of inflation we seem, more and more, to rely upon the coercion of Government controls as the best means of action.

The fact is that wage and price controls have failed to ease the present inflationary trend. They have failed because they have not dealt with the causes of inflation but only its symptoms.

Discussing the inevitable failure of controls, economist Murray Rothbard points out that—

The controls won't work. The prime reason why they won't work is that they do not tackle the cause of inflation, but only lash out at the symptoms. Every price is simply the terms of an exchange on the market. When I buy a newspaper for a dime, ten cents in money is being exchanged for one newspaper. And so the key to what makes prices high or low is the relationship between the supply of goods available and the supply of money. Suppose that by some magic process, the quantity of money in the country doubles overnight. The supply of goods remains the same, for nothing has really happened to lower or raise them. But then we will all enter the market with twice as many dollars burning a hole in our pocket as compared to yesterday . . . we will all have to pay twenty cents for the same newspaper.

The fact is that the supply of dollars has continued to rise, due to the policy of the Federal Reserve Board to increase the money supply. In addition, deficit spending means that the Government is spending far more money than it has. Government is the party responsible for inflation, yet controls which are meant to ease inflation are applied only to private individuals, and never to Government. It is little wonder that inflation continues.

In an address before the Insurance Forum on November 2, 1972, Walter B. Wriston, chairman of the First National City Corp., discussed the subject of "Freedom and Controls."

Mr. Wriston declared that—

The truth is that governments and only governments create money. Other factors in our economy, while contributory and even very important, are only peripheral. Controls, however, obscure this basic truth and thus appear to many to be an acceptable alternative to proper monetary and fiscal policy for cooling inflation. As each new control fails to operate satisfactorily, a new one is added. The theory seems to be that if you drill just one more hole in a leaky boat the water might just run out. It's the old story of not understanding the cause of the trouble.

While controls do nothing to stem inflation, they do lead, in the long run, to a serious loss of freedom. Mr. Wriston notes that—

If you entrust your fate to the government, you will soon learn that bureaucracies never die. They just grow and grow year after year and, as they age, their initial very limited risk-taking capability atrophies completely . . . once the process of control is initiated, it spreads to all sectors of the society until at last, if you put a floor under costs and a ceiling over prices, there will be no room for a freeman to stand erect.

Controls will not stop inflation, but if they persist they may seriously limit our freedom.

I wish to share the thoughtful speech by Walter B. Wriston with my colleagues and insert it into the Record at this time:

FREEDOM AND CONTROLS

(By Walter B. Wriston, chairman, First National City Corp.)

THE DIOCLETIAN PARALLEL

Anyone on Wall Street watching the ups and downs of the market would be tempted to embrace a cynical remark once made by George Bernard Shaw. He said: "We learn from history that men never learn anything from history."

Things are not really bad, but in times of stress memories grow dim and our impatience with the laws of economics develops into deep frustration. In our desire to set right the many things that we see in our society and in our economy which frustrates us, we sometimes forget that other men in other times or other places have tried similar remedies with predictable results.

Many people in our society today, who see no inherent contradiction between the concept of individual freedom and government controls, might be less sanguine if they reviewed a bit of ancient history. In the third century the most pressing problem facing the Roman Emperor Diocletian was inflation and his solution has, in part, its parallel in modern times.

Unable to raise more money for the imperial treasury through additional taxes, Diocletian believed he had no recourse but to debase the currency of the empire. Since the printing press had not yet been invented and there were no central bank to issue notes, he flooded the market with copper coins at a time when precious metals were in short supply. Of course, prices quoted in terms of copper coins went skyward. Although Gresham was yet unborn, his law was already at work with had money driving out good.

GRESHAM'S LAW WAS ALREADY AT WORK

With the empire on the verge of bankruptcy, Diocletian had to come up with what we would now call a new game plan. He finally issued an imperial edict establishing wage and price controls. Price ceilings were set on 900 commodities and 130 different grades of labor. Having little faith in the ability of the people to discipline themselves, he imposed the death sentence or deportation on anyone who dared to buy or sell above the established rates. While many were executed or deported, his edict proved to be impossible to enforce.

The bureaucracy designed to administer the edict grew to be crushingly expensive, and swelling the supply of the currency merely fed the spreading fires of inflation. The combination of these two factors, as we all know, contributed to the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. Nations with worthless currencies, then as now, rarely speak with strong voices in international circles.

Diocletian's dilemma and his remedy have been repeated in one form or another again and again throughout history. In the light of ancient as well as recent history, those among us who hall wage and price controls and other restraints as wonder drugs to cure the ills of our economy should temper their enthusiasm.

WHENEVER TIMES ARE OUT OF JOINT, WE LOOK FOR SCAPEGOATS

Whenever the times are out of joint we look for scapegoats—labor blames management and management blames labor. Often both blame government which, of course, reciprocates. When basic imbalances of power, either economic or political, are created and permitted to persist, there is a tendency to grow impatient with old truths. We begin to hear that old laws no longer work, two and two are no longer four and it is time for bold new initiatives. Those impatient with the pace of change urge that we create new rules and regulations to achieve the ends that used to be the product of the old laws. We even invent new cosmetic words

like "guidelines" to blur the blunt fact that we are talking about rigid regulations.

Although some economists perceive this to be a new world with new rules, there are still some basic tenets that have not changed. When a government prints too much money in relation to the economy, in time the value of money declines.

Learned men, of course, can and do develop intricate arguments couched in subtle language to describe the complex factors which influence the value of our money. The truth is, however, that governments and only governments create money. Other factors in our economy, while contributory and even very important, are only peripheral.

I do not mean to suggest that the balance of power between management and labor is not a significant factor in many sectors of our society. When this balance gets out of equilibrium, certain industries do indeed develop what has come to be called the cost-push syndrome. Far from refuting the old laws, this simply proves anew that old laws of economics still work. The cost-push syndrome has helped to produce the wonderfully cosmetic phrase "incomes policy," a euphemism for price controls. Whatever term is used, it is abundantly clear in the simplest economics that the price perceived as income by one man is just as truly another man's cost.

CONTROLS OBSCURE THE BASIC TRUTH

Controls, however, obscure this basic truth and thus appear to many to be an acceptable alternative to proper monetary and fiscal policy for cooling inflation. As each new control fails to operate satisfactorily, a new one is added. The theory seems to be that if you drill just one more hole in a leaky boat the water might just run out. It's the old story of not understanding the cause of the trouble.

The experiences of other nations are especially relevant as we look at long-term trends in our own country. We need not go back to the days of Diocletian to confirm the fallacy of controls. Indeed, we can say categorically that controls in modern times—when the goods produced dwarf by far Diocletian's 900 commodities—are virtually impossible to enforce without serious inequity. Even in the Soviet Union only 10,000 of the 40,000 articles produced there actually come within the scope of the country's controls. Drawing on this state of affairs, one international economist came to a very interesting conclusion. He said: "Nowadays no central organism, however far-reaching its powers, is capable of ordering the productive process in detail so as to enable it to fulfill all requirements and expand efficiently. . . . The clash of interests between man as a producer and man as a consumer is a basic fact. . . . The only way of getting over that is the free market which prevents the producer from arbitrarily asserting his interests over the consumer. . . . Hence the need to preserve the open market, which is the least harmful way of adjusting production. . . ."

ONLY THE FREE MARKET PROTECTS THE CONSUMER

This statement was made by a man who knew all about central planning, Mr. Ota Sik, a socialist economist and former Minister of Economy in Czechoslovakia.

Attempts at statutory control have been made not only in communist countries but elsewhere by both liberal and conservative governments. They have been tried and found wanting in places as far apart as Canada and New Zealand. Western Europe, of course, has had a severe case of controlitis since the end of World War II with negligible results. More often than not, European controls have caused so large a cut in profit margins as to produce an investment recession which only aggravates inflation by curtailing supply. France, for example, has the longest history of price controls with a mas-

sive bureaucracy to enforce them. Yet as the *London Economist* recently pointed out, "controls in France have never been anything more than a traditional French farce." None of the controls prevented the French franc from being devalued no less than seven times since the war.

ON THE WAY TO FAILURE, CONTROLS DISTORT THE MARKET

Citicorp operates in about 90 countries around the world and we have been in the international business since 1902. I think it is fair to say that there is probably no set of economic controls, foreign exchange controls or other devices, which we have not seen at one time or another in one place or another. They fall over the long term. If all they did was fail, controls might be worth a try in the short run. But, on the way to failure, controls distort the market, discourage producers, cause shortages and produce more uncertainty.

Incomes policies, I also might remind you, were hardly a smashing success in Great Britain. After five years of attempting to regulate wages and prices in the sixties, it was discovered that inflation in England had actually accelerated. It is perhaps ironic that after a socialist government abandoned price controls, some Americans advanced them as a super-sophisticated way of dealing with the problem of economic freedom. Englishmen visiting my office shake their heads in wonder and ask how we could embark on this course with British failure still so clearly visible.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF INFLATIONARY EXPECTATIONS HAD TO BE BROKEN

In saying this I do not mean to suggest that the President's action a year ago August was not necessary. The psychology of inflationary expectations had to be broken. The freeze was a way to start that process. Although we were winding down the actual inflation, both absolutely and in relation to other industrial countries, the drumfire in the media suggested the opposite. One could easily gain the impression that controls were imposed on our economy when it was rapidly spinning out of control. It is closer to the truth to say that the August 15th freeze was imposed on an economy that was in fact recovering from a recession. Treasury Secretary George Shultz knew this when he said: "Controls can work if they are first added to accelerate a process already under way." He stressed that they must be supplemented by proper monetary and fiscal policy actions and applied when there is still enough slack to permit strong productivity gains. The freeze was designed to break the inflationary psychology and was regarded as temporary. The freeze achieved its shock value and gave way to Phase II.

IF THERE IS NO RISK, THERE CAN BE NO OPPORTUNITY

The way things usually develop anywhere in the world, however, is that once the process of control is initiated, it spreads to all sectors of the society until at last, if you put a floor under costs and a ceiling over prices, there will be no room for a free man to stand erect. One of the great advantages of private companies operating in a free market is that a company can fail and go out of business. If you cannot make a product the world wants and sell it at a profit, your business will not survive. The marketplace automatically regulates this. If you entrust your fate to the government, you will soon learn that bureaucracies never die. They just grow and grow year after year and, as they are, their initial, very limited risk-taking capability atrophies completely. They want a fail-safe economy. They want a world in which there are no risks and penalties for failure. It is obvious, however, that a society which attempts to protect men from risk just as surely then must bar them from opportunity.

IT'S THE STRUGGLE FOR POLITICAL POWER THAT MAKES THE ECONOMY A CENTRAL ISSUE

Some people who applauded price-wage controls at their inception dwelt in the dream world that controls would make it easier to deal with large labor demands, but would leave profits free. This unsophisticated view is now overwhelmed by experience, and many who held it are now joining the ranks of those who would abolish controls now.

We are all the product of the velocity of our own experience. Americans have tended to see many things in economic terms which turn into political trends. It perhaps started with Alexander Hamilton, and has run through to Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. One of our great historians, Charles Beard, spent most of a lifetime delineating what he perceived to be the economic bias of the men who wrote our Constitution. Despite all this scholarship, our values are not basically economic values unless they are carriers for political values. It is the struggle for political power today that makes the economy a central issue and not the other way around. Controls, then, are a carrier for political power, and therefore when we think about them it should be in this larger context. Viewed in this perspective, we are talking about the future mix of the American political system.

There are those among us who wish to do away with the free enterprise system and force a new kind of society upon America. If this sounds extreme, perhaps we should speculate for a moment what kind of world we would have if the laws of the United States of America gave the President vast new power over the life of our credit and stock markets. Suppose the President, acting through some government agency, could require every borrower to obtain a license before he could have access to the market. Imagine that before any lender could lend, he must also get a license from an all-powerful federal agency. This power to license both borrowers and lenders would extend to the amounts involved, and, of course, would carry with it the authority absolutely to deny credit to brokers and bankers, to individuals or corporations. Imagine a law like this and then let yourself speculate upon the profound effect it would have on our marketplace and upon the entire fabric of our society. When you have thought about this for a moment, give it even more consideration, for such a law is now on the statute books of our country. It is called the Credit Control Act which was passed in 1969.

THE ROAD TO ECONOMIC SERFDOM

Full implementation of this act, of course, would take us well down the road to economic serfdom. Fortunately, we currently have a President who believes in free enterprise and a market economy. The fact that our Congress passed such a monstrosity, however, should jolt us free of any day-dreams. What I find most appalling about this so-called Credit Control Act is that it was in fact a rider tacked on to another more comprehensive bill that passed the Senate by a voice vote. No senator even stood up to have his name recorded on a basic reordering of American priorities. It is, in fact, ironic that credit market controls should even be considered seriously after the credit crunch of 1969 when interest rate ceilings not only hurt borrowers but produced pointless distortions in credit flows. If banks are discouraged from making loans, borrowers who are able will turn to the open market. Here the large, strong borrowers will fill their needs, but the small medium-sized companies are not likely to find the impersonal market as accommodating.

WHEN THE CRISIS RECEDES, THE REGULATORY RESTRAINTS REMAIN

Many of our lawmakers, unfortunately, seek to mitigate a crisis by resorting to more severe regulation. When the crisis recedes,

the regulatory restraints often remain. Wage and price controls may be a case in point. They are popular now with some people because they appear to offer an easy escape down the middle road away from inflation on one side and unemployment on the other. They appear to those who do not understand the complexity of the economy and see the culprits in simplistic terms as big business or big labor. They fail to appreciate that control of wages and prices, if carried to its logical conclusion, could lead to control of all income and of all resources. Such an outcome would destroy freedom for both labor and management in the marketplace.

As each change in our value system is recognized and popularized, there are those who see a new opportunity for fresh regulation. It is curious that controls should gain favor at a time when the consumer movement in this country is gaining momentum. Controls permanently applied are bound to dull the competitive creativity of the producer, making him less sensitive to consumer needs. Without the incentive of the free market, as observed by even Ota Sik, the socialist economist, the quality of goods deteriorates. Thus, in the long run, it is the consumer, deprived of both quality and diversity of goods and services, who stands to suffer most.

THE CONSUMER STANDS TO SUFFER MOST

In the financial world we have seen in our lifetime the government fix the price of its bonds in the forties, and we have felt the enormous trauma which was produced when the so-called Treasury Accord was terminated in 1951. It was repudiated because it forced the Federal Reserve into an inflationary expansion of money. Like those who now fear the lifting of controls, there were many who feared that bond markets would not be able to function without pegging. It was argued that pegging eliminated the risk of buying bonds. This illusion overlooked the fact that in order to peg the bonds, the Federal Reserve inflated the money supply, which over time stole from the value of fixed income obligations.

BANKS HAVE LIVED UNDER ABSOLUTE PRICE CONTROLS SINCE 1933

Perhaps those of us in the banking business are more sensitive to distortions in the marketplace created by controls than are some of our friends in other industries. We have had absolute price control on what we can pay for our inventory since 1933. Since the price that we can pay to individual savers is sometimes less than the price that competing institutions can pay, we have watched the erosion of our marketplace. At the same time we have been keenly aware that the consumer is often cheated out of the income which he would have every right to expect if a free market prevailed.

More regulation is, of course, behind the idea that the way to protect the public is to create a new bureaucracy to do the job that the existing one failed to do. We all know that the massive machinery of bureaucracy is already too antiquated and decrepit to cope with the pace of change in our society. But instead of dismantling a system designed for the Victorian Age, we add yet another corridor to the labyrinth leading away from the free marketplace. The end product of this bureaucratic maze is a world isolated from risk—a world in which the efficient and the inefficient are equally rewarded. Without penalty for failure, there is no incentive for success.

The freedom to win or lose, to succeed or fail, is basic to our way of life. When the marketplace is hobbled by regulation, the distortions created are eventually reflected across the country. First investors worry that controls will continue and thus corporate earnings will be lower; then they worry that controls will end and inflation will surge

ahead. This is not the kind of fail-safe environment they had bargained for when the stock market surged ahead 30 points the day after controls were announced.

Freedom is rarely destroyed by a frontal attack. Freedom more often succumbs to an indirect dividend-conquer technique.

CONTROLS UNDERMINE THE RESOLVE OF MANAGEMENT AND WEAKEN THE FREEDOM OF LABOR

Controls undermine the resolve of management and weaken the freedom of labor. And their use moves us closer to putting more and more of the decisions that belong in the marketplace with government. It is time to end the control program before our freedoms are eroded beyond repair. John Stuart Mill put it this way more than 100 years ago: "Every function superadded to those already exercised by the government causes its influence over hopes and fears to be more widely diffused, and converts, more and more, the active and ambitious part of the public into hangers-on of the government. . . . If the roads, the railways, the banks, the insurance offices, the great joint-stock companies, the universities, and the public charities, were all of them branches of the government . . . not all the freedom of the press and popular constitution of the legislature would make this or any other country free otherwise than in name." As a people we are not likely to abide for long controls which in the end will destroy freedom. To expect otherwise of our people is the final folly in all attempts to create a fail-safe economy.

PAKISTANI POW DEADLOCK LINGERS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor in the July 2, 1973, edition has brought attention again to the plight of 90,000 Pakistani soldiers and civilians held in Indian prison camps. The continuing stalemate between India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh is very unfortunate; but it is inexcusable for India to hold the Pakistani POW's for bargaining purposes. It is unbelievable that India which seeks leadership among world powers should continue to be callous to the problem of the Pakistani prisoners of war and the wives and children of many of them who are also held. I submit the editorial from the Monitor for printing in the Record, and I hope the efforts of the press will continue to call attention to this crucial problem.

The Monitor's editorial follows:

PAKISTANI POW DEADLOCK LINGERS

A year ago July 3, at a summit meeting at Simla, India and Pakistan reached an agreement which held out promise of an early settlement of their differences and of "a durable peace" for the Indian subcontinent. Part of the agreement was fulfilled last December with a mutual troop withdrawal from occupied areas on the western front and a redefinition of the cease-fire line in Kashmir.

But unfortunately, 12 months after Simla, the deadlock is as deep as ever over the crucial issue of the release of 90,000 Pakistani prisoners of war captured by India in the former East Pakistan, now the state of Bangladesh.

Last April the Prime Ministers of India and Bangladesh, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, made a joint offer linking the return of the POWs to an exchange of minorities by Bangladesh and Pakistan. Under this package proposal, the half million Muslim Biraris, now living in Bangladesh, would be transferred to Pakistan, and some 150,000 East Bengalis, stranded in Pakistan by the 1971 war, would be repatriated to Bangladesh. Sheikh Mujib made a major concession by dropping his demand for prior recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan as a condition for the POW's return.

The package is unacceptable to Pakistani President Bhutto on two counts: Bangladesh insists on 195 Pakistani POWs being handed over to it for war crimes trials, and Pakistan does not consider itself responsible for the Biraris, whose original homeland, the state of Bihar, is now a part of India. Mr. Bhutto did, however, invite India to send envoys to Islamabad to discuss the proposal. This invitation has not been followed up.

In the meantime the Pakistani leader has complicated matters by rounding up hundreds of East Bengalis, some of whom he intends to try for "treason" if Bangladesh goes ahead with its war crimes trials.

There the stalemate lies. There is right and wrong on all sides of this triangle. But India, it seems to us, is on questionable grounds in still holding on to the Pakistani POWs for bargaining purposes. The Geneva conventions, to which India subscribes, stipulate that prisoners of war be released as soon as possible after the end of hostilities. It is 18 months since the prisoners were captured. They should go home without further delay. The plight of the unwanted Biraris in Bangladesh and of the East Bengalis in Pakistan is a poignant one and calls for a compassionate solution, but is it right to tie it to the return of the POWs?

It is high time that the subcontinent's three leaders cut through the deadlock in which so many thousands of hapless people are involved. At Simla Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Bhutto found they could talk together and reach common ground. They should hold a new summit as soon as possible, and this time it should be a three-way one, including Sheikh Mujib.

MARGARET CARMAN, EXCEPTIONAL CITIZEN OF FLUSHING, N.Y.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work done by an exceptional citizen of Flushing, N.Y. She is Miss Margaret Carman, a dedicated teacher and historian and a gentle yet very active resident of Flushing.

Miss Carman was born in Flushing and attended Flushing High School, where she taught English and secretarial studies for 44 years. Not only is Miss Carman an excellent teacher, but she also has been active in preserving the finer traditions of Flushing. For her work as president of the Bowne House Historical Society and as an expert on the history of Flushing, she has been honored by the Greater Flushing Community Council.

It is a great pleasure for me to insert the following article about Miss Carman. The article appeared in the Queens Tribune:

FLUSHING'S FINEST LADY—MARGARET CARMAN
(By Roberta Confino)

The soft blue eyes of Margaret Carman reflect images of Flushing as a small town. Her thoughts reveal keen awareness of current issues. Her voice is filled with patriotic pride in the history of Flushing. Recently, for the *Queens Tribune*, Margaret Carman wrote a series of articles on the history of Flushing. Now the *Tribune* would like to salute Miss Carman as a dedicated citizen and community worker.

Born in Flushing Miss Carman attended Flushing High School, the oldest free public school in New York. Growing up in Flushing, she recalls, was vastly different from today. There was space for running and playing. In the winter there was belly-whopping on the slopes of the old Flushing Institute. In the summer there was swimming in Flushing Lake and protection of "violet bunks" in Kissena fields. With the extension of the subway and the numbers of visitors to the World's Fair of 1939, Flushing was "discovered". The town, Margaret Carman sadly states, "lost its individuality." Miss Carman went on to Barnard where she majored in English. She eventually returned and taught at Flushing High School for some 44 years, prior to her retirement in 1960.

At Flushing High, Miss Carman taught English and Secretarial Studies. She compares the educational systems of her beginning years with present times, holding strong opinions on major current issues. When Miss Carman began teaching there was no compulsory education. Those who came to school did so because they wanted to learn. There was time for individual attention to students. She believes the voluminous numbers of students, on double sessions, now inhibits teacher-pupil individuality. Softly, yet firmly, Miss Carman opposes busing of children. She believes forcing the students to leave their neighborhoods for long rides to and from school encourages a resentment toward both the school and teachers. There is tremendous difficulty in motivating such students. She feels busing results in a destruction of school spirit. Miss Carman recalls when school spirit was tremendously high and when teachers were a part of the "family".

In 1950 Miss Carman was in charge of the Diamond Jubilee of Flushing High School, at which Alumni Night brought 1,000 former students. Miss Carman has nominated the institution (not the actual buildings) of Flushing High School to be declared a historical landmark. She hopes to have such recognition before the 100th anniversary of the school on May 15, 1975.

Miss Carman has been President of the Bowne House Historical Society. The centuries old home of John Bowne represents the struggle for religious freedom in America. Seventy volunteers conduct tours through the home, located near Parsons Blvd.—the beginning of "Freedom Mile." The "Mile" extends from Parsons down Northern Blvd., in the heart of Flushing, to Lawrence Street. Along the Mile are listed 17 historic sites, including parts of Flushing High School, the Town Hall, the Civil War Monument and the site of the Flushing Journal Office and of the Prince Nurseries.

There are only two histories of Flushing, one written in 1858, the other in 1898. Within the Flushing Community now is an ardent historian. She at present is not considering writing a modern history of Flushing, but she is undoubtedly an expert. Two years ago the Greater Flushing Community Council bestowed upon Margaret Carman a plaque distinguishing her for her activity within the community.

Margaret Carman, remembered and loved by thousands as a dedicated educator, remains a tender, devoted and active resident of Flushing—her "home town."

OUR ECONOMIC FUTURE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Hobart Rowen's article of July 1 highlights the acute problems which face the Congress as well as the administration in dealing responsibly with our current economic situation.

The article which appeared in the *Sunday Washington Post* follows:

TIGHT MONEY DOMINATES THE ECONOMIC FUTURE

(By Hobart Rowen)

If there ever was any doubt that Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns is unhappy with the 60-day price freeze and the administration's apparent unwillingness to think of new taxes for the Phase IV period, it was dispelled by his testimony last week before the Joint Economic Committee.

The most important message for the administration—and for the business community—in Burns' testimony is that he sees nothing in the freeze and the prospective Phase IV that will permit the relaxation of a tight money policy.

By Friday evening, the nation was confronted with a Federal Reserve discount rate of 7 per cent, matching the all-time peak set in 1920–21. This foreshadows a prime bank lending rate of 8 per cent and probably higher.

"I don't see the Federal Reserve beginning to moderate its credit policy just yet," Burns testified. "I can not encourage the thought of lower interest rates in the immediate future."

Burns is known to feel very strongly on this issue. Despite the fact that a tight money policy involves the risk of triggering an early recession, Burns feels that it is the duty of the Federal Reserve to stay with that restrictive policy until the money managers get some help on the fiscal side.

This presents the administration, which is struggling to get out of the freeze strait-jacket and into an acceptable set of wage and price standards for Phase IV, with a painful dilemma because there are already convincing signs that the tremendous economic boom peaked in the first quarter.

Industrial production and personal income gains have slowed somewhat; the latest readings on plant expansion are somewhat less exuberant than they were a few months ago; and airline travel, which some consider an advance indicator, has turned sluggish.

The administration, therefore, is somewhat naturally gun-shy of proposing a degree of additional restraint that might come into effect when the economy no longer needs it.

Burns' response to this argument is to recommend fiscal devices that would have an immediate impact, and which could be altered or abandoned quickly to meet changing circumstances. For example, he argues for an investment credit that could be varied from 3 to 15 per cent, to replace the 7 per cent investment credit which has been helping to fuel the capital goods boom.

An even more novel Burns proposal is a "compulsory savings plan," which in effect would be a 10 percent surtax on existing tax liabilities. This would "be locked up in the Federal Reserve" and then turned back when the economy needs a shove forward.

But would new taxes be politically feasible? The man who has the most to say about these matters, Rep. Wilbur Mills (D., Ark.), the powerful chairman of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee, told this column after Burns' testimony that "I

don't think it's appropriate to raise taxes now because of the threat on an economic downturn."

Mills agrees with Burns that there should be more fiscal restraint, but he would achieve it by further cuts in the proposed \$268 billion federal budget. "I don't like this year-to-year increase of \$18 to \$20 billion in spending," Mills says.

What does it all add up to? Burns wants help on the tax side, and he isn't going to get it. Mills would like help from the spending side, and that's not very probable.

So control of inflation will devolve on a very restrictive monetary policy, which—like a tougher tax policy—will accentuate the downward forces in the economy and hasten a recession. What effect Phase IV will have on the whole picture is at this point an open question. But when and as the next recession arrives, the Fed will be blaming the administration, the administration will be blaming the Fed, and each will be pointing a finger at Congress.

The rest of us will be left holding the bag, wondering why all sectors of government can't get together to do a better job of managing and planning the economy.

**RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE:
WHAT IS BEING DONE FOR THE
U.S. VETERAN—AN INTERVIEW
WITH EDWIN ARNOLD**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a recent televised report to my constituents of Louisiana's Sixth District I conducted an interview concerning what is being done to aid returning service men and women. I insert the text of that program at this point:

RARICK. The Veterans Administration is the second largest agency of the Federal Government, and looks after the needs of some 29 million living U.S. veterans. It directs the activities of 168 veterans hospitals, has 57 regional offices, and employs some 185,000 employees. Helping the men and women who have served our country during times of war and peace after their discharge from the service is, as you can see, a big responsibility and a difficult job.

To help us understand better what is being done in the area of veterans affairs, and specifically what is being done to benefit the veterans in the Sixth Congressional District, I have today as my guest Mr. Edwin L. Arnold, Assistant to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs for Congressional Relations. Mr. Arnold is a native of Indiana and served as a Marine Corps officer in Korea. Ed, thank you for joining us today.

We read a great deal in the press today about the returning Vietnam veteran, and how he differs from the veteran of World War II and Korea. Some of the reports, especially in relation to drugs and job opportunities, sound discouraging. My question is this: Is the Vietnam veteran making the adjustment to civilian life, and what is your agency doing to help him make this adjustment?

ARNOLD. Thank you, Congressman. It's a pleasure to be with you. In response to your question, our experience shows that the Vietnam veteran is making the adjustment. Keeping in mind the Vietnam war was the longest, the loneliest, least understood war in our country's history, the Vietnam veteran has proven the disciplines of military

life can be beneficial, as was the case with his counterparts of World War II and Korea, in making the adjustment to civilian pursuits.

RARICK. How is the Louisiana veteran being helped in his regard by the VA?

ARNOLD. Congressman, in your state the Veterans Administration operates three fully staffed and accredited hospitals located in New Orleans, Shreveport, and Alexandria. And then to serve the benefit needs of Louisiana's honorably discharged veterans, the VA maintains an office in New Orleans, and we refer to this as the New Orleans Regional Office.

RARICK. What, if anything, is being done to help the Vietnam veteran that was not done by the VA or the Federal government for the veteran of World War II or for that matter, the Korean veterans?

ARNOLD. In particular, the Veterans Administration office in New Orleans has been working very closely with the Louisiana State Director of Veterans Affairs, Mr. Dick Staggs, in ways to assist the Vietnam veteran, and I want to commend him for his wonderful cooperation. Through a program of counseling, we are also assisting private industry in developing programs that we in turn can approve which will benefit the training of Vietnam veterans. However, one of the highlights of the Vietnam era, by comparison to World War II and Korea, has been the President's creation of a national Jobs for Veterans Committee. This is a national effort in scope, designed to focus attention to job opportunities by enlisting the support of private industry and governments at all levels and, Mr. Rarick, I am pleased to tell you the successes of this effort have been tremendous.

RARICK. Who can the Vietnam veteran contact in Louisiana if he needs aid or assistance?

ARNOLD. Actually, the responsibility for the employment of veterans, if you're talking about the Federal level, rests with the Department of Labor. And by all means, the veteran should, if he's interested in finding employment, contact the local employment office. However, if he's interested in job training or furthering his education we invite the veteran to contact our VA regional office in New Orleans.

RARICK. And how many employees are made available in Louisiana, for example, to help the veteran?

ARNOLD. To serve the medical needs of the veterans residing in Louisiana, the Veterans Administration has the three hospitals. The total employment of these hospitals is about 2500 employees. On the benefit side, the New Orleans Regional Office has approximately 284 on its staff.

RARICK. I think it's probably safe to say then that hospitals are one of the major missions of the VA in probably any state in the country. Now what can you tell our listeners as to any programs which they may find of interest in regard to veterans?

ARNOLD. Congressman, the Veterans Administration is really in the forefront nationally insofar as the training of physicians and dentists and allied health personnel. As a matter of fact, in Louisiana last year through our affiliations with Louisiana State University and Tulane University the VA assisted in the training of nearly one hundred physicians and dentists.

RARICK. What is the patient load in our hospitals in Louisiana?

ARNOLD. In the state of Louisiana, the VA has approximately 1500 beds to serve the medical needs of the veteran and these are very active general, medical, and surgical facilities.

RARICK. Well, I think our viewers are aware that of course all these hospitals and services cost money. Can you tell us how the budget, the present budget of the VA, compares with the budget of previous years. Are we going up, down, or holding our own?

ARNOLD. We're going up, Congressman. President Nixon's budget request for this current fiscal year was 12.2 billion dollars. This is the highest budget in the 43-year history of the agency and interestingly it's 80% above a similar budget request for fiscal year 1969, and 310 million dollars over the actual total expenditures for the last fiscal year. We feel that this is an adequate budget and certainly we are confident that we are going to be able to provide for the needs of the veteran and his dependents.

RARICK. Well, last year Ed, Congress passed another educational bill for veterans. Can you tell our viewers how the new educational bill differs from that say of four years ago?

ARNOLD. This is the second increase of its kind since President Nixon's inauguration over four years ago. The current rate reflects about a 70% increase over the rate paid to veterans attending college in 1969.

RARICK. What will the veteran receive under the GI bill for attending school?

ARNOLD. A single veteran attending an institution of higher learning receives \$220 a month, Congressman. A married veteran receives \$261 a month, and a married veteran with one child would receive \$298 a month, with additional amounts for additional children over the \$298 figure.

RARICK. In my Congressional District, I have three major educational institutions. We have LSU, Southern University, and Southeastern in Hammond. Can you give us any idea of how many veterans are in attendance down there at these institutions?

ARNOLD. Congressman, our records show that approximately 2,613 veterans are in attendance at these three fine institutions and there are approximately 193 dependents of veterans attending these schools.

RARICK. In other words, the veterans are taking advantage of these programs.

ARNOLD. Definitely.

RARICK. Keeping in mind the President's philosophy of government, that is, that government should serve the needs of the people, what is the VA actually doing to carry out the President's directives in this regard?

ARNOLD. Actually, Congressman, "service to those that served" is really our reason for being. During the Vietnam War, the Veterans Administration embarked on a program of contacting our men and women in battle zone areas of Vietnam. In addition to this "first" for our agency, VA counselors and assistance officers are located at various separation centers here in the United States to inform the soon-to-be veteran of his entitlements and benefits and to encourage him to contact us. Once the veteran is discharged, the regional office in the state where the veteran resides writes a letter to the veteran giving the address and phone number of that office, inviting the veteran to contact the VA for assistance if he so desires.

RARICK. Mr. Arnold, in March of this year, the Veterans Administration inaugurated in the state of Louisiana mobile vans. As I recall, you were present and participated in the dedication of that ceremony. Can you tell us what success or what is in the outcome of this mobile van operation?

ARNOLD. Before commenting on our van operation, Congressman, I would like to recognize your three district offices. We have received reports that they are doing an outstanding job of rendering service to the veterans of the Sixth District of Louisiana and also I would like to commend the efforts of others in Louisiana, for instance, parish counselors and veterans organizations, for their efforts on behalf of Louisiana veterans.

Getting back to our mobile van program, our vans visited 56 cities and towns and rural areas of Louisiana by necessity remotely removed from the accessibility of the VA regional office of New Orleans. In this connection, nearly 2,200 veterans were contacted that might not have come to us for assistance. In addition, you might be interested

that these vans, or offices on wheels, traveled over 7,000 miles in your state.

RARICK. Seven thousand miles. That's seeing a lot of veterans that are needing help. We'd be remiss before we left the program today if we didn't discuss one of the new threats that accompanies most of the new veterans coming back from Vietnam and that is the drug problem. This is a rather recent problem for medical help and I'm sure that you are aware that we in Congress are very cognizant of it. I know that the Veterans Administration is making great strides in drug abuse. Can you tell us just what the VA has entered into in the area to try to rehabilitate these boys? What is available for them?

ARNOLD. At this time, the VA has 44 drug treatment units in operation throughout the country. However, each of our hospitals is equipped to handle and care for any veteran with a drug problem if he will only present himself. I think also that at this point in time we should say that really the vast majority of the veterans of the Vietnam conflict have returned free from a drug problem to find their place in society. When you consider the nearly 6 million Vietnam veterans and the fact that less than 1% came home with a problem, I think this is significant.

RARICK. Less than 1%? That's commendable. May I suggest that as a result of Veterans Administration action we probably have lowered the number of veterans under treatment today?

ARNOLD. We believe so.

RARICK. Well, I certainly want to thank you, Mr. Arnold, for appearing on our program. I'm sure our viewers have enjoyed many of your expressions and knowing what the Veterans Administration is doing to help the men and women who have served our country honorably and returned home, striving to find a productive, suitable place in our society and help direct our country to the great destiny that is ours. I greatly appreciate you being with us today, Mr. Arnold.

ARNOLD. Thank you, Congressman. As you pointed out in your opening remarks, there are 29 million living veterans in the United States, 450,000 of them living in the state of Louisiana. There are 56,000 veterans residing in the Sixth Congressional District, 11,000 being Vietnam veterans. Knowing of your record as a decorated combat veteran of World War II, we consider it a privilege to have you as one of our veterans residing in Louisiana's Sixth Congressional District.

RARICK. Thank you very much.

GREATER CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT CONTROL OVER CIA NEEDED

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it was recently disclosed, and affirmed by the President, that the administration planned to create a domestic intelligence plan utilizing the existing intelligence community and involving illegal activities. If such a plan were implemented, it would not only contradict the intent of the National Security Act of 1947, but would also allow the CIA to carry out those same covert activities at home which it presently carries out abroad. In essence, the plan would completely undermine our very democratic society.

Congress established the CIA but gave

the Executive a blank check as to how its activities would be conducted. The 1947 act prohibited the CIA from participating directly in domestic covert or police-type activities. However, so long as policy decisions are made in secret by an inner council solely responsible to the President, such activities could be implemented without the knowledge of either the public or Congress. Realizing certain activities abroad must remain secret for purposes of national security, there should be greater congressional oversight to make sure that CIA activities are truly legitimate.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert, for the RECORD, an article by Laurence Stern entitled, "A Sense of Deja Vu at CIA," that appeared in the Washington Post, July 10, 1973, which further reveals the need for greater congressional oversight.

The article follows:

A SENSE OF DEJA VU AT CIA—WATERGATE DISCLOSURES RAISE QUESTIONS

(By Laurence Stern)

"We were not involved because it seemed to me that was a clear violation of what our charter was."

Richard M. Helms, Feb. 7, 1973.

"Dick Helms was most cooperative and helpful."

Tom Charles Huston, July 1970.

In the vernacular of courtroom melodrama, someone was dissembling.

It was either Richard M. Helms, the respected former director of the Central Intelligence Agency, or was it Tom Charles Huston, the White House architect of the controversial 1970 domestic intelligence plan.

The conflict was rooted in an appearance by Helms before a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last February 7.

Helms was being questioned by Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.). It had come to his attention, said Case, that in 1969 or 1970 the White House asked that all the national intelligence agencies pool resources to learn all they could about the anti-war movement.

"Do you know anything," he asked Helms, "about any activity on the part of the CIA in that connection? Was it asked to be involved?"

Replied Helms: "I don't recall whether we were asked but we were not involved because it seemed to me that was a clear violation of what our charter was."

"What would you do in a case like that? Suppose you were?" Case persisted.

"I would simply go to explain to the President this didn't seem to be advisable," said Helms.

"That would end it?"

"Well I think so, normally," Helms concluded.

Case's prescient question was posed nearly four months before the public leak of Huston's memoranda describing for the first time the intensive domestic surveillance program approved and then, allegedly, rescinded by President Nixon five days later.

The Huston papers implicated Helms and his agency in the 1970 intelligence plan so directly that the word perjury was being uttered in Senate offices by those who were privy to the secret testimony given by Helms in February.

One of Huston's top secret memoranda, addressed to former presidential chief of staff H. R. (Bob) Haldeman, reported: "I went into this exercise fearful that CIA would refuse to cooperate. In fact, Dick Helms was most helpful..."

Huston also reported that top CIA officials joined in meetings with other intelligence agencies to draft the 1970 intelligence report.

By the time the Huston documents surfaced and the contradiction became apparent, Helms had returned to his ambassadorial post in Iran. He was never publicly confronted on the conflict between his own testimony that "we were not involved" and Huston's assertion that "Dick Helms was most cooperative and helpful."

Yet here was compelling new evidence that the CIA had been involved in domestic security matters which, by Helms' own admission, violated the agency's congressional charter. The 1947 National Security Act establishing the CIA decreed that it "shall have no police, subpoena, law enforcement powers, or internal security functions."

Incidents such as these breed a sense of frustration, if not political impotence, among those on Capitol Hill who have sought to place in the hands of Congress the countervailing power of oversight on CIA operations.

"The Old Boy business is so depressing," complained one senior Senate staff specialist in CIA matters. "The Helms performance was a love-in when they should have been blowing him out of the water."

Time and time again since its inception 26 years ago, the CIA has been caught with its cloak and dagger showing in the wrong places at the wrong time.

Six years ago the agency was rocked by its last major intelligence scandal—the disclosure that it had been secretly funding and infiltrating student associations, universities, labor unions, church groups and diverse other private organizations.

Tens, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars in public funds were distributed without public accounting to influence the views and activities of supposedly independent organizations in the United States and abroad.

The money was circulated through a network of tax-exempt foundations operated, in many cases, by an influential elite of bankers, lawyers and industrialists who provided a massive and respectable cover.

If ever there were grounds for a wholesale congressional review of the CIA's role in the public and private business of the country, the 1967 episode would seem to have provided the occasion.

"I'm not at all happy about what the CIA has been doing," said then Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, "and I'm sure that out of this very singularly disagreeable situation will come a reformation of that agency."

But nothing changed basically.

President Johnson appointed a study commission, headed by then Under Secretary of State Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach, which reported back speedily that the CIA had been following the orders of the National Security Council in carrying out the covert financing scheme.

The Katzenbach panel called for a modest reform. It proposed a prohibition on CIA funding to educational, philanthropic and cultural organizations such as the ones the agency had been secretly funding. But it also suggested a loophole under which such grants could be made to serve "overriding national security interests." Helms was one of the three panel members.

Less than a year after the secret funding scandal broke, a group of Old Boys met in January, 1968 under the auspices of the prestigious Council on Foreign Relations to take stock of the agency's somewhat battered public position. The elite panel included the late CIA director Allen Dulles, international financier C. Douglas Dillon and two former heads of the agency's Plans (famously known as "dirty tricks") Division.

While the public rhetoric promised reform and tighter safeguards on CIA operations, the focus of the off-the-record discussion at the council's New York offices was altogether different. This was the private diagnosis presented to the group by Richard M. Bissell Jr., who was the CIA's chief of covert operations during the Bay of Pigs debacle:

"On disclosure of private institutional support of late it is very clear that we should have had greater compartmenting of operations. If the agency is to be effective, it will have to make use of private institutions on an expanding scale, though these relations which have been 'blown' cannot be resurrected."

"We need to operate under deeper cover, with increased attention to the use of 'cut outs' (agency fronts) . . . The CIA interface with various private groups, including business and student groups must be remedied."

Bissell's comments were never intended for public consumption. But a record of the discussion was found in an university official's office during a 1968 student raid in Cambridge, Mass.

The issue, as privately defined among these blue ribbon members of the intelligence community, was not reform. It was how to do it better and how not to get caught.

Now the agency is in hot water again in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal, the Ellsberg affair and the CIA's involvement with ITT in the 1970 Chilean presidential election.

For the first time the American public learned of CIA "safe houses" for covert operations within the shadow of the National Cathedral in one of Washington's prime residential districts. There have been revelations of domestic political espionage teams composed of ex-CIA employees.

The agency also seems to be a dispensing center for "sterile" phone numbers, spy cameras, mail drops, wigs and tape recorders—no questions asked—when approached through proper White House channels.

The most serious lesson of the recent disclosures is that the agency and the White House national security managers have not been cured of the penchant for entanglement in domestic affairs.

And Congress, in deference to the agency's mystique of national security untouchability, has been reluctant to press hard questions.

One such question might be the role of the CIA's Domestic Operations Division, which was created nearly 10 years ago and which has been publicly mentioned in the press and at least one serious study of the CIA, The Espionage Establishment by David Wise and Thomas Ross.

There might also be questions about the nature of the super-secret National Security Intelligence Directives (known in intelligence parlance as Enskids) by which the powers of the agency have been gradually expanded far beyond their original charter for foreign intelligence gathering.

During the confirmation hearing last week for William E. Colby, the nominee to head the agency, acting Senate Armed Service Committee Chairman Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) asked Colby about the NSC directives. Colby suggested that the matter was too sensitive for public discussion.

One of these directives, NSCID 7, empowered the agency to question persons within the United States and to interview American travelers to and from Communist countries, Wise and Ross wrote. It also established the basis for the CIA front groups and fund conduits which were "blown" in the 1967 disclosures.

The prevailing tone of Congressional oversight of the intelligence community was expressed during a 1971 debate by Sen. John C. Stennis (D-Miss.), the senior congressional overseer of CIA activities.

"As has been said, spying is spying," Stennis said. "You have to make up your mind that you are going to have an intelligence agency and protect it as such, and shut your eyes some and take what is coming."

In recent weeks the agency has been subject to heavier congressional scrutiny than ever in its history as a result of the Watergate disclosures. Five committees, four in the

Senate and one in the House, have been looking at various aspects of agency operations as they related to Watergate, ITT, Ellsberg and the 1970 intelligence plan.

But the searching and systematic examination of how the CIA functions and how deeply its operations intrude into the internal affairs of the United States does not seem likely to emerge from this spate of overlapping investigations.

For those who have over the years watched the cycle of exposure, public penitence and demands for curbing the excesses of the CIA's covert activities there is a strong sense of *deja vu* at the moment. The agency, for its part, is "toughing it out" until the clamor subsides once again.

On June 4, Senator PROXMIRE introduced S. 1935, and on June 12, I introduced H.R. 8952, both of which would clarify the National Security Act of 1947 as to what the CIA could or could not do and place greater congressional oversight control over the CIA. I plan to reintroduce this bill Tuesday, July 17. I urge all my colleagues to consider this matter and cosponsor this bill. Not only would it be a step in reasserting congressional authority over matters of vital interest to the United States, but would also prevent the Executive from undermining congressionally approved foreign policies and would prevent the use of the national security shield from subverting the Constitution.

WORLD ECONOMY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most talked about subjects among Members of this body is the role and capacity of the United States in the world economy. In the written and oral discussion of this subject I often detect two fallacies which I think are major barriers to one's understanding and which are preventing the Congress from taking steps toward a constructive input on this important national policy. The first misconception is that we can transfer to our discussion of the world market our assumptions of our own domestic marketplace. The fact is that our principal trade rivals do not operate the way we do. They exercise a close partnership of business and government in promoting their exports. The world market is not capitalistic, it is not socialistic, it just does not fit one terminology.

The second misconception that I detect is that we are still in the post-World War II era whence the United States is assumed to be or assumed the right to be the dominant world power. For some reason many of us seem to think that if the United States is not far and away the richest and most economically powerful country in the world, the United States is "a second-rate power." That is simply foolishness. We must accept the reality of a highly competitive world market. This is to say we cannot be No. 1, but from now on it will be all photo-finishes. We certainly would not be No. 1

if our policies are dominated by unrealistic conceptions of our economic environment.

Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the House to a speech by Mr. John T. Gurash, president and chairman of INA Corp. His statement, I believe, represents a realistic and practical view of the world in which we must deal. It is both realistic and at the same time an optimistic view of our future.

The speech follows:

RELIEVING WORLD ECONOMIC TENSIONS: WHAT BUSINESS CAN DO

(Remarks by John T. Gurash)

"... the issues will finally be resolved at the highest levels of government... but there are things businessmen can do to keep economic rivalry from damaging the traditional close ties between countries..."

"... We all have a great deal at stake. Not only the future of our companies. But more important, the future of world peace..."

As a businessman whose firm has long-standing international commitments, I'm concerned—as I know you are—about the economic tensions in the world today. We all have a great deal at stake. Not only the future of our companies. But more important, the future of world peace.

That tensions exist is self-evident. The question is, what's behind them? Where have things gone wrong?

I had a clue recently in leafing through a 1946 issue of Time Magazine, and reading the headlines in that post-war year:

Europe and Japan were on their knees.

America had an unchallenged nuclear monopoly.

Russia and China were a monolithic communist bloc.

And just about the only signs of American business abroad were Hershey bars and nylon stockings.

The advertisements? Every one of them for American products.

And what do we read in Time Magazine today?

Europe and Japan are at the height of prosperity, with a combined economic clout greater than the United States'.

Dozens of countries are making news. Countries that didn't exist in 1946.

And mutual suspicions have divided Russia and China.

The advertisements? Sony and Volkswagen. BOAC and Fiat. Nikon and Volvo. The American products are nearly outnumbered.

Change is what has happened. For years we have been playing by the rules of the post-war period.

Now, a quarter-century later, the rules no longer apply.

The early 1970's will probably go down as the time all the changes came to a head. The entry of Britain to the Common Market. The double devaluation of the dollar. The SALT talks. And President Nixon's visits to China and Russia.

The cold war has finally ended. The test now is to make sure an economic war doesn't break out in its place.

Pessimists are predicting that's just what will happen. And on the surface there is plenty of evidence to support them:

An out-of-date monetary system that doesn't seem to work for anyone.

Devastating inflation in almost every major industrial country.

A return of protectionism in the United States.

And an epidemic of economic nationalism in every corner of the globe.

It's not a happy picture. The balance of power—economic power, military power, and political power—has changed. And with it has come a change in the way the countries of the world must deal with each other.

So far as the U.S. is concerned, the American people are coming to the realization that our reign of dominance in the world is at an end.

This has been painful to American pocket-books, but even more painful to American pride. And some of my countrymen are determined to find simple explanations to a complex problem.

International economics, after all, is not a very stimulating subject to the average citizen.

I recall a story in Sir Harold Macmillan's memoirs about the old Duke of Devonshire who, when he could think of nothing else to say at a public meeting, would shout, "I will stand no tampering with the fiduciary issue."

It always brought great applause from the audience, which hadn't the faintest idea what he meant.

In America the protectionists are playing the same sort of game. Resorting to double-talk and oversimplification to explain away our economic problems.

They are pointing the finger of blame in two directions—at our own multinational corporations on the one hand, and at our allies-turned-economic-rivals on the other.

As for our trading rivals, many Americans feel that Europe and Japan have not accepted responsibility commensurate with their economic power.

These countries have reduced their economic and psychological dependence on the U.S., it is said, without materially reducing the economic barriers that made sense in an earlier time.

Former Treasury secretary Connally, for example, puts it quite bluntly: "All the major countries with whom we have adverse trade balances," he says, "are imposing competitive disadvantages on the U.S. through quotas, taxes and other restrictions."

As for the multinationals, I don't think I need defend them before this group, or lecture about the evils of the Burke-Hartke bill. But the fact is the great international companies have become a very inviting target. And the critics of multinationalism are using the grossest oversimplifications to make their case.

One referred to the multinationals as "economic arsonists."

Another suggested that if current trends continue, General Motors will cease domestic manufacturing and be simply a U.S. distributor of Japanese automobiles.

And the AFL-CIO charged that with the exodus of U.S. production to overseas plants, "This greatest industrial power in the world's history is in danger of becoming nothing more than a nation of hamburger stands."

With this sort of rhetoric filling the air, one can appreciate the challenge facing President Nixon as he attempts to steer his proposed trade legislation through Congress. Particularly with the domestic political crisis clouding the issue.

... the great international companies have become a very inviting target. And the critics are using the grossest oversimplifications to make their case..."

I believe the President is an internationalist with a strong commitment to free trade, and his bill is basically a free-trade bill.

But in trying to satisfy many conflicting interests with a single piece of legislation, he had added a fair amount of sugar to help the medicine go down with the protectionists.

Congress has been known to swallow the sugar without swallowing the medicine, so it remains to be seen what happens when the complex issues of international trade are subjected to political barter.

It also remains to be seen whether an angry Congress will set aside its domestic quarrels with the President long enough to grant him the broad new powers he has requested—and needs—in the trade area.

Another question mark is the President's

reputation as a tough negotiator, not known for making unilateral concessions. He has declared his intention to treat America's monetary, trade and defense arrangements with Western Europe as an indivisible package, a package that several European leaders have already taken issue with.

The whole climate of economic relations has led to some gloomy prognoses for the future. Someone has called it a "dialogue of the deaf" between the U.S. and Europe.

Hubert Humphrey, ordinarily not a pessimistic man, has said that "The trade wars of the 1920's were child's play compared to what could break out in the 70's."

And Giovanni Agnelli of Fiat, who calls the U.S. and Europe the vital center of the world economy, says "If this vital center does not hold together, the world economy will break apart."

"... we have to look beyond the complex technical problems of foreign trade, and apply some of the God-given common sense we businessmen pride ourselves in..."

Let me make it clear, without sounding like Pollyanna, that I do not take the pessimistic view. If I did I would be home building my own economic fallout shelter, instead of visiting with you here in London.

Perhaps it's my insurance background. It breeds optimism. For when you sell an insurance policy against some unforeseen catastrophe, you are betting your money that the catastrophe won't occur.

And that's how I'm betting my money on the international business scene. For I think that as long as we keep our heads about us, we'll come out all right.

I believe we have to look beyond the complex technical problems of foreign trade, and apply some of the God-given common sense we businessmen pride ourselves in.

For as Sir Christopher Soames has said, we must have the will to reach an understanding if we are to avoid endless bickering on specific issues.

The new round of trade negotiations later this year promises that opportunity. There have been signs of greater flexibility on the European side. And President Nixon's trade bill, plus his scheduled meetings with European and Soviet leaders, certainly offer the possibility of expanded trade opportunities in all directions.

The President's announcement that he will call on Common Market leaders in Brussels is particularly promising. It suggests that the Common Market is coming into its own as a political as well as an economic entity. And it could mean that "the Year of Europe" will be the beginning of a new and healthy relationship between equals.

Part of the new relationship will be a search by businessmen on both sides for new accommodations, new ways of doing business with each other, in fast-changing markets throughout the world.

We will be experimenting with new forms of overseas investment, as we try to find the formula most appropriate to each time and place.

We have seen a number of experiments already—turnkey arrangements, management contracts, joint ventures and participations.

INA Corporation has pursued one such path—the participation—and we have met with enough success to believe we are on the right track.

Our most significant has been with Compagnie Financière de Suez, one of the largest diversified holding companies in Europe.

The virtue of this relationship has been our ability to cooperate in joint ventures and other opportunities overseas that might not otherwise have been available to an American firm. And since we own a significant but not a controlling interest in Suez, we avoid the political and social obstacles one might otherwise encounter in the host country.

One offshoot of our Suez participation has

been our 10 per cent interest in Assurances Abelle et Paix, a major French insurance company with operations throughout Europe. For each of us the benefit is improved access to markets in which the other is already established.

Another kind of experiment is typified by a trans-Atlantic relationship between two companies for which INA Corporation was the catalyst.

Through our participation in Suez, we were able to help St. Gobain Pont-a-Mousson, the French industrial company, invest in Certain-teed Products Corporation, an American firm. The benefit for St. Gobain: improved entry to American markets. For Certain-teed: access to St. Gobain's advanced technology.

It may be premature to talk about trends based on such limited experience. The regulatory situation in the various countries is extremely complex. And INA—highly liquid and not restricted by fixed assets—is better suited to this type of arrangement than perhaps other companies.

But a trend may be developing. As all of you know, major transactions of this sort have taken place recently in London and Paris, and more will undoubtedly occur.

I'm certain we will see many experiments like this in the future, as we try to find new ways to increase international trade and investment without jarring political nerves in individual countries.

But experimentation takes time. And time may be the one thing we don't have. For while these new arrangements are evolving, events rush ahead and our governments move quickly to respond to short-term concerns at home.

As a result we face the danger that matters demanding the most urgent attention may be treated in isolation rather than in concert. And the even greater danger that we may find ourselves pushed by national selfishness into a future of perpetual crisis.

Thoughtful men recognize this danger.

From government, Dr. Kissinger has called for "A new Atlantic Charter" to overcome the strains between us.

From academia, Professor Brzezinski of Columbia University has called for trilateral cabinet meetings, with the U.S. and Japanese cabinets sitting down with the European Communities Council of Ministers.

And from business, Signor Agnelli has proposed an Atlantic economic summit meeting bringing together the heads of government of the U.S., Canada, and each of the European Nine.

These proposals have one common thread—resolution of differences at the highest levels of government. This process has already begun with President Nixon's visits with European leaders. And it is at this level that the issues will finally be resolved.

"... there must be a concerted effort on both sides of the Atlantic to bring direct foreign investment more into balance..."

But the solutions must begin at another level altogether. As they say in Detroit, solutions must begin where the rubber meets the road—among the businessmen of the world who deal with each other on a day-to-day basis.

There are things we can do to keep economic rivalry from damaging the traditional close ties between countries.

First, a concerted effort on both sides of the Atlantic to bring direct foreign investment more into balance.

In 1971 U.S. direct investment abroad amounted to \$86-billion while foreign direct investment in the U.S. was only \$13.7-billion.

I've found it puzzling that while American companies are criticized abroad for overwhelming the world with foreign investment, the major European companies have done little to reverse the flow with foreign investments of their own.

Right now the environment for direct in-

vestment in the U.S. could not be more inviting.

The dollar has been devalued twice. There is a substantial dollar surplus in many countries.

And the shares of many U.S. companies are selling at depressed prices on Wall Street.

Reverse investment flow would do much to restore equilibrium to the world monetary picture, and to relieve pressure on the U.S. balance of payments.

As you well understand, balance-of-payments is not an American problem alone, but a world problem. For if the U.S. deficit continues to worsen, other countries will find themselves holding larger and larger amounts of progressively less valuable dollars.

In addition these trans-national participations—like INA's relationship with Suez, or St. Gobain's with Certain-teed—would ease the entry of European companies to the very lucrative but sometimes difficult American market. And they would make it possible to leapfrog the legislative barriers that could well arise in the U.S. if the protectionists carry the day.

Second, we need a determined effort to make our international corporations more genuinely international, if we are to manage our global businesses successfully. And we must begin with our own people.

The job is twofold. First, increased understanding by top executives of the complex issues of international trade.

Second, the development of a cadre of truly international executives within our own ranks.

On the first point, I am concerned that many business leaders regard the current monetary and trade issues as technical problems, to be dealt with by so-called international specialists.

But the day is past when international business can be dismissed as a specialty. It is no longer possible to place a neat dividing wall between domestic and international operations.

The global marketplace doesn't function in separate compartments. Neither should our companies.

On the second point, few but the largest multinational companies have made a concerted effort to develop global managers.

True, there are Americans in Paris and Britons in New York, but it seldom goes beyond this. The American or Briton returns home after a few years, having had his international "exposure." By and large foreign operations—yours and ours—are managed by foreign nationals.

"... I suggest the creation of a forum for the great international corporations of all countries, where we can work together on proposed solutions to our mutual problems..."

The global manager, however, must look at business not from an American point-of-view, or a British point-of-view, but an international point-of-view.

This will take training. It will take travel. And it will take an understanding on the part of top management that international affairs are not a fringe specialty, but the very heart of our business.

It will be a costly undertaking. And going as it does against the grain of strong national feelings, I know it will not happen overnight.

But we must begin. Anything else would be penny-wise and pound-foolish. For if we are going to have a truly integrated world economy, we must begin by integrating and de-tribalizing the people who will make that economy work.

Finally, I suggest the creation of a permanent and continuing forum for the great international corporations of all countries, where we can work together on proposed solutions to our mutual problems.

Organizations such as yours are enormously helpful, for they bring together business

leaders in an atmosphere of informality and friendship.

But we also have to focus on the specific issues that threaten to divide us—taxation, currency reform, non-tariff barriers and the like—so that when crises arise, as they inevitably will, we can propose to the governments of the world well-thought-out international solutions.

Perhaps I am suggesting the business equivalent of the United Nations—comprising the top businessmen in the world.

Not only the heads of private enterprises in North America, Western Europe, Japan and elsewhere. But the heads of government-run industries as well.

The model for such an organization could be the Committee for Economic Development, a U.S. group which—coincidentally—came into being at about the same time as the United Nations.

It was conceived in the early 1940s by a group of American business leaders concerned about a possible post-war economic crisis. They set about to make specific recommendations to avoid the boom-and-bust cycle that had traditionally followed wars.

Though their fears proved unfounded, their motives have met the test of time. Funded by leading American companies, the CED enjoys the active participation of the best executive and academic talent in the United States.

And because it is both non-profit and strictly non-partisan, its studies and recommendations have received attention and action in the highest circles of American government and American business.

I think the time is right for an international organization like this, supported by companies in many countries, tapping the best economic thinking in the world and the seasoned judgment of its principal business leaders—then making its findings available to all.

This would not be a mouthpiece for the business point-of-view, but a valuable mechanism for advancing the cause of world trade and world peace.

Such an organization would require no enabling legislation, no referendums by voters, no funding by government.

It requires only the will on our parts to discuss the issues in an orderly and intellectually thorough way.

CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS LOSE TALENT OF ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT EVERETT ROLFF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in and out of Federal service a great number of public servants chose the July 1 fiscal year to terminate official duties. Among those was Everett Rolff, associate superintendent, assistant superintendent and business manager of the Vallejo unified school system.

Not only did Rolff provide valuable education advice to my congressional offices for better than 10 years, he was one of the national spark plugs that garnered the votes for Impact Aid, Public Law 874, legislation.

Were it not for people like Rolff and another handful like him, Public Law 874 would have met its demise certainly under either Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson or Nixon.

Particularly the past few years the sledding has been most difficult with sometimes no funds at all provided in the budget.

California has shared in Public Law 874 funds nearly \$1 billion over the past dozen years. School districts nationwide have a debt, I am glad to acknowledge, to the likes of Everett Rolff whose concern may have been local but who had the perspective to understand that only through unified national collection action could the voice of the people be heard in Congress.

I want to publicly thank Everett Rolff for the record and also voice a hope that impoverished school districts of the West will inherit another able voice to take his place.

The Rolff vita as recorded in the Vallejo Times Herald follows:

EVERETT ROLFF

Saturday marked the beginning of the retirement years for Everett Rolff, business administrator of the Vallejo City Unified School District for the past 26 years.

Prior to coming to Vallejo, he was employed as a business officer at the University of Hawaii and at the University of Washington in Seattle.

Rolff also taught commercial subjects in three school districts after completing his education at the University of California at Berkeley in 1933 where he majored in economics and business administration.

During an interim three year period he was employed as book production manager for Sunset Magazine's How-To-Do-It Book Division.

Rolff is a former president of the Northern Section of the California Association of Public School Business Officials, and former chairman of the Vallejo-Benicia Chapter of the American Red Cross and the North Bay Council of Red Cross Chapters.

In 1972 he was appointed to the Urban Housing Task Force Committee of the San Francisco Metropolitan Area.

His personal license plate which bears the letters "RSBA" represents his certificate as a Registered School Business Administrator. On July 1, its new meaning will be Retired School Business Administrator.

"My service in Vallejo has been most interesting and rewarding," Rolff said who has no specific plans for retirement "other than to have a continuing interest in the better education of children."

Rolff and his wife, Mildred, are the parents of six children.

THE HELSINKI CONFERENCE AND EAST-WEST DÉTENTE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the July 8 edition of the Richmond Times-Dispatch included an excellent editorial on the Helsinki conference and the question of East-West détente.

The editorial wisely points out that the interpretation of such concepts as sovereignty, peaceful settlement of disputes, nonintervention and human rights are frequently different in Communist nations from what they are in the United States and other Western democracies.

Our negotiators at the European security conference will do well to bear in mind that the principle of nonintervention, for example, does not rule out such actions as the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968—under the Russian interpretation of "nonintervention."

I favor the negotiations now in progress, because I believe that open and frank discussion serves the cause of peace. However, in these talks, as in all negotiations with the Communist powers, it is essential that the United States and her allies be on their guard.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "The Meaning of Détente," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE MEANING OF DÉTENTE

At the opening in Helsinki last week of the 35-nation European security conference, which has been touted as possibly the most significant conclave on European relationships since the Congress of Vienna in 1814, Soviet foreign minister Andrei Gromyko presented a check list of proposed principles for conferees to agree with. Outwardly at least, it would seem hardly anyone this side of Genghis Khan could disagree with them.

The "inviolability" of national borders. Sovereign equality of nations. Renunciation of the threat or use of force. Peaceful settlement of all international disputes. Nonintervention in the internal affairs of other states. Respect for human rights and freedoms. The right of peoples to decide what social regime and form of government they feel is necessary. Blah, blah, blah, and so it went.

But after the Gromyko speech, some nonsense newsmen cornered Szevid Sofinski, a spokesman for the Soviet foreign ministry, and it turns out that Moscow has some radically different ideas than the West about the specific meaning of such laudable principles as the above. Wouldn't "non-intervention" in the affairs of others rule out, for instance, a repeat of the 1968 Soviet-led Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia that crushed a movement by local Communists toward less orthodox Marxism? Why no, Sofinski replied, because the invasion was not an interference in internal affairs but a response to a fraternal socialist country's plea for assistance (a fiction the Kremlin maintains to justify its ugly repression of the Czechs). Well, wouldn't the right of peoples to set up their own governing arrangements allow the peoples of divided Germany to reunite peacefully some day? Sofinski here lapsed into incoherence, and when the newsmen pressed him for an answer, he stormed out of the press conference.

Then, too, on the matter of increasing human contacts between East and West, a key concept favored by U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers in his opening remarks, it appears that the Russian idea again diverges significantly from the Western idea. The democratic states envision a relatively free movement of people and information across national borders, with a host country tolerating a resulting discussion of ideas that differ from its own ideology. But Gromyko defined broader human contacts in terms of official exchanges of cultural groups—dancers and athletes, for example—whose activities can be carefully controlled. Any entering persons should strictly observe not only all local laws (as should be expected) but all local "customs and traditions" and any deviation would be considered an attempt to interfere in the host nation's affairs, Gromyko said.

One of the fondest hopes of Western diplo-

mats is that a new era of cooperation between and convergence of East and West can be ushered in by the Helsinki talks. But available evidence to date is that, far from building bridges between people from contrasting social systems, "detente" may be building walls. In East Germany, for example, the Communist regime has issued new regulations intending to forbid contacts with visitors. Inside Russia, the Cold War appears more bitter than ever for the dissident writers and others who are getting tossed into so-called "mental hospitals" with disturbing regularity, and for Jews who dare to express a desire to go to Israel.

Certainly it does no harm, and over the historical long pull it may do some good, for nations of the East and West to try to reach understandings to guide the peaceful conduct of their relations. But a great deal of harm could be done if the Western governments fail to understand precisely what the Russians have (or do not have) in mind when they endorse detente in glittering generality, and if they fail to demand the most specific kind of concessions from the Russians in exchange for Western recognition of the post-war boundaries of Europe. Legitimization of the Russian army's gains in Eastern Europe has long been a major objective of Soviet foreign policy, and it would be better that the security conference fall flat on its face than for the West to hand the Kremlin what it wants without obtaining in return assurances of a better, freer life for the good people of Eastern Europe.

JEWISH CEMETERIES DESECRATED IN WORLD WAR II

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on November 2 of last year, I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement regarding the more than 2,000 Jewish cemeteries desecrated by the Nazis during World War II which are located in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and the U.S.S.R. At that time, I described the efforts of the "Geder Avot" section of the World Center of European Rabbis, with offices in New York City, to obtain reparations for the destruction of these cemeteries and to preserve those still remaining in accord with Talmudic law.

This issue has again come to the fore as the result of an article in the June issue of the Jewish Veteran by Arthur Settel, who at one time served in my office, and who served as chief press officer for the U.S. Department of State during the occupation of Germany following World War II.

I should also like to take this opportunity to correct an inadvertent error in my remarks of last year which has been brought to my attention by the Polish American Congress, and others. As Casimir I. Leonard, executive director of the organization pointed out to me, the cities of Lwow and Stanislaw, as well as some other communities which were before 1939 part of Poland, are no longer Poland's. As he pointed out, for example, Lwow, the third largest city of pre-World War II Poland, was occupied by the Soviet Army in September 1939 when Stalin and Hitler cooperated in dismembering Poland and since that time, like many other historic Polish

cities, has not been under Polish jurisdiction.

The Settel article, which follows as part of my remarks, points up a situation which has been for some time offensive to many persons with deep religious convictions and which has not been fully resolved.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Settel's article be printed as part of my remarks.

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

STUMBLING BLOCKS TO GERMAN-JEWISH CO-EXISTENCE

(By Arthur Settel)

"Djid,"* widely known Yiddish correspondent for Jewish newspapers around the world, sat facing United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy, supreme representative of the U.S. in Occupied Germany, in the latter's spacious office in the I. G. Farben Building, on a hot July day in 1950 in Frankfurt-am-Main.

He had sought and obtained the interview on my recommendation in my role as Chief Press Officer for the U.S. State Department in the Infant Federal Republic.

The central thrust of the interview was how the "new" Germany was relating to its remnant of a Jewish population that had once exceeded 650,000 and now totaled perhaps 12,000 souls—all who remained after the Holocaust in a tortured and tormented land.

"Djid" used this *nom de plume* with deliberate intent: to remind readers of the term used by Polish anti-Semites in referring to Jews.

McCloy's position was simple, direct and to the point: German-Jewish co-existence was possible, and in time could be nurtured and perhaps ripen into mutual understanding and eventual friendship between the two great peoples.

He did not condone the atrocities; he did not counsel forgiveness; he did not believe in miracles; one could not expect an instantaneous conversion to democracy. But democratic elements in Germany were receiving encouragement and support, and would in the end triumph over the vestiges of Nazism.

Djid opened his attache case and withdrew a sheaf of photographs.

"Mr. High Commissioner," he said, "I would like to bring to your attention a situation in present-day Germany which is unbelievable.

"In Koblenz, in the French Zone of Occupation, there is a suburb called Leutzel, and in Leutzel there is a street called Metternichstrasse. On a hillock on that street, there stands a shabby little building used as a kindergarten."

"Djid" laid out his photos on Mr. McCloy's desk.

"These pictures I took myself less than a week ago," he said. The steps leading up to the kindergarten were of stone. German youngsters were shown at play on the steps.

"Mr. McCloy," said Djid, "all of these steps were taken from the ancient Jewish cemetery in Leutzel. Every one of them was a tombstone. Here," he continued slowly in broken but clearly comprehensible English, "you can see the Hebrew lettering."

The self-controlled, generally unemotional U.S. High Commissioner looked aghast at the display before him.

A transcript of the interview as published in New York's German-language newspaper "AUFBAU" quoted McCloy as saying: "Das ist allerding ungläublich." (This is absolutely incredible.)

"When was this stairway built?" he demanded.

*The English equivalent of "Kike."

"The school was erected before the War but had been bombed out, and a temporary wooden structure put in its place. The stairway, however, remained," Djid replied. McCloy picked up the photos one by one, turned them around and fixed his gaze on the enlargements. The names of the deceased in Hebraic script, with the dates of their birth and death, were easily legible.

He looked at me.

"I should like you to drive out to Koblenz-Leutzel," he said, "and have a look at this school." I said I would do so.

McCloy buzzed for his secretary. He dictated the following letter to M. Francois-Poncet, the High Commissioner in the French Occupation Zone in which Koblenz is situated.

The letter read:

APO 757—FRANKFURT,

July 18, 1950.

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR: I have just heard a story to which I could scarcely give credence were it not for some rather specific evidence that accompanied the story. It is that a kindergarten in Koblenz-Leutzel, on Metternichstrasse, has had its approaches, consisting of a series of steps, constructed out of tombstones taken from Jewish cemeteries. The tombstones, I am told, can be clearly discerned and inscriptions on the tombstones are still present. I have been given three photographs which I enclose.

In spite of the photographs and in spite of the story, I am still hesitant to believe they could be allowed to remain. Should not the Germans be compelled to remove these steps if the story is true? Naturally, the continuance of these tombstones as steps leading into the school would be shocking and would lead to some very violent sentiments both in your country and in mine.

I thought, therefore, that it was well to call the matter to your attention for investigation. If you need any further information about the subject, I would endeavor to try to obtain it for you but I believe the above data should be sufficient.

Sincerely,

(signed) JOHN J. MCCLOY.

Honorable A. Francois-Poncet, French High Commission for Germany Bad Godesberg.

On my inspection trip, I was informed by the Mother Superior of the kindergarten that she was aware of the origin of the staircase but that "permission" to use the headstones had been "granted by the local Rabbi" whose name she had forgotten.

I tried in vain to establish his identity. I was told that Koblenz had not had a rabbi for years.

A few days later we were advised that the Burgermeister of the town had ordered stonemasons to "erase" the Hebrew lettering from the steps, in response to orders from the French Occupation Authorities.

Mr. McCloy reiterated his protest to Monsieur Francois-Poncet. And so the stones, now mutilated beyond recognition, were removed and new ones installed in the Jewish Cemetery at Koblenz-Leutzel.

On another occasion, this writer and his wife, while on a weekend tour through Western Germany early in the fifties, found that the famous Tomb of Rashi in Wurms was being used as a garbage dump. A strong protest to the City Fathers led to a cleanup by a squad of citizens rounded up by the Burgermeister. An apology was made to the Juedische Gemeinde.

However, I am happy to report there has been some progress. The number of Jewish cemeteries in Germany has not increased markedly in the past few years, while the desecrations and acts of vandalism have virtually ceased.

The explanation may be that democracy has taken hold, or possibly the fact that so few Jews are left in Germany.

They have gone elsewhere to die.

GAO IS STRENGTHENED

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office is the investigative arm of the Congress and under the able direction of Mr. Elmer Staats it has gone into vigorous pursuit of the facts. It provides an invaluable service to the Members and committees of the Congress by presenting the facts and analyses of vital programs that need reform. I have had the opportunity to work with GAO officials recently, and find myself impressed with their calibre, dedication, and energy. In short, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Staats for the work he is doing, and offer my praise for the GAO for what it is worth.

Mr. Charles Bartlett wrote an article, "GAO Plunges Into Politics," which appeared in the July 9 edition of the *Evening Star*. This article not only outlines the services the GAO is providing, but supports worthwhile efforts to give the GAO additional leverage. I insert that article in the *RECORD* at this time for the information of my colleagues.

The article follows:

GAO PLUNGES INTO POLITICS

(By Charles Bartlett)

One of the less happy, long-term consequences of the Watergate affair is the heavy cloud of mistrust which will hang for a long time over wide areas of the government.

The magic of the White House telephone will be, for example, seriously diluted by the excesses of the Nixon aides. Bureaucrats once accustomed to jump at hearing a voice from the White House will want their orders in writing. Oral transactions within government may have had their day.

Similarly, Congress will feel reaffirmed in its disbelief of much of what it hears from the executive branch. Disclosures of the Nixon efforts to bend the bureaucracy to the White House will be bound to inspire more fervent efforts in Congress to find out what really goes on behind the executive curtain.

The chief instrument of this probing mood will be the General Accounting Office, an institution that is being pulled out of its bookkeeping past and plunged into the hot flame of political controversy. The evolution of the Watergate affair has been punctuated by GAO reports detailing the financial transgressions of the Nixon re-election committee. An agency once inclined to skirting the issues is now plunged as deeply in drama as the FBI.

Under Elmer B. Staats, a career budget officer whom President Johnson named comptroller-general in 1966, the GAO reports have slowly shed their dull preoccupation with figures and begun to poke into how well government programs are working as well as what they cost. Formerly an army of accountants, the GAO has diversified its investigative talents.

This diversification has inspired some members of Congress to propose that the GAO take over Congress' review of the President's budget requests. Steps are certainly needed to make the appropriations process more efficient, but this one would compromise the agency by requiring it to review programs for which it has previously recommended funding levels.

However, Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., is wise to urge the Senate to give the GAO more leverage in its pursuit of facts. The executive agencies have been reacting to the expanded curiosity of the GAO investigators by pulling down their shades. They have an instinctive aversion to having their dirty linen washed in the comptroller-general's tub.

A classic instance of this attitude has been the Treasury's stubborn refusal to share with the GAO all the documents on which the decision was made to loan \$250 million to Lockheed Corp. Treasury officials claimed they could not pass along information they secured in confidence from Lockheed. The GAO, responding to widespread curiosity in Congress over the validity of the loan, has maintained that it only wanted access to papers prepared by officials for official use.

Similarly the GAO has encountered difficulties with the Defense Department, which has been uncooperative on many fronts, with the AID agency, which refused to produce its planning papers on grounds they may embarrass the recipient nations; and with the Internal Revenue Service, which is bucking an investigation of its efficiency.

The hobble on the GAO is its necessity to rely, in its showdowns with executive agencies, upon the judgment of the attorney general. He is, after all, an official of the administration and he is apt to be predisposed in favor of the agency that is being investigated.

So Ervin proposes that the comptroller general be empowered to take his suits for information directly to a three-judge federal court with an immediate right of appeal to the Supreme Court. His suits could then be blocked only by Congress, and the GAO will be lifted from the shadow of the Justice Department.

Unfettered investigators are unhappily the best hope of quickly restoring confidence in the processes of government. The nation is fortunate that the GAO has been transformed from an army of bookkeepers in time to take on the role.

OUR MASSIVE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT IN EUROPE UNDER THE NATO TREATY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, an issue of current national concern is the United States continued maintenance of a massive military establishment in Europe under the NATO treaty, for the incredible period of 23 years. The issue is not only important militarily, especially at a time when the spirit of the NATO and, indeed, its continued existence are being seriously questioned by many nations some of which were parties to the treaty, but most importantly, the basic economic and fiscal costs of maintaining the forces. Apparently, this country does not think that the NATO has lost much of its sacrosanctness and image as a cooperative military forum.

For one thing, when 25 years ago, the NATO allies outlined the profiles of world peace through military cooperation on a regional basis, the general assumption was that each member nation would go with the philosophy in a manner con-

sonant with its constitutional processes and local circumstances. Inferentially, NATO was from its inception a forum whose conceptual underpinnings circumscribed its pioneering commitments and cohesiveness. Things have changed materially and the "forum," it would seem, has atrophied by the processes of variegated logistic perspectives and the maniacal arms races and nuclear arms buildup within national frontiers.

We seem to have failed to notice this transition which is why we still cling passionately to the belief that world peace lies in a cooperative military endeavor—an endeavor in which our partners have outwitted us.

What we have to acknowledge is the fact that the general cooperative enthusiasm of the 1950's upon which the NATO idea was predicated had a different aura to it than that of the 1970's. In the 1950's, our economy was much healthier than it is now. The constant threat of inflation in recent years attest to an economic phenomenon which spells catastrophe for this country. We can no longer afford to be extravagant in our military cooperation for peace, and if extravagance is inevitable, we should be modest and realistic about it.

What all these boil down to is the truth that we are militarily oversuperventive in the NATO venture, unmindful of the cost burdens on our economy. For instance, the cost of maintaining U.S. forces in Europe and in the United States with the NATO missions has steadily climbed from \$12 billion in fiscal year 1971 to an estimated \$17 billion in fiscal year 1973. Balance-of-payments deficits resulting from military accounts in Europe have been estimated at \$1.8 billion in fiscal year 1973.

I would like to draw the attention of this House to the transcript of recent testimony of Mr. Edward L. King before the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on reduction of U.S. military forces stationed in Western Europe which has just been released.

I strongly urge my colleagues to at least thumb through it. Mr. King's analysis and explanation of the U.S. logistics under the NATO is both penetrating and thought provoking. Mr. King contends that the NATO Treaty which is considered as the authority for our troop deployment in Europe does not specify any level of U.S. military force to be stationed in Europe. In fact, it does not even require members to take military action to meet a common threat.

The size and composition of U.S. military forces assigned to NATO has been determined by the executive branch of the U.S. Government—not by substantive "commitments" contained in treaty articles.

In other words, our assumed commitments under the treaty has been founded on erroneous analysis of the treaty language, particularly the provisions of articles 3, 4, and 5 of the treaty. These article provisions make it "commendable" or "permissible" rather than "mandatory" for members to give military support to each other or to a party in the unlikely event of armed attack on that

party after all avenues have been explored to avoid armed conflict.

Mr. King points out further that:

There is a great deal of vague supposition contained in this description of the extent of the Soviet threat to Europe. But the American people have kept over 300,000 of their sons and daughters in Europe, and paid ever-increasing billions each year to help defend our allies against this nebulous and increasingly unlikely "threat." It is difficult to understand or justify the large number of U.S. military personnel deployed to Europe, and the resultant escalating costs that weaken the international value of the dollar, in view of the estimation of the "threat" and the high percentage of our European-based military personnel engaged in noncombat duties.

The main combat force is the 198,600 Army troops stationed in central Europe. As of December 31, 1972, the following figures, excerpted from King's testimony, represented U.S. military personnel stationed in Western Europe and related areas:

Country and number of personnel

Belgium	2,000
Denmark MAAG	7
France MAAG	7
Germany	221,000
Greece	3,000
Iceland	3,000
Italy	10,000
Morocco	1,000
Netherlands	2,000
Norway MAAG	6
Portugal	1,000
Spain	9,000
Tunisia	14
Turkey	7,000
United Kingdom	21,000
Afloat in Mediterranean	24,000
Other	3,000

When these statistics are critically examined in the light of the institutional obsolescence of NATO, the obvious conclusion is that the magnitude of our military operation in Europe has been due in large part to our zealotry in taking the language of the treaty literally.

While I am not suggesting that we should withdraw all of our military personnel in the NATO, I am suggesting that some means be devised, or the suggested 10 percent per year reduction, be improvised to commence a gradual reduction of the strength of our forces to a modest level as well as a reduction of the cost commensurate with residual forces.

Ours is a great country and this posture did not come about overnight. We should jealously guard this image. On the other hand, we should reassess the basic philosophy of multilateral cooperation, especially one which has military overtones. The issues we should begin to ponder are how we can maintain our leadership in world affairs without soiling it with altruistic excesses; how we can continue to command respect in the community of nations without posing as isolationists; and how we can pick up the tag of our NATO involvement without straining the economy to the breaking point.

We must face the simple facts that no longer is the United States able to send billions and billions of dollars to Europe in a Marshall plan. In fact, our dollars today are only worth 50 percent of their value in the early 1950s.

Accordingly, it is reasonable in line

with the Nixon-Brezhnev détente and the U.S. diminished dollar posture that the United States shortly reduce its military posture in Europe to perhaps a 50 percent level.

TENNESSEE VALLEY PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION URGES TVA TO PREVENT FURTHER RATE INCREASES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, which I am honored to serve as chairman, recently conducted hearings concerning recent escalating electric power rate increases by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In the course of the hearings, the General Accounting Office suggested that the TVA Act be amended to provide that the agency repay to the U.S. Treasury only the interest on the appropriations investment.

Following the hearings I introduced a bill incorporating this recommendation and I was pleased to note that in the recent issue of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News that the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association cites this GAO proposal and concludes:

Out of the three days of hearings, then, came the clear signal from members of Congress to TVA to make every effort to prevent future power rate increases . . . and a specific proposal that might help along these lines.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the editorial from the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News in the RECORD:

A WAY TO CUT TVA'S COSTS

Last month the House Appropriations subcommittee held three days of open hearings on TVA's appropriations—but most of the attention was focused on TVA's rate increases.

The three-day show was chaired by Rep. Joe L. Evins of Tennessee, the powerful chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee handling TVA matters.

The hearing—unusual in that it marked the first time that TVA's appropriations hearings before the House subcommittee have been open to the public—aired the conflicting views of TVA's three main classes of customers: the municipal and rural co-op power systems, the directly-served industries, and the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Rep. Evins made it clear that he did not like the amount and extent of TVA rate increases in recent years, and said he thought TVA should look for new ways to hold down its costs in order to protect the rate payer. TVA chairman A. J. Wagner, manager of power James Watson and other TVA officials insisted that they were working diligently to keep costs down. But that fuels, interest rates, and environmental costs kept going up and up.

A SPECIFIC PROPOSAL

Out of this hearing—featured by Rep. Evins' use of a rate consultant, Arnold Hirsch, to question TVA's rates and costs—came one specific proposal: a recommendation by the U.S. General Accounting Office that TVA use

an "alternative repayment method" for making payments to the U.S. Treasury.

At present, the TVA Act required TVA to make two payments to the Treasury: (a) A "dividend" on the Government's appropriation investment in TVA power facilities, this dividend to be equal to the Government's current cost-of-money applied to the outstanding appropriation investment. In fiscal year 1972 this dividend, or return on investment, amounted to \$55 million; in 1971, due to higher Federal interest costs, it amounted to \$65 million.

(b) The other payment made to the Treasury by TVA is a repayment of the Federal Government appropriation investment in TVA power. TVA is now making such repayments at the rate of \$20 million a year. It will continue to repay the appropriation investment at \$20 million a year until \$1 billion has been returned to the U.S. Treasury, or more than 50 years.

The specific proposal made by the GAO was that TVA stop making the second type of payment—the repayment of appropriation investment at \$20 million a year.

Reason for this proposal is that the Federal Government, which owns TVA, should maintain a sizeable amount of equity capital in the power system. As TVA continues to finance power expansion through revenue bonds issued in the private money market, however, the ratio between the Federal Government's equity capital, and the Authority's debt, gradually tilts toward the debt side. In a few years—if TVA continues to borrow in the private money market, and, at the same time, make repayments to the Treasury which reduce the Government's equity—the traditional debt-equity ratio will become more and more out of kilter.

Thus, said GAO, there is good logic to support the idea of leaving the present appropriation investment of more than \$1 billion as the Government's equity in TVA power. This would allow the Government to retain a sizable equity, and permit TVA to stop making the \$20 million a year in repayment of equity capital.

Support for the GAO proposal came from Rep. Whitten and Rep. Evins, powerful members of the House Appropriations Committee.

This proposal would, indeed, help TVA to cut its costs, by \$20 million a year, at a time when other costs seem to continue to climb.

Out of the three days of hearings, then, came the clear signal from members of Congress to TVA to make every effort to prevent future power rate increases . . . and a specific proposal that might help along these lines.

ROBERT C. WILSON SALUTED AS PRESIDENT OF COLLINS RADIO CO.

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Collins Radio Co. of Dallas has made tremendous strides in corporate efficiency, volume, and profits during the last 18 months. In large part, this upward trend is due to the efforts of the company's president, Robert C. Wilson.

Wilson recently received the golden plate reward of the American Academy of Achievement, which annually recognizes persons of exceptional accomplishment in their fields of endeavor. He was one of a group of business, professional,

entertainment, and government leaders honored for outstanding achievement in ceremonies held in Chicago on June 13, 1973. The awards presentation climaxed the annual salute to excellence weekend sponsored by the Academy.

The citation to Wilson, read at a banquet attended by some 10,000 people, was as follows:

President of Collins Radio Co.—former sales clerk, fireman, sailor, and manager of industrial activities throughout the world, he was chosen by the Gallagher President's Report as one of the outstanding business leaders in 1972—and credited with "one of the most remarkable turn-arounds in company performance in recent history."

Bob Wilson has reinforced the already excellent reputation of Collins Radio Co. and put the company back on a sound financial track. He well deserves the honor accorded him by the American Academy of Achievement.

AIRLINE SERVICE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, recently, in fact during the Easter recess, Mrs. Hunt and myself traveled to the Barbados for a brief vacation. In getting there we used the services of two airlines, Pan American and BOAC.

Normally, one would consider such a trip as being rather routine, particularly on the part of the airline. This time however it proved quite the contrary. The routine services one would expect, the care of personal belongings, was definitely lacking on the Pan Am leg of the trip.

Without going into a great deal of detail I should just like to mention that ground personnel apparently were not versed in procedure, and the baggage handlers turned out to be baggage maulers. New suitcases appeared to have been intentionally damaged—holes had been punched through. Golf clubs had bent shafts. No care was shown whatsoever.

Recently I was quoted in Jack Anderson's column giving comments about airline service. The article brought a response from Mr. Dennis L. Johnson, president, Johnson Associates, Inc., of Oak Brook, Ill. I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Johnson's letter, and the column he sent along which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on Sunday, June 10. As Mr. Johnson says, the name of the game is service.

The materials follow:

JUNE 26, 1973.

Hon. JOHN HUNT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUNT: Airline service seems to be a thing of the past! I read with great interest your mention in the Jack Anderson column regarding airline service.

The attached reprint from the Chicago Sun-Times of June 10, 1973 focuses on two critical areas:

1. Airline must understand that service is

part of their legal and corporate responsibility; and

2. Service can mean profits.

If the public and elected officials do not demand service, I am afraid the airlines may go the route of the railways. If I could assist you in any possible way to make the change from "cattle carrier" service to responsible service, please let me know.

Sincerely,

DENNIS L. JOHNSON,
President.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 10, 1973]

WHAT YOU AND I ARE GETTING LESS
AND LESS OF

(By Robert Cuscaden)

Service: You know what that is. It's what you and I are getting less and less of these days.

You know. You buy a brand new car at Lord knows what exorbitant price. You drive it home and before you've got that beauty in the garage you've already made a list of 326 things that need to be fixed. By the end of the week, the list has mushroomed to a ghastly 1,419 items.

But what the heck? You weren't born yesterday. The fact that things are going to go wrong is no traumatic discovery. So you hop into the car (making a mental note that now the door doesn't close quite right either), and drive back to your friendly auto dealer.

And THEN the trauma does begin. All of a sudden this guy who was turning hand-springs for you, couldn't do enough for you, etc., suddenly he's fresh out of time. Oh sure, he'll get all those little problems fixed, but, gee, his garage is all filled up right now, and how about coming back in about a month or so?

"Service, service, service, that's what it's all about," sighed Dennis Johnson to me last week as we had lunch amidst the moving splendors of the Gas Light Club. Johnson, who heads up his own 35-personnel management consultant firm in Oak Brook, said "Consumers aren't all that naive that they are upset everytime a mass-produced item has problems. But—and especially in today's consumerism-oriented environment—they definitely do expect to get some service."

During the seven year existence of Johnson Associates, its consulting has generally been done in the academic world (admissions procedures, etc.), but the firm has recently formed a Corporate Service Division.

"Our position," Johnson told me, "is that until the corporate world realizes that service, real service, is part of its responsibility, it's kidding itself. And from a pragmatic point of view, of course, without the service ingredient, there simply won't be sufficient profits."

Johnson recently did a very revealing survey of airline stewardesses. "Our client rightly came to the conclusion that it didn't make much sense to spend thousands of dollars on an advertising budget to promote a certain image of service, and then have a non-service-oriented person destroy that image," he said. "The stewardess obviously is the most important contact any traveler encounters. After all, when you travel by air, how much time do you spend with the pilot, or a member of the ground crew?"

Johnson's survey found that stewardesses generally fell into one of three categories. Reading from best to worst, the first group, the service-oriented group, basically came from small city, even rural environments, where in high school they became involved in volunteer service work; they liked people and wanted to help them.

The second group was somewhat comparable to the first, but the day-to-day pressures, and their own occasional personal

problems, tended to affect their relations with customers; there was much less empathy among this group.

The third group had little real interest in the job; it was just a job, and which had proved far less glamorous than this group of girls had expected. Most importantly, this group had little recognition of the service functions of a stewardess.

"It's interesting," said Johnson. "The best possible public relations is the return customer—and that's the whole point of service."

CRANDON, WIS., DIAMOND JUBILEE

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I feel fortunate to represent the area of north-eastern Wisconsin which is known throughout the Midwest for its natural wealth and is the source of great pride to the citizens of my State.

Nestled in the northern part of my district is Forest County and the city of Crandon, which is celebrating the 75th anniversary of its incorporation. Allow me to take this opportunity to congratulate the residents of Crandon and to wish them much success in continuing their record of sound and dynamic growth.

When Forest County was created in 1885, the area now comprising the city of Crandon was set aside as the infant county's future seat of government.

The inhabitants of Forest County at that time numbered no more than a hundred persons, spread along the route of the Milwaukee, Lake Shore & Western Railroad. In one respect, they were a homogenous people. "They were poor, but independent," as one early chronicler wrote. However, the land was good to the first settlers of Forest County, and the pioneer spirit which motivated them to settle the area also provided the stamina to see early times of hardship through.

Crandon was named after Maj. Frank P. Crandon, the tax commissioner of the Chicago & North Western Railroad, who worked for the creation of Forest County from the time the idea was first proposed. With the creation of the county and county seat, the influx of new residents began. In 1898, the city of Crandon was incorporated and in 1901, the railroad began regular service to the city, providing the transportation needed to develop the logging industry, which in turn cleared the land for farming.

Since that time, Crandon has grown to be a community of more than 1,600 residents. The city is surrounded by wild streams, lovely lakes, and beautiful forests. Her citizens are employed in the recreation industry, farming, and wood products manufacturing. Her growth, community spirit, and northern environs are a justifiable source of civic pride to those who know and live in Forest County.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the people of Crandon, Wis., in commemorating their 75th anniversary and congratulate them on reaching this significant milestone in their history as a community. The residents of Crandon have my very best

wishes for a long and prosperous future—a future that I feel will surpass the accomplishments of the past.

HOW NOT TO FIX A RACE

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include the following interesting article by Pete Axthelm which appeared in the Newsweek magazine of July 9, 1973:

How Not To Fix A Race

Only weeks after Secretariat provided horse racing with its most glorious moment in a quarter of a century, the House Select Committee on Crime is directing attention toward a much darker side of the sport. Last week, the Committee released a report that depicts much of racing as a lurid, crime-infested wasteland. If the committee is to be believed, in fact, it is remarkable that Secretariat managed to negotiate his way through the Triple Crown races without bumping into (1) a jockey-briber, (2) a small-time hood armed with horse-doping paraphernalia or (3) a rival colt stimulated by a battery or "joint."

No one in racing is naïve enough to deny that some such abuses exist, and many race-trackers may welcome the committee's proposal for a Federal law providing stiff penalties for those who tamper with horses. But the lawmakers have based their report on so many innuendoes, rumors and shoddy investigative methods that the potential benefit of their findings seems far outweighed by the damage they may do to the honest people in the industry.

In searching for underworld owners of horses and tracks, the committee won some publicity by bandying about the names of Frank Sinatra and Sammy Davis Jr., but in the end it absolved the stars and found only one third-rate countyfair track with definite Mafia connections. As for undisclosed stable owners—a disturbing reality in the sport—the committee focused chiefly on flamboyant horse trader Robert Presti, who had already been found out and banished by racing's own protective agencies.

MOBSTERS

The congressmen were captivated by one Bobby Byrne's (a pseudonym) account of how he and his confederates roamed the stable areas of the country, jabbing depressants into the necks of horses to slow them down and let the mob's selections win. "Sure he did," scoffs one gambler. "The security guys didn't notice this guy because with all those hypodermic needles, he was disguised as a porcupine." As for Byrne's alleged bribes to unnamed riders, track insiders know countless mobsters who lose their money steadily just for the pleasure of winning an occasional bet—and boasting to their girl friends that they "fixed" a race.

Finally there is the intriguing subject of the battery. Ever since Edison, electronically inclined thieves have sought to speed up horses, by "plugging them in." For years, dishonest jockeys have experimented with tiny hand-carried shock-makers that can be applied to the horse's neck in the home-stretch. But the "joint" is usually an unreliable accomplice, because many horses become angry and contrary when the men on their backs give them electric shocks. In view of the wide-eyed wonderment this de-

vice drew from the committee, it is too bad that none of the members was present at one track on a cold winter day when a track figure known as the Pink Dinosaur bet \$6,000 on a filly that the jockey had promised to "light up."

FILLY

Seconds before post time, the Dinosaur spotted a regular and let him in on his secret. "Oh, no," said his friend. "A kid hit that filly with a joint last fall and she went straight up in the air."

It was too late to sell off his tickets, so the Dinosaur could only watch the race with apprehension. His filly was leading by four lengths in the stretch when the jock reached down and hit her neck—and then the Dinosaur gasped with horror. "The next minute," he recalls, "the filly had swerved into the rail and broken her shoulder, the jock was sailing through the air, the battery was bouncing down the frozen racing strip—and I was looking for fresh money." All racetrackers occasionally need fresh money—and racing can always use fresh ideas for its security and public esteem. But there were few of these in the committee's report. One suspects that not a single member has ever learned the first lesson of the sport—by blowing a good bet.

FARMERS PROBLEMS

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters in recent weeks from constituents in the farming areas of my district.

All express concern that perhaps Government is not giving the farmer a fair deal in economic controls. The latest problem to come to light is that of the red tart cherry farmers, primarily those in New York, Pennsylvania, and Michigan.

Growers are harvesting their smallest crop since 1963 and second smallest crop in 25 years. Packers cannot pack cherries at the prices at which they are frozen and growers cannot harvest at last year's raw fruit prices for a substantially smaller crop.

Since the current crop of red tart cherries is approximately the same as the 1967 crop, growers have suggested that instead of freezing prices at last year's levels, the Cost of Living Council should allow prices to rise to but not exceed the 1967-68 average price level.

I would like to submit two letters from farmers in my district. The first discusses the plight of the cherry farmer and the second describes the concerns of the average farmer who is worried about staying in business.

Mrs. Janet Kirby of Albion, representing Women for the Survival of Agriculture, Orleans and Monroe Counties, wrote:

We have just received word that the Cost of Living Council has turned down the Red Tart Cherry Industry Proposal for a pricing alternative on this short-crop year.

It is hard to support a government that will turn down anything as fair as this proposal. It costs as much money to raise half a crop as it does a whole one. If a farmer can't sell a short crop at a higher rate, it can put him out of business. Tart cherries are being harvested right now . . . there isn't

time for the government to "wait and see what happens" and try to make amends later.

Do we have any other alternatives to try to save the cherry industry in the United States?

James J. Piedimonte, a farmer in Holley, wrote:

I am writing this letter because I am concerned about my future in farming. I have been farming all my life and I have never had things as difficult as the last few years. The farmer has to comply with so many regulations today and all these things cost him money.

I am opposed to many of the Labor Department's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations especially the setting of time periods between the spraying of fields with certain organo-phosphate pesticides and the re-entry of workers into those fields.

Also, the Government says there isn't any price freeze to the farmers. You've put a price freeze on the processor—how am I to stay in business? I've borrowed more money and make less than any time of my life, plus machinery repair, gasoline, fertilizer, spray material and taxes have all been increased. I cannot survive and many, many farmers are beginning to see the same future. We will be forced out of business. I have two sons who are young and like farming but they can make more money working in industry than I can pay them.

I had the pleasure of meeting you in Murray at the flag dedication. I'm the Republican candidate for supervisor in the Town of Murray. I've also heard you speak in Medina and you impress me that you would listen to our problems.

Please help us with the OSHA regulations and the price freeze to the processor.

I ask my colleagues to join me in seeking relief for the cherry farmers and suggest that in the future we examine very carefully all legislation and controls which inadvertently continue the trend toward making the small farmer a dying breed.

ELECTRONIC VOTING MACHINE PROBLEM

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1973, I reviewed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 11 and noted that it did not agree with my actions on the floor. The Honorable Pat Jennings thereafter furnished me with a copy of the computer printout of my voting activity on June 11. Upon comparison of these two documents I sent a letter to Mr. Jennings which I quote:

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: Thank you for sending me the June 11, 1973 printout reflecting all my votes, which I have compared with the June 11 Congressional Record.

I definitely recall the following, which is contrary to the Record:

1. Roll Call 201 (p. 19028)—"Present" instead of "Absent"
2. Roll Call 202 (p. 19029)—"Nay" instead of "No Vote"
3. Roll Call 204 (p. 19040)—"Yea" instead of "No Vote"
4. Roll Call 205 (p. 19046)—"Nay" instead of "No Vote"

My voting card is apparently in proper repair since my vote was recorded on Roll Call

206 and subsequent votes. No statement can be made about possible station transmitter malfunction since I did move about to different stations for these votes which did not record.

While it is realized that my above noted votes for June 11, 1973 cannot now be officially recorded, I thought you should be advised of the facts; especially since other Members had also talked to me about similar problems.

Perhaps there is some intermittent short in the system. Recently I have been observing the board to confirm that my votes have been recorded and am also checking each days Congressional Record to see if the above noted votes were isolated instances.

It is the purpose of this letter to alert your office to this situation, and in the event other Members complain of similar experiences, you will have this record of my recollections of June 11 while they are still fresh in my mind.

THE PRESIDENT'S HOUSE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have read a good deal of late about the expenditure of public moneys at San Clemente and Key Biscayne on homes owned by President Nixon. A thoughtful commentary on these expenditures appeared quite recently in the Burlington County Sunday Times of July 8. I place that commentary before my colleagues for their information and consideration.

THE PRESIDENT'S HOUSE

Politicians, perhaps, do not have a public image of cleanliness and morality in the most normal of times, much less at the moment. Still, as a group, they all learn very early in their careers what they can, and cannot do as public officials.

The freshest of township council members in the smallest of municipalities learns early in the game that he cannot call the Public Works department to plow his driveway when it snows; he cannot request the township clerk to do his income tax; he cannot send a township policeman to pick up his wife at the airport.

Politicians cannot do these things for the simple reason that they look bad. People expect a certain level of probity from their public officials, and are quick to throw them out of office when such standards are not met. Much as they joke about politics and corruption, most people rightly set much higher standards of behavior for public figures than for private ones.

All of which makes it very hard to understand just what President Nixon was thinking of when he had his San Clemente and Key Biscayne homes so lavishly refurbished, at government expense.

After all, the man has been in politics for more than 27 years. Fairly early in his career he was nearly knocked out of politics altogether by the "Fund" charges, when he was accused of having a political slash fund that he used for personal expenses. It was the furor around that fund that provoked the "Checkers" speech, in which the future President bared his personal finances before a nationwide TV audience.

From then on, you would think. Mr. Nixon would be acutely sensitive to financial appearances. Yet now we find the government has paid for hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of improvements on his properties.

The White House argument is that all the improvements are security-related, but this

is clearly fatuous. There is no more relation between swimming pool heaters, flagpoles, rotating beds of flowers, and the President's security, than there was between the Water-gate break-in and national security.

But, the White House says, Mr. Nixon didn't ask for all of these improvements: They came from the Secret Service. That, too, begs the question. The Secret Service, if it had its druthers, would build a 200-foot-high wall around the White House and not let the President out ever, but the President does not let them do that either.

The Secret Service's mission is to protect the President, and to please the President. It is up to the President, not the Secret Service, to make a judgment on the appropriations of such ideas as installing a new heating system, at the taxpayers' expense, in his private home.

Finally, the defense goes, the President is too busy looking at the broad picture of geopolitics and international machinations to be bothered with such details.

That we doubt. Any man who can see a single demonstrator in Lafayette Park, two hundred yards from the White House, and order him removed, can certainly see hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of free improvements being installed in his homes.

In this case, there is no doubt that the President knew what was going on. That he saw nothing improper about it is disturbing indeed.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAINE NATIONAL GUARD

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a joint resolution of Maine's Legislature commending the Maine National Guard for their outstanding contribution to our State. Over the years the National Guard has provided invaluable service to the citizens of Maine and established an unblemished record of success through their instate training programs. I commend to your recognition this resolution and extend to the Maine National Guard my heartiest congratulations. I urge this body to continue to support future instate training programs.

JOINT RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF LOCAL TRAINING OF THE MAINE NATIONAL GUARD

Whereas, the Maine National Guard is a reserve force of trained and equipped men for the defense of critical State and national interests; and

Whereas, the Maine National Guard has provided well over \$360,000 in savings to the State over the past 3 years; and

Whereas, such savings are reflected in serving needy projects throughout the State in exchange for their training value; and

Whereas, the Legislature wishes to acknowledge with gratitude such in-state training contributions of the Maine National Guard with sincere hope this valuable program will be continued and expanded; now, therefore, be it

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that the Members of the 106th Legislature of the State of Maine join in an expression of gratitude to the Maine National Guard for their valuable participation, brought about through in-state training, in needy projects throughout the State and extend special thanks to all those who are in a position to encourage and expand this worthy service; and be it further

Ordered, that a suitable copy of this Order

be transmitted forthwith to the Governor, the Adjutant General and the Maine Congressional Delegation in the Congress of the United States as notice of the Legislature's interest and support in continuing and expanding the existing levels of in-state training programs in the near or immediate future.

U.S. POSTAL MONOPOLY: IT JUST CANNOT DELIVER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and I have introduced legislation designed to end the Government monopoly in the carriage of first-class mail. The continuing deterioration in the quality of postal service coupled with steadily increasing postal rates underscores the need for this legislation. It is somewhat peculiar that a government which has sought to end monopoly since the late 1800's is so reticent to end a monopoly wholly of its own creation. I am confident that private mail service will prove to be cheaper and faster than Government service and I think the consumer deserves the chance to find out.

Mr. Speaker, Allan C. Brownfeld makes a compelling case for ending the Government's postal monopoly and I insert his recent column from the Anaheim Bulletin at this time in the RECORD:

U.S. POSTAL MONOPOLY: IT JUST CANNOT DELIVER

WASHINGTON.—The American postal system is, by any estimate, in a rapid state of deterioration. Service is worse than ever, and we are now told that a first class letter will, in the near future, cost ten cents. As prices increase, service decreases.

At one time all postal boxes received collections after 5 p.m. Today, only 50 per cent of them are collected after 5 p.m. Saturday mail deliveries may now be curtailed in downtown city areas. When CARE, the international relief organization, tried to rush into the mail a postcard appeal for funds to aid victims of Nicaragua's Christmas earthquake the result was that eight carloads of mail was mislaid for nine days. By the time they were located, the earthquake was no longer big news and the response—or lack of response—showed. The U.S. postal service is still trying to find out what happened. Stories such as this, unfortunately, are legion.

Several years ago, as a result of public dismay over deteriorating postal service and the continual rise in costs, an independent federal agency was established to handle the mail under the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. It was incorporated to give it the appearance of free enterprise, but the government retained full control and a monopoly on most types of mail service.

We are told that the quasi-corporation combined the best features of both worlds—government-provided service and the expertise and methods of the market place. We have now learned, however, that the two are not compatible. We should have known that long ago.

NEGATIVE SIDE

Recently Harlan Lewin, the president of the Wichita Independent Postal System of America; noted that, "if you ask the clerk in a post office around Christmas time how things are, he will almost always say, "Terri-

ble, we're so busy." Now you ask a clerk in a department store, she'll say, "Great, we're so busy."

Mr. Lewin's independent postal system says that it can deliver mail for three and three quarter cents per letter as against the U.S. Mail's eight cents. The organization has franchises in 52 cities, and believes that it can deliver mail more efficiently than the U.S. government, at a lower price and at a profit.

In his book, "Bureaucracy," economist Ludwig von Mises points out that the essential differences between the management of a business and of a government bureaucracy is that, "Business management or profit management, is directed by the profit motive. The objective is to make a profit. As success or failure to attain this can be ascertained by accounting not only for the whole business but also for any of its parts, it is feasible to decentralize both management and accountability without jeopardizing the unity of operations and attainment of their goal. . . . In public administration there is no connection between revenue and expenditure. Bureaucratic management is the method applied to the conduct of administrative affairs the result of which has no cash value in the market. Bureaucratic management—cannot be checked by economic calculations."

As it stands today, the law states that first-class mail is the absolute monopoly of the U.S. Post Office Department. No one in the country is allowed to deliver a letter except the U.S. Mail and, under the Private Express Statute of 1936, "a letter is further defined as a message in writing from one person to another containing live, current information which would incite the recipient to act or to refrain from acting."

A growing number of private mail companies are being established across the country in an effort to challenge the monopoly of the U.S. Postal Service. These firms, of course, are forbidden from competing with the Government in the delivery of first-class letters. In the handling of third class matter, however, such as advertising circulars and so-called bulk mail, private delivery services are doing a booming business. One of the largest firms in this field, for example, is the Independent Postal System with headquarters in Oklahoma City. According to its president and founder, Thomas M. Murray, it now has 53 offices in 19 states, plus one in Canada. It employs 18,000 people and can deliver material to about 7 million homes. Other firms include Consumer Communications Services Corporation of Columbus, Ohio and the American Postal Corporation of Los Angeles.

LOWER RATES

It is interesting to note that these private firms are making a profit by charging lower rates than the U.S. government is charging while, at the same time, the government increases its yearly deficits.

In a free society there is no reason why the delivery of first-class mail should be a government monopoly. Now, Rep. Philip M. Crane R-Ill., and Rep. Steven D. Symms R-Idaho have protested the impending increase in postal rates and have called for Congressional action on their legislation to end the government monopoly of first-class mail service.

The two congressmen said that an increase in first-class mail rates from six cents to 10 cents in three years "is hardly a record of which our government can be proud; it dwarfs the meat price increases which have recently been the topic of such debate. It is clear that something is fundamentally wrong with the postal service when American citizens must pay more and more for less and less. The source of the trouble is, of course, the monopoly."

Crane and Symms introduced their legislation on January 3. Hearings have not yet

been held or scheduled—a sad commentary on Congress' lack of concern about our postal problems.

Editor's note: The arrival—of Mr. Brownfeld's column from Washington, D.C. is a case in point. After receiving two of these columns late in the same mail, we checked to see when they had been dispatched, only to find one of them had no markings at all, not even the cancellation of the stamp. Naturally enough, it was the one that contained the above article.

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, due to differences between Federal and State budgeting processes, Delaware has incurred difficulties in shifting from categorical grants-in-aid programs to the new revenue sharing approach. We are of course, working hard to make the changeover as soon as possible, but it is evident to me that certain areas are being shortchanged.

Recently, the Delaware General Assembly passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, asking that the Congress and the administration take steps to improve this changeover process. I include this resolution in the RECORD:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 20

In Reference to Federal Revenue Sharing. In harmony with the policy adopted by the Intergovernmental Relations Committee of the National Legislative Conference following its meeting with the President on March 30, 1973, the Senate of the State of Delaware, the House of Representatives concurring therein, hereby adopts the following resolution:

Whereas, each and every one of the fifty sovereign States has, through the years, by design and by tradition, adopted certain methods of funding programs; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States and the National Administration should recognize and make allowance for the unique variations in funding programs existing within the States. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved that the Congress of the United States and the National Administration be urged to continue administering grants-in-aid programs in their present form until such time as Special Revenue Sharing programs have been enacted. Since States are in the process of adopting their budgets—some for one year, others for two—an appropriate amount of time must be available to the States in order to plan for a transition from categorical grants-in-aid to a Special Revenue Sharing approach.

Be it further resolved that the Congress of the United States and the National Administration also be urged:

1. to provide for reasonable procedures such as hold-harmless clauses and flexible timetables,

2. to insure a greater degree of certainty in the amount of Federal funding which can be expected by the States by providing that appropriations be consonant with authorizations, and

3. to insure adequate and meaningful planning at the State level by making annual appropriations prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

Be it further resolved that the Congress of the United States and the National Administration enter into a meaningful dia-

logue with the States so that Special Revenue Sharing legislation will be drawn in a fashion that will enable each State to benefit equitably under such laws.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each member of Delaware's Congressional Delegation, and that they be hereby requested to pointily arrange for its insertion in the Congressional Record.

STERILIZATION AND FAMILY PLANNING

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my outrage and deep concern over what may at best be incredible callousness and would at worst be deliberate racism on the part of the administrators of the federally funded health care program in Montgomery County, Ala.

On June 14, 1973, Mary Alice Relf, age 12, and Minnie Relf, age 14, were surgically sterilized in a Montgomery, Ala., hospital. The tubal sterilization took place under the direction of the Family Planning Clinic of the Montgomery Community Action Committee, an OEO funded project.

The admitted actions of this clinic, in administering a highly experimental drug and then later their referring for sterilization these two young girls by the head of the County Medical Society who then performed the unsolicited tubal operations—are all too reminiscent of the Tuskegee syphilis experiment in which other poor uneducated black peoples were used as human guinea pigs. The Tuskegee case was only discovered last year; now only a short time later, once again the Federal Government is implicated as a direct agent abusing and abrogating the human rights of the victims of an unjust racist society. What is especially pernicious about both cases is that they are in all likelihood not uncommon.

Obviously, it is the obligation of the courts to rule on merits of the lawsuit brought by the Southern Poverty Law Center on behalf of the girls' parents which charges that, first, that the mother was deliberately misled about the nature of the medical procedure—that is, not only was sterilization not sought by the parents but that it was initiated by the Action Committee itself without their permission; second, that what consent was given was made even though there was probably no knowledge of the full consequences of sterilization; and, third, that the consent given, may very well have been coerced.

The authoritative and normative power of medical and State officials over powerless and helpless peoples dependent upon them for expertise and aid in such fields as family planning and health care in general, can be overwhelming and more than sufficient alone to intimidate the powerless to undertake acts often contrary to their own self-interest. Yet, the courts cannot relieve everyone in this country of an obligation to ask: "How

can this continue to happen? How is it possible that anyone can proceed—with no more protection for the human rights of an individual than the mere appearance before a notary public—to sterilize a 12- and 14-year-old girl?"

The courts cannot relieve a medical profession, bound by the Hippocratic oath to the saving of human lives, from an ethical obligation to prevent these all too often recurring incidents. Moreover, the courts cannot "relieve" legislatures of States such as Alabama—which retain and continue to enforce statutes providing for the compulsory "eugenic" sterilization of humans—of the responsibility to cleanse those barbaric relics of 19th century social Darwinism. These anachronisms are depraved to a large degree, for they are the products of social scientists paid and encouraged to produce so-called scientific evidence of mental inferiority of poor blacks and other peoples' of color as compared to persons of more "pure white" ancestry.

Finally, action by the courts in this particular case cannot relieve the Congress of an obligation to act swiftly and decisively to insure that such incidents do not recur. Even parental consent ought not be sufficient grounds to be used to permanently deny an underaged child permanently of the right to ever bear children. Needless to say, sterilization is final and once done irreversible. We must recognize that the parent of a mentally retarded child—in particular—often suffers not only a sense of guilt or anger over the plight of the offspring, but often outright debilitating bewilderment. Therefore, they may often not be in a position to make what we might call rational judgments about issues such as sterilization.

We must recognize that there is substantial evidence of welfare departments and other social agencies placing coercive pressure on parents to agree to many actions not really in the best long-range interests of the child. We must recognize that our limited understanding of reproductive biology and primitive quality of contraceptives often leaves parents or welfare departments with seemingly no satisfactory alternative other than sterilization to prevent a tragic conception by a child neither desirous nor capable of raising offspring.

I believe that Congress must state firmly that while the potential for abuse, for coercion, and for discrimination against poor or ethnic minorities are not only present, but actually exist, that the power of deciding the question of sterilization of a minor cannot be appropriately delegated. If the minor cannot decide for himself or herself—and few indeed have the maturity of judgment to do so—then the Congress must exercise its authority to insure that Federal programs at least recognize that sterilization is an inappropriate and unacceptable form of family planning for minors.

I propose to submit legislation to amend H.R. 6021, which I have introduced to extend for 3 years the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970. This amendment states quite simply:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated under this act, or

any other act, shall be used to pay for the sterilization of any minor, and no program receiving funds under this act, or under any other act, shall be used to pay for the sterilization of any minor, and no program receiving funds under this act shall refer for sterilization, or perform a sterilization, upon any minor.

I commend the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for their action placing a moratorium upon any such sterilization procedures for minors. But I feel compelled to ask the Department—in light of these incidents—to reconsider its earlier position that medicaid should be seen as the major vehicle for future expansion of family planning services. This Alabama incident clearly illustrates difficulties involved in insuring that expenditures of funds under medicaid are limited to genuinely voluntary and non-discriminatory programs. Medicaid is essentially a State-initiated and controlled program but we cannot trust the States to provide adequate safeguards in this area—particularly so long as many of them, through their eugenic sterilization statutes, create an atmosphere which condones and even encourages involuntary sterilization.

This of course, is especially acute when poor and powerless people are concerned. There is no substitute for strong Federal standards in the provision of family planning services and I believe it would be far easier to develop such standards and implement such safeguards through the extension and improvement of our present project grant programs under title X of the Public Health Services Act.

REFANNING PROGRAM TO AID NOISE POLLUTION

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the American people are properly and increasingly concerned about noise pollution, I wish to express my full support for the positive action taken by the Congress in restoring \$14 million to the NASA Appropriations Act for work on refanning the JT-3D jet engine, used on all DC-8 and 707 jet aircraft.

Aircraft engine noise is one of the chief causes of noise pollution, especially in metropolitan areas. Earplugs and sleepless nights have become an unfortunate part of the lives of too many of our urban citizens. As a result, Congress authorized and appropriated in the fiscal year 1973 \$30 million for the research and development of noise reduction equipment for both the JT-8D engines that are used on 727's, 737's and DC-9's as well as the JT-3D engines.

Yet, the President's Office of Management and Budget, with the compliance of NASA, effectively reduced the program for that year to \$21 million. Forced to choose between the refanning programs for either the JT-8D or the JT-3D engines, NASA picked the JT-8D. Program

administrators reasoned that there are more aircraft powered by these engines and that they are expected to be in service longer. But the net effect of these decisions would have allowed 707's and DC-8's, the noisiest of present aircraft, to operate at current high noise levels until well into the 1980's.

The action of the Congress to restore the full refanning program, which I wholeheartedly supported, is a solid step forward in substantially reducing noise pollution caused by commercial jet aircraft.

CONSTRUCTION NEWS STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC WORKS TO DISPERSE POPULATION, STRENGTHEN RURAL AMERICA

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Construction News, in its current issue has an excellent article entitled, "The Real Transportation Crisis," which stresses the importance of improving the rural transportation system which has been relatively neglected for 30 years, especially during the construction of the interstate highway system.

The article stresses the importance of encouraging more people to live in rural areas and points out that 80 percent of our population lives on 5 percent of the land area.

It has long been one of my primary goals and objectives in the Congress to encourage the development of rural America and certainly this excellent article reinforces my position on this matter and I commend it to my colleagues as an excellent analysis of our transportation crisis.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this subject, I place the article in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

THE REAL TRANSPORTATION CRISIS

(Rising food prices, clogged grain movements are symptoms of our inadequate rural transportation system which has been neglected for 30 years)

Sandwiched between other national crises plaguing the U.S. is another potential debacle which until recently has been lost in the shuffle. And yet its reverse impact on the economy could, unless checked in time, be the most harmful of all to our current and impending problems.

At a time when we are matter-of-factly producing space hardware to explore the moon and orbit the earth, the paradoxical truth is that this nation doesn't have adequate transportation wherewithal—rail, highway or waterway—to get its bulk farm commodities to the marketplace.

An immediate, housewife-documented consequence is higher food prices. Perhaps even more serious, in the long run, is our inability to efficiently move millions of tons of wheat, feed grains and soybeans to our ports for overseas shipment. This is crucial because agricultural exports offer the best and perhaps last hope for achieving a more favorable balance of trade and rejuvenating the U.S. dollar.

No one questions the capability of our

farmers to raise the crops. And the government can and has put millions of set-aside acres back into production for the stated purpose of hiking agricultural exports from the present \$8.1-billion annual level to as much as \$18-billion by 1980. But, as long as our transport facilities remain in disrepair and disarray, this productive potential is at least partially academic.

Helping focus national attention on this problem was testimony submitted to the Congress last March by Associated Construction Publications, Ray Metzger Jr., publisher of Construction News, and Construction Digest editor Art Graham told the House Transportation Subcommittee that there is a direct and obvious link between skyrocketing food prices and (a) abandonment of thousands of miles of rail trackage serving rural areas and (b) hundreds of thousands of miles of deteriorating primary, secondary and farm-to-market roads suffering from 30 years of accumulated neglect.

Since then there has been a rapid-fire series of developments:

On April 5, Transportation Secretary Claude S. Brinegar announced establishment of a full-time DOT task force to deal with the freight car shortage. "Outside of the northeast," he explained, "the most serious railroad problem is the shortage of freight cars—especially for grain loading. We are very much aware of the difficulties this poses for shippers trying to move grain to meet contractual commitments."

Concurrently, The Road Information Program (TRIP) launched a press media campaign to explain the impact of inadequate roads on the cost of transporting farm commodities and, ultimately, on retail food prices.

At the invitation of Gov. Dan Walker of Illinois, farm and transportation leaders from 12 states participated in a Mid-American Agricultural Rail Transportation Crises Conference at Chicago April 9-10. "Farmers have been asked by the Nixon administration to put millions of additional acres into grain production, but what good will this do if they can't get the grain they've already produced to market?" Walker asked, adding: "Poor movement of grain products has the same effect on food prices that limited supplies of red meat has on consumer prices."

Representatives of 17 states which account for about 85 per cent of the nation's wheat, soybean and feed grain production convened again in Chicago, May 16-18 for a Midwest Grain Movement Conference cosponsored by Illinois and Nebraska. This seminar resulted in a dozen-odd major resolutions demanding immediate, priority cause/cure consideration of the grain shipment impasse. Governor Walker in turn submitted these recommendations to the National Governors' Conference at Lake Tahoe, Nev., June 3.

Meanwhile, on April 30, Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) introduced a joint resolution instructing the Secretary of Transportation to make "a full and complete investigation and study of farm-to-market roads, railroad beds and availability of operational rail lines serving rural areas in the U.S. for the purpose of determining the condition and adequacy of such roads and rail lines to carry the volume and weight of agricultural and other commodities from rural areas necessary for the nation's economy." A report on the findings of this study, together with DOT's recommendations for remedial action, would be submitted to the President and Congress not later than next December 31.

A week later, Minnesota's other Democratic senator, Walter F. Mondale, introduced legislation (S. 1749) to establish within the Department of Transportation a Rural Rail Transportation Administration with authority to make loans or loan guarantees to maintain and/or reestablish rail service for major

agricultural areas. Explaining that in his state alone there will be 304 communities isolated from operational railroad facilities by 1980, and that a third of these cities and towns presently must rely on secondary roads restricted to less than 9-ton carrying capacity, Mondale said he was afraid that "many of our rural communities will be left to die" unless they are provided adequate transportation access. He also referred to the world demand for farm products as "the major hope of preventing a sharp deterioration in the U.S. balance of payments" which, he said, makes it "doubly critical not only to the agricultural community but also to the nation's overall economic future that we maintain rural rail lines."

Why this sudden furor? Essentially, what we have had for many years is an inevitable crisis waiting for a time to happen.

More than 46,000 miles of railroad trackage—principally those lines traversing sparsely populated rural regions—have been abandoned in the past 40 years. Railroads today are functioning with 30,000 fewer locomotives and 840,000 fewer cars than they had during their peak years in the 1930s. This loss equates to 13 main line railroads, stretching from coast to coast, each located 100 miles apart and each having 2,300 locomotives and 64,000 cars.

When the nation launched its expanded roadbuilding program in 1956 the emphasis was, with justification, on the planned interstate expressway network and on modernization of heavily-traveled federal-aid primary routes. Although these two systems represent only 7 per cent of our total highway mileage, they now carry 50 per cent of all automobile, and truck traffic.

As a result, however, much of the remaining 3.6-million miles of roads and streets have gotten only cursory attention. Except for routine, minimal maintenance, most of the 2-million miles of non-federal-system rural roads have gone untouched and unimproved for 30 years or more. As an example, of the 373,000 highway bridges built before 1935, 343,000—almost 90 per cent—are on county secondary and other rural roads. And some 88,900 bridges, or one out of every six in the U.S., are now classified as "critically deficient."

These combined conditions provided the ingredients for what Governor Walker has referred to as the grain shipment "time bomb—one of the nation's major domestic problems that has been swept under the rug too long."

The fuse was three precipitating factors: a bumper grain crop in 1972, the sale in the past 12 months of more than 700 million bushels of wheat, feed grains and soybeans to Russia, and record floods which closed the Mississippi and Missouri rivers to barge traffic for weeks this spring.

"It is no wonder then that we find ourselves faced with great difficulties," Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Corn Refiners Assn., told the second Chicago conference in his keynote address. "Movement of grain and grain products so far in 1973 exceeds 1972 loadings by almost 50 per cent. Total grain to be exported in fiscal 1973 is almost 75 million metric tons compared with 50 million metric tons in fiscal '72. And this massive increase in demand for transportation came on the heels of a peak year in 1972."

"Implications of the present railroad car shortage extend beyond the plight of shippers," he added. "Shortages of transportation inevitably will result in price list dislocations in various markets. Thus, we face a price impact on food products at a very time when this nation is engaged in serious efforts to moderate food price increases to the ultimate consumer."

Liebenow, who is a former president of the Chicago Board of Trade, called on the government to "openly assume responsibility of dealing with this problem because, after all,

it bears direct responsibility for the crisis situation because of the Russian grain sales."

Acknowledging that the accumulated "structural problem" impeding the flow of farm commodities will require fundamentally new policies and long-range legislation, Liebenow went ahead to emphasize that "I don't believe this country can await the resolution of this underlying problem. Legislation of this kind cannot come quickly enough. More immediate action is required."

His recommendation was that the President promptly commission an inter-agency study, under auspices of the Cost of Living Council, to determine what steps can be taken that would promise quick relief to the American consumer. This commission would examine and report on such questions as:

Could a more liberal admixture of trucking and rail transportation provide significant short-term relief?

Can the government, perhaps including the Defense Department, ease its claim to an inadequate supply of freight cars?

Could the government profitably use emergency authority to coordinate truck, rail and shipping transportation?

Should emergency legislation be sought on a temporary basis, leaving open the question of appropriate long-range solutions?

Later, the conference approved a somewhat parallel resolution drafted by Metzger and Graham which calls on the National Governors' Conference to take the initiative in formation of an ad hoc committee to deal with the problem.

Serving on the committee would be appointees from the Midwest Grain Movement and Governors' conferences, chairmen of the Senate and House public works and transportation committees and representatives from the Departments of Transportation and Agriculture.

"Much of the specific data on abandoned and inadequate rail facilities and substandard roads and bridges has already been compiled," Metzger said, "and the impact of this transportation bottleneck on grain movement and food prices has been confirmed."

"It would be the responsibility of the committee to evaluate this information, pinpoint the best and most practical short- and long-range solutions to the problem, and then to make recommendations and draft legislation to help overcome these transportation inadequacies."

Although the overall financial position of the nation's railroads seriously impairs their capability to make capital investments in new rolling stock and improvement of facilities, it would be unfair to imply that there hasn't been a major effort by most companies during the past decade to cope with increased carloading demands, not only for grain but for lumber, aggregates, automobiles and other bulk commodities and manufactured products.

As was pointed out by representatives of the Assn. of American Railroads during the grain movement conference, U.S. railroads established an all-time record of 778-billion ton-miles of freight service in 1972, an increase of 5.2 per cent over the previous year. And grain car loadings—including those for both domestic and export shipments—averaged 32,660 per week for the first 10 weeks of this year, an increase of nearly 44 per cent over the corresponding period in 1972. This was accomplished despite the fact that there were 40,000 fewer freight cars in service last year than in 1969, when the previous all-time rail traffic record was set.

Since 1960, when virtually all rail grain shipment was in boxcars, railroads have been adding an average of about 11,000 covered hopper cars to their fleets annually. They and private shippers now operate 190,000 of these large hopper cars, and another 5000 were on order as of last March 1.

It is generally true that, as a group, railroads still rank well down the list in terms

of management, operational and labor efficiency. But gains also are being made in this area. A special AAR task force already is well along in a design study for a greatly expanded computerized freight car information program, while improvements are still being made in the basic system now in use. And various individual railroads are continuing to develop new and highly sophisticated computer programs within their own systems.

These stubborn facts remain, however: (a) railroads still do not have sufficient rolling stock to handle loading volume requirements, and existing fleets are not being utilized with maximum efficiency; (b) thousands of miles of rural area rail trackage are no longer in use, and more abandonments are in the offing, and (c) as much as half of the roadbed mileage still in service is inadequate and unsafe for today's 100-ton hopper car loadings.

Without a sustained, multi-billion dollar infusion of funds for new rolling stock and for needed improvement of roadbeds and other physical facilities, U.S. railroads will be extremely hard pressed to meet mounting demands for movement of grain and other basic commodities in the immediate future, let alone handle their subsequent burden of an overall national freight load which, according to DOT predictions will double by 1985.

As was repeatedly emphasized at the two grain movement seminars, this situation also mandates immediate attention to the other modes of transportation, i.e. rural and farm-to-market roads and inland waterways.

Although over-the-road shipment of heavy bulk farm commodities for distances of more than 50 miles has, in the past, been considered prohibitively expensive, many rail-isolated farmers and suppliers are now left with no alternative. In Illinois alone, because of the lack of railroad lines and/or cars, truck hauling of grain increased by nearly 19-million bushels in 1972.

This extended truck-hauling trend will continue to accelerate. And, even within the prescribed 50-mile radius, the movement of grain to elevators and the equally important transporting of fertilizer, feed grain and heavy equipment to farmers is being choked off or made much more expensive by horse-and-buggy secondary roads and dilapidated, unsafe bridges.

It was this fact which prompted Rep. William H. Harsha (R-Ohio) to comment, during recent floor debate on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, that actual and proposed abandonment of thousands of miles of rail trackage is putting "an inordinate burden on our already over-burdened highway system and leaves highways—many of them inadequate—as the sole source and method of moving goods and services in and out of many of our rural communities." Harsha went ahead to point out that this is a significant factor in steadily rising food prices.

Overdue improvements and expansion of the nation's waterways system have been almost equally slow in coming. Commercially navigable inland channels were extended by a scant 290 miles, or only slightly more than 1 per cent, in the 1960-70 decade, and stop-and-go funding of Army Corps of Engineers programs has stalled dozens of needed lock and dam and navigation projects.

A case in point is the old Lock & Dam 26 on the Mississippi River at Alton, Ill. The 41-million tons design capacity of these locks was reached and passed five years ago, and barge tow delays of as much as 18 hours are not uncommon.

There is no practical alternative route for these barges and, in addition to the present delay-loss to shippers and consumers of millions of dollars a year, there exists the

possibility of structural failure which would immediately deprive all cities on the upper Mississippi and Illinois rivers of through-barge transportation.

Testifying before Congressional appropriations committees in mid-May, James B. Meanor Jr., manager of the Metropolitan St. Louis Chamber of Commerce transportation department, warned that "with the railroad car shortage becoming even more serious, loss of barge service to and from the upper midwest area would result in extremely serious conditions for its people and industry."

"In this connection, grain exports, much of which move south by barge, are extremely important to improving our balance of trade deficit," he added.

Meanor urged quick release of funds for replacement of Lock & Dam 26, explaining that, even if construction were to start immediately, the new facility would not be fully operational for another seven or eight years.

Sen. R. Vance Hartke, chairman of Senate's Surface Transportation Subcommittee, sums up the total picture in this manner: "The situation, simply put, is that our needs for fast, safe and efficient ways to move people and goods are far in excess of the capacity of available systems."

"Our rail system is in disrepair. The waterways are nowhere near their full potential as useful carriers. And, despite tremendous strides made in recent years, many of our roads and streets are still either unsafe or inadequate for the traffic volumes they are required to handle."

A number of other influential Congressional leaders are now speaking out on this problem and the enigma of more and more bypassed and isolated "ghost towns" in the hinterlands contrasting sharply with people-packed, transportation-jammed urban areas.

"Our population distribution today is badly unbalanced, with 80 per cent of all Americans living on 5 per cent of the nation's land area," explains Rep. John A. Blatnik (D-Minn.), chairman of the House Public Works Committee. "Half of all our people live on the perimeter of the mainland within 50 miles of the Atlantic, Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico or the Great Lakes."

"We can and we must reverse this flow, and in so doing we can do much to reduce the population pressures that are at the root of today's urban congestion," he stated, adding: "One way to get people back to countryside America is through the development of adequate highways that will encourage industry to locate in rural and small town areas."

"In our concern over the undeniable transportation crisis of our cities," Blatnik concluded, "we cannot afford to overlook or minimize the vital transportation needs of rural America."

Rep. Don Clausen (R-Calif.) echoed the same logic when he said that "if there is ever going to be a change in the quality of life in America, it's going to be brought about as a result of creating either new economic growth centers or revitalizing and diversifying some of the more sparsely populated areas in the U.S."

"If we are going to reverse or slow this out-migration from our rural sections, and if we're going to stop the stacking of people on top of one another in the big cities, then we must stop giving total consideration to allocating funds where the population is without giving some consideration to where the population can be," Clausen pointed out.

The grain shipment impasse is, obviously just one important symptom of a number of interlocking problems from which the only key is a carefully conceived, adequately financed and quickly implemented national transportation plan.

DISMANTLING THE VOTER'S OBSTACLE COURSE—THE VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee is presently holding hearings on S. 352, the "Voter Registration Act."

As we all saw in the last elections, many registered voters were disenfranchised because of mechanical breakdowns at the polls on election day or long lines. In addition, others simply do not know where their polling place is. I feel that S. 352 is an especially good vehicle for updating registration mechanisms and facilitating the enfranchisement of many more citizens. I have testified at the hearing and requested that two bills, "the Voter Protection bill," and "the Voter Information bill," be incorporated as amendments to the act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this Congress to contact the Elections Subcommittee requesting the incorporation of these amendments.

The following is the text of my testimony:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your affording me the opportunity to present my views with regard to problems stemming from present voter registration inadequacies.

Complex, multi-step application procedures and administrative error have, at the least, subjected the individual to considerable delay and, at most, resulted in his disenfranchisement in Federal, State, and local elections. Residence requirements and sparsely-located registration centers with office hours from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. pose unnecessary obstacles for the registration of a highly mobile, working population. The partial result of these administrative and other problems, including the continued denial of the vote to many black citizens as a result of locally restrictive registration statutes, has been a very poor participation rate of 54.5 percent in the November 7 election.

As Federal legislation is the only vehicle to uniformly solve these voting problems, I wish to add my support to the McGee Act, S. 352. Two charges have been made in opposition to the provisions of this "Voter Registration Act." The first contention is that the establishment of such a system would encourage fraud.

On the contrary, fraud has been found to more frequently occur at the ballot box and not during the registration process. In addition, Section 407 provides for comprehensive sanctions against such fraud.

Secondly, it is maintained that the Act's provisions would unduly overwork local election officials. Yet the adoption of simplified registration application procedures and the establishment of the Voter Registration Administration, coordinating local, State, and Federal efforts, as well as providing economic support, would expedite and simplify the workload of local officials.

In addition, to further establish minimum standards so as to prevent a repetition of last November's numerous foul-ups, may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this committee include as amendments to this Act two bills

which I have previously introduced. These may be referred to as the "Voter Information Bill" and the "Voter Protection Bill," both of which I believe to be proximate to the intent of the "Voter Registration Act." Suggested language for the "Voter Information Bill" and "Voter Protection Bill" are attached to this statement.

Mr. Chairman, it is a sad commentary on popular notions of participatory democracy that only 50 percent of the national electorate knows the name of their congressmen. Opportunities for greater citizen contact with governmental officials not only make for a more informed citizenry more apt to participate in the electoral process, but would go a long way toward the goal of making government more accountable to the public.

The "Voter Information Bill" would require every post office to display information on registration requirements and the places, dates, times and methods of registering and voting at elections held in the area served by the post office. In addition, the posting of the names and office addresses of U.S. Senators and Representatives, and representatives to the State legislature would be required. Finally, necessary information on the availability and cost of Western Union Public Opinion messages to the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress would be posted. Perhaps seeing a Representative's name and address in his post office will now spark someone to write a letter or register to participate in the electoral process when he might otherwise have been silent.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, may I also submit as an amendment to the "Voter Registration Act" a bill to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment to assure the proper conduct of elections, the "Voter Protection Bill." Mr. Chairman, last November 7, thousands of registered voters were faced with the alternatives of disenfranchisement or the necessity of attempting to obtain a Court order so as to register their votes. This stemmed from incomplete and incorrect registration roll listing, inoperative voting machines, early closing hours at the polls, and complex absentee ballot procurement procedures. Simplified registration procedures provided in the "Voter Registration Act" would prevent the repeated occurrence of a situation in New York City where new registrants, holding voter registration cards, arrived at the polls only to learn that necessary secondary cards were missing. Albuquerque, New Mexico, residents were similarly subjected to disenfranchisement as they did not receive secondary registration notifications.

Mr. Chairman, the listing of similar, unnecessary foul-ups goes on and on. In addition, 120 jammed or unworkable voting machines subjected Jersey City, New Jersey, residents to hours of delay, forcing them to obtain a court order extending the voting hours. Machine malfunctions in some Philadelphia wards cancelled out Democratic Presidential votes cast on a straight party ticket.

The "Voter Protection Bill," which I am offering as an amendment, would require each polling place to have adequate voting machinery and facilities to service every voter within fifteen minutes of his arrival at the polling place. In addition, it would be required that back-up paper ballots and competent repairmen be readily available to function if the machines should fail to correctly operate.

Early poll closing hours of 4 p.m., 6 p.m., or 6:30 p.m. have at least inconvenienced, if not prevented working people and commuting suburbanites from exercising their vote. Inclusion of the "Voter Protection Bill" would extend polling place hours from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Perhaps the absentee ballot application

and voting procedures pose the greatest obstacles and administrative pitfalls for the average voter. The varied and complex procurement procedures for absentee ballots have confused many and discouraged many others from voting at all. Increased absentee ballot requests in urban areas have resulted in large backlogs. Postal delay, in addition, has resulted in late arrival and the ensuing voiding of ballots cast. The "Voter Protection Bill" stipulates that absentee ballots, in blank, be made available within one week of the date of request. Simple, one-step application post cards shall be placed in every post office. Upon completion by the voter, such a ballot shall be returnable to a central office or agency in each state which shall promptly forward the ballot to the appropriate officer and place for counting.

In addition, the Attorney General would be authorized to make grants to election boards and officials of States for the purposes of research and training for their responsibilities under this bill. The Attorney General would also pay to each State on an annual reimbursement basis, 25 percent of the increased election operating cost directly resulting from the application of the standards imposed by this bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that the "Voter Registration Act" as amended by the "Voter Information Bill" and the "Voter Protection Bill" would constitute a major step toward eliminating election day foul-ups. It would streamline the voter registration process and would bring about the advent of a more highly involved and participatory citizenry.

ERIC STOW HATCH: "A VERRAY PARFIT GENTIL KNIGHT"

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Eric Hatch was truly a man for all seasons. His brilliance and accomplishment, his boundless energy and enthusiasm were reflected in the luster of a many-faceted career in which excellence was the hallmark of every achievement. Eric was the superb scholar, writer, radio executive, horseman, soldier, and enthusiast for study and identity with the roots of our historic past, especially that of Connecticut.

Eric Hatch died on July 4 while the bells still echoed in celebration of the Fourth of July, an occasion which represented for him the symbol and substance of our national heritage. He and artist-writer Eric Sloan had suggested some 10 years ago to U.S. Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF that every city and town ring bells on this holiday. He, like Jefferson and Adams, ardent patriots, passed from time into eternity on this day which was filled with special significance and deep emotion.

Eric Hatch's love of Connecticut was reflected in the diligence and competence with which he pursued his duties as chairman of the Connecticut Historical Commission and the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. His dream of a museum of Connecticut history—where a school child could "in one day learn more than he had ever

known before about how Connecticut was founded"—will be an enduring memorial to his indomitable spirit.

He was the founder and first commander of the 1st Litchfield Artillery, the only horse drawn artillery company in the State. It was my privilege as Secretary of the State to present to him the articles of incorporation of the group in which he took such special pride. Their three-volley cannon salute on the Litchfield green following the funeral service was a last farewell to a beloved leader.

The art of language fascinated Eric Hatch. Its fruits were in a writing career as a member of the original staff of the New Yorker and contributor to national magazines, in more than 25 novels including "My Man Godfrey," the television scripts of the well known program Topper and the succinct editorials of station WBIS in Bristol which he owned.

Throughout the brilliance of the fabric of this life was woven a warmth and respect for people that added new dimensions to his stature.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the eulogy delivered at the funeral of Eric Hatch by Father Gordon B. Wadhams. This beautiful tribute captures the spirit of a remarkable human being who was devoted to his family, his State and country, and did so much to enrich the future for us all.

The eulogy follows:

ERIC STOW HATCH

It may be that in time to come it will afford us joy and consolation to remember these things.

To me falls the honour this afternoon of paying tribute to the memory of Eric Stow Hatch. . . . And this notwithstanding my all too brief acquaintance and friendship with him, a matter of under three years. The honour, too, of bespeaking, for you, his friends and admirers of far longer standing than I can claim, our common concern for his widow, his sons and daughter, his brother, and others of his near family in their loss from sight and sound of one most dear to them, and in their consequent bereavement.

Let me tell you what I found in Eric Hatch to admire and to love. Since these were readily to be discerned in him, they must come first in the telling. I admired and love him for:

His princely bearing and deportment, his courtly manners, his attractive diffidence, his gentlemanly reserve, his sophisticated, sometimes mischievous, yet always kindly, humor and wit, his erudition, his command—in writing and in speech—of the Mother Tongue.

Yet, notwithstanding Colonel Hatch's renown in the military service of our country, and notwithstanding his spectacular success in his chosen craft, he will certainly best be remembered by us in Litchfield and by the people of Connecticut for the passion that filled and energized his public service these latter years. I mean, his devotion to his country's unique beginnings and consequent heritage, his determination to preserve and hand on the heritage and traditions of his beloved State of Connecticut. I need not elaborate on this, for it is well known to you all.

But this, I think, should be said: *his was no merely private concern.* His was not, for example, the scholar's concern only, as when a man determines to know all there is to know about a given subject for the sheer delight of knowing; he was no mere collector

for personal gain or enjoyment, no preserver of antiquities, for the sheer delight of ownership. No. Eric Hatch's passion for history, for the handing on of a heritage was directed in the main toward the public good. It pained him to see how so many men and women and boys and girls and young people in our fluid and disorderly times seem to be persons "without a country"—rootless, constantly on the go, heedless of whence they have come, of where they now are, of whence they will go; ignorant of their history; wanting in that sense of the past and that dedication to the building of a yet more glorious future, which are the meaning of true patriotism.

"Let the children learn," said Eric, aware of how little and how badly American History is taught nowadays. "Let the young people learn, by seeing and touching and hearing and learning about the books, the furniture both primitive and elegant, the houses, the artifacts and homely crafts, the skills and occupations of their forebears. Let them know that these are the rock from which they were hewn, the pit from which they were dug—that this is their past as it is also their identity now." Hence, the Museum. Pray God that it will soon be an actuality and not just a dream.

The other day I asked Connie, "What one virtue, what one word, best gives the key to Eric?" There was no hesitation in her reply. "Patriotism," she said. "Eric was a great patriot."

To me another word occurred: a word the ancient Romans used of their great men. "Pius." "Pius"—not to be confused with our word "pious," with all its unpleasant connotations. "Pius"—the distinguished citizen, the dedicated patriot, the man of exemplary virtue, the man of reverence for the Divinity, the servant of the public good. This was Eric Stow Hatch.

And so, these our obsequies—gratifyingly traditional, majestic, fittingly triumphant—are about to be concluded; but not without we pray for the soul, the on-going life in the Risen Lord of Eric Hatch. We pray for him whom God has supported and upheld "all the day long"; for whom the shadows of this life have lengthened, and its evening come; for him whose busy world is now hushed, life's fever being over and its work done. Grant him, O Father, in thy mercy a safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last. Amen.

FREEDOM GROUPS LOSE FRIEND

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this country lost a great patriot and many people lost an esteemed friend June 30, 1973, when Dr. Nestor Procyk of Buffalo succumbed to a lengthy illness. I knew him during his many years in Buffalo, and he was not only a fine doctor and fine man, but a vibrant worker in the cause of the relief of captive nations. His is a remarkable history, one of hard work and success in the face of almost overwhelming odds, and I would like to share it with my colleagues at this time.

Born 60 years ago in Hnilytsky, Ukraine, educated in the Ukraine, he was graduated from Yagiello University in Krakow, Poland in 1938. His studies towards a medical degree at the University of Berlin were interrupted in 1941

when German armies invaded the Soviet Union. Nazi authorities imprisoned him in Flossenber, Dresden, and Hesh-burck concentration camps until 1945.

But his spirit was still strong. He organized the Ukrainian Red Cross in Munich, and directed the psychological and medical assistance and rehabilitation for the Ukrainian repatriates—work which is continuing in an organization which is still functioning.

He managed to make his way to Paris, where he completed the long-delayed medical degree at the Sorbonne in 1949. Dr. Procyk met his wife Dasha in Paris and they would have celebrated their 22nd wedding anniversary next week.

The Procyks came to the United States in 1950, where he continued his medical service as resident physician at Holy Family Hospital and Swedish Hospital, interned at Knickerbocker Hospital, and in 1953 was resident psychiatrist at Manhattan State Hospital. He was named senior psychiatrist at Gowanda State Hospital in 1955 and supervising psychiatrist at Buffalo State Hospital in 1956. In 1962 he was appointed assistant director of the new West Seneca State School, and since 1970 had served as director of education and training there. He became a U.S. citizen in 1955.

Dr. Procyk was a well-known and highly respected figure in western New York's medical community. He was an assistant professor of psychiatry at State University of Buffalo Medical School, on the staffs of Linwood-Bryant Hospital, Meyer Memorial Hospital, and the Veterans' Administration Hospital outpatient clinic, as well as a member of the American Association of Mental Deficiency, the Erie County and New York State Medical Societies, the American Psychiatric Association, and the Neuron Club.

Yet, with the full schedule of professional activities, he still found time and energy for the political activities dearest to his heart—those for the benefit of captive nations. He was a founder of the Ukrainian-American Freedom Foundation, had served since 1953 as national president of the Anti-Communist Bloc Nations, and was an active member of the National Advisory Board of the American Security Council.

He received recognition and honors at home and abroad for his endeavors, including receipt of the Captive Nations Eisenhower Proclamation Medal from the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1959, the Medal for the Freedom of Bulgaria from exiled King Simeon in 1968, selection by the mayor of Buffalo as chairman of the Committee on Captive Nations in 1967, attendance at the inaugural ceremonies for the late President Lyndon Johnson in 1964, and participation in dialogs with President Richard Nixon at a Blair House dinner last September.

Dr. Nestor Procyk will be greatly missed by those who knew him personally and by those who are beneficiaries of his dedication. He leaves his wife, Dasha; a son, Nestor Procyk Jr.; two daughters, Diana and Zoreslava Procyk; his mother, Mrs. Kateryna Lubianeky; and a sister, Mrs. John Martin.

Our hearts and our prayers are with

his family. He was a good man and we thank his family for sharing his life with us. We share their sadness now.

CANADIAN ENERGY STUDY DOES NOT PRECLUDE A TRANS-CANADIAN PIPELINE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a recent Wall Street Journal article, commenting on a just released Canadian energy policy report, concluded that the study virtually ruled out the construction of an oil pipeline through the MacKenzie Valley during the current decade. The implication of this article was that the huge demand on the Canadian labor force, various supply industries and capital markets stemming from construction of an oil pipeline in addition to other much needed energy projects would generate strong inflationary pressures, and erode the position of the Canadian dollar in international markets. Naturally, proponents of the trans-Alaska pipeline have seized on this article to further bolster their argument that a Canadian oil line is not worthy of consideration.

Unfortunately, the rather sketchy summary contained in the Journal article is highly misleading because it focuses on only selective parts of the report. Moreover, the report was by no means a definitive statement of Canadian policy. Rather, it was an outline of various policy options that the government should consider as part of its effort to develop a comprehensive Canadian energy policy for the remainder of this century. Only one of the five major options presented in this study would seem to rule out the construction of a MacKenzie Valley oil line. Therefore, in an effort to clear up any misunderstandings that may have resulted from the Journal story, I want to briefly review the report and highlight some key considerations which suggest that construction of a Canadian oil line would not necessarily create unmanageable dislocations in the Canadian economy.

FIVE BASIC POLICY OPTIONS

The actual study is centered on the effects which five hypothetical sets of energy projects would have on the Canadian economy. The five sets of projects are entitled "self sufficiency," "standard development," "extensive development," "maximum development," and "delayed development." All except the self-sufficiency case call for the construction of a natural gas pipeline in the MacKenzie Valley between 1975 and 1980.

The extensive development case also calls for the construction of a MacKenzie Valley oil pipeline in 1978 plus additional oil production projects. The maximum development case further adds a uranium enrichment plant, additional gas pipeline developments, maximum production from oil sands projects and expansion

of refining capacity. The delayed development case is the same as the standard development case with the natural gas pipeline construction and the development of the Mackenzie Valley gas and oil production capacity being delayed to the end of the decade rather than being begun at mid-decade.

The maximum development case is the only case that is declared infeasible by the study, and that case is considered at all times to be "an illustrative case only." All project sets are compared with the macrobase, that which is considered to be the "historical normal" for the Canadian economy. Except for the self-sufficiency case which falls below the historical normal levels for the economy, all

other cases involve greater growth in GNP, larger capital investments, lower unemployment levels, and higher rates of inflation. The relevant question is the degree of deviation from the historical normal and whether the economy can be managed so as to enable greater development of resources, without at the same time creating unwanted inflation, balance of payments and exchange rate problems.

Most importantly for our purposes, the extensive development case, which includes construction of a Mackenzie Valley oil line, is not ruled out by the study. To be sure under "worse case" assumptions the extensive development case would put strong pressures on the Ca-

nadian economy, especially on price levels and the exchange rate. But a more thorough probe reveals that these adverse pressures are not a preordained outcome. They would be substantially alleviated if less Canadian content were used in the construction process, and if offsetting monetary or fiscal policies were employed to achieve a more favorable growth/inflation tradeoff.

CANADIAN CONTENT

The basic study assumes a 60-70 percent level of Canadian content—labor, material, and financing—for pipeline construction. Using this figure, which is repeatedly asserted to be unrealistically high for major pipeline construction, the study yields the following projections:

	Historical normal (percent)	Self-sufficient	Development—			
			Standard	Extended	Maximum	Delayed
Average GNP growth (1973-80) (constant dollars)	4.99	4.59	5.04	5.46	6.43	4.93
Average unemployment	4.93	5.55	4.26	3.62	2.70	4.70
Average price increase	2.59	2.32	3.21	3.88	5.17	2.86

These projections indicate that construction of an oil pipeline would have an important and positive impact on the Canadian economy. Under the extensive development case GNP would be increased significantly and the unemployment rate would be lowered by more than one and one-third percentage points. Naturally, higher levels of national output and employment would raise incomes, increase the real standard of living, and even enlarge tax revenues. The fact that the Canadian Government has recently approved an extensive series of tax changes designed to stimulate the economy suggests that it is not content with the 5-percent-plus unemployment rates that have prevailed for most of the past decade. Therefore, the positive employment and output effects expected from the extensive development case would be highly welcome.

Nevertheless, the projections also suggest that pipeline construction could generate excess demand pressures which would increase the expected rate of inflation. Since Canada is highly dependent upon export markets such a development would obviously be detrimental. Moreover, if the Canadian dollar continues to float in international money markets its exchange value would be obviously reduced by inordinate domestic inflation.

Fortunately, the study suggests that if the historic Canadian content level of 60 to 70 percent is reduced to 50 percent, the danger of overtaxing the domestic economy would be considerably reduced. Moreover, a 50-percent Canadian content assumption is not at all unreasonable in light of the fact that large pipeline construction projects are increasingly becoming truly international efforts. Inputs are now literally drawn from a world market.

A considerable portion of the 48-inch pipe, for example, the most costly construction component, would likely be purchased from Japan. In addition, U.S. produced pipelaying machin-

ery would likely be used, and foreign technicians, skilled craftsmen, and capital would also be required.

Thus, the size of the proposed oil pipeline construction project coupled with the construction of a similar gas pipeline, makes the 50-percent Canadian content assumption highly plausible. While Canadians would obviously desire that local workers and firms have maximum opportunity to participate in the project, there is no reason to believe that this requirement would be carried to such an extreme that the Canadian economy would be severely destabilized in the process. The effects of lowering the Canadian content assumption on the extensive development case, then, are as follows:

	[In percent]		
	Historical normal	Extended development 60-70	50
Average GNP growth (1973-80) (constant dollars)	4.99	5.46	5.31
Average annual unemployment	4.93	3.62	4.0
Average annual price increase	2.59	3.88	3.39

1 Approximately.

The obvious and expected result of lowering the level of construction labor, material and capital demand on the Canadian economy is to reduce the gains in output, as measured by GNP and the unemployment rate, but also to reduce the inflationary pressures that would accompany them, as well. In short, were a more reasonable level of Canadian content used in constructing the pipelines, Canadian GNP would still be raised significantly, in relationship to the normal case the unemployment rate would be lowered from nearly 5 to 4 percent, and only a moderate increase in the inflation rate over the historically projected level would occur. Stated differently, by making a maximum prudent contribution to the construction of the oil pipeline, but not an excessive one, the Canadian

economy would reap significant benefits without sustaining any unacceptable costs.

OFFSETTING FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES

It should be further noted that the study was conducted under the assumption that no Government policies would be used to counteract the effects of increased construction activity. "The control solution assumes that there will be no change in nominal tax rates and that there will be moderate increases in Government expenditures." By not programming monetary and fiscal policy into the model, the estimates produced indicate the maximum effects of a given course of action. From the above tables, it is obvious that the magnitude of such effects for the extensive development case—even in a situation of no Government intervention—cannot be considered unreasonable for the Canadian economy. Though prices would increase by an average 0.8 percentage points faster than they would without building the two pipelines, extensive development causes price increases of only 0.31 percentage points greater than the standard development case.

In any event, these projections represent maximum effects and certainly would require only moderate Government action. Fiscal action, combined with a tight monetary policy could readily ease inflation. Furthermore, a moderately restrictive monetary policy will make it easier to attract foreign capital as Canadian interest rates rise. Hence, domestic inflation could be curbed while the economy continues its high level of activity due to the stimulus provided by the large pipeline construction project.

INFLATED CAPITAL REQUIREMENT ESTIMATES

To arrive at their projections, the Canadian study estimated capital requirements—

To reflect additional expenditures for geological and geophysical activities. While expenditures of this type are usually considered as an operational expense (and not a capital expense)—in this particular study

they are treated as a capital expenditure item as they form an important ingredient of frontier development costs.

This switch in accounting methods raised the amount of capital requirements by 4.4 percent. Exclusion of geological activities from capital needs lowers capital requirements by \$1.62 billion. Such exclusion would lower the impact of the extensive development case even more.

CYCICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The macroeconomic model used by the Canadian study indicated that the Canadian economy may experience a downturn between 1977 and 1979. In light of this possibility, the report concluded:

If the period 1977-1979 should actually develop as shown in the control solution to be a time of relatively slow growth, the construction of a Mackenzie Valley oil pipeline could provide an important stimulus.

The study continues by stating that the use of lower levels of Canadian content in construction and financing—50 percent instead of 60-70 percent—"appears to be a relatively efficient means of reducing the pressures and disruptions of periodic surges in demand for particular goods and services." The reduction in the level of Canadian content involves a direct reduction in demand for those industries which supply pipeline inputs as imports replace domestic inputs.

BALANCE OF PAYMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Lastly, the study focuses on the impact on energy development on the balance of payments. Capital inflow required under traditional levels of Canadian content—60-70 percent—would be \$10.5 billion for the extensive development case. With the more reasonable 50-percent level, required capital inflow is reduced by 38 percent to \$6.5 billion.¹

The surplus on the capital account resulting from the sale of Canadian securities abroad would need to be offset by a deficit on the current account—brought about by increasing imports—so as to bring about a favorable balance of payments. Appropriately, this study notes that—

Investment in energy development has historically led to immediate direct increases on the import of machinery and equipment and other construction materials. As the level of Canadian content of pipeline development in the 1970's is expected to be considerably lower than in the past, because of the size of the projects, the immediate direct increases in imports should be correspondingly larger.

According to the study, the decline in the current account caused by the increased imports may or may not be sufficient to offset increased capital inflows.

In the resource development boom of the mid-1950's, some change in the terms of trade was required to further stimulate imports and hinder exports.

While the absolute amounts of the required deficit appear high by past standards—

¹ When a lower level of Canadian content is assumed, the foreign financing requirements decrease because there is less induced investment in proportion to the net reduction in stimulus to aggregate demand.

When the current account deficit is measured as a proportion of GNE—gross national exchange—the maximum with case B—standard development—is only 1.5 percent in 1976 with the low Canadian content assumption. Under case C—extensive development—the maximum percentage is again 1.5 percent in both 1976 and 1979 (the two periods of pipeline construction).

Thus, it appears that maintaining a favorable balance of payments would not be an insurmountable problem.

It is obvious that the study considers the extensive development case a viable alternative. Though moderate government intervention may be necessary, no extraordinary controls would have to be employed. The extensive development of Canadian energy reserves through the building of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline will not likely tax the Canadian economy beyond its capabilities.

THE NEW AMERICAN-SOVIET TRADE POLICIES

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, this discussion today is especially timely, and I welcome the opportunity to make a few brief remarks.

I recall that only 4 or 5 years ago there was considerable opposition in the Congress to an expansion of East-West trade. Of course, much of this opposition was predicated upon the fact that most of the Communist countries were supplying the North Vietnamese and Vietcong with weapons of war. Now that the American ground combat role in Vietnam has ended, the atmosphere seems to be leaning toward an increase in trade with the Communist nations.

But regardless of a possible change in attitude, I think we still have an obligation to put this matter into perspective. In considering such manifestations of trade as most-favored-nation agreements, we must weigh all the angles in granting preferential treatment to Communist countries.

Certainly, we should always keep in mind that a world power like the Soviet Union is anxious to have trade work in its favor politically. While there has been an outward appearance of a relaxation in cold war tensions, Soviet Russia still has a closed economic system. The Soviet leadership does not look upon trade in the same way we do. Like everything else, trade is only an extension of Soviet political endeavors. Therefore, we must be especially careful in granting them concessions. Whether it be the Soviet Union, or its satellites, or the People's Republic of China, the fact remains that the Communist world is diametrically opposed to our system of government and everything it stands for. I wonder just how much the Communist leadership has departed from the teaching of one of its most revered theorists, Lenin, who maintained that trade should be used as an extension of Communist influence.

Here's what Lenin had to say about the

generosity of the Western world in regard to trade, and I quote:

They will grant us credits, which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armaments industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers.

Now, Lenin may not be as viable in the Communist philosophical context as he was for the first 40 years after his death, but he is about the only early Communist leader whom the contemporary Communist leadership admires. He is taken seriously by the Communist world. If the world's Communist leadership has departed from such a doctrine let them prove it. If they want most-favored-nation treatment, they can start proving their good faith by not promoting conflict in the Mideast, in Korea, in Latin America, in Southeast Asia, and on and on.

The economics of international trade necessitates at least a degree of mutual benefit on the part of the nations entering into trade agreements. This is why reciprocal trade agreements are made—at least theoretically. One nation is supposed to reciprocate for the granting of concessions by another. I am not at all sure that the Communist nations have shown that they are willing to reciprocate, and until so-called wars of liberation are called off by the Communists, this Nation should think twice about granting them MFN and other trade concessions.

COMMUNITY MEALS FOR THE ELDERLY PILOT PROJECT BEGINS IN YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 6, 1973, I had the pleasure of attending the opening luncheon of "Community Meals for the Elderly" at Norton Manor in Youngstown, Ohio. "Community Meals for the Elderly" is a 6-month pilot project administered by the Youngstown Area Community Action Council under a \$27,000 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Besides providing one hot, nutritious meal a day for senior citizens, "Community Meals for the Elderly" is designed to furnish informational, referral and social services, and a "sense of community." By drawing elderly persons out of isolation and into a recreation-socialization atmosphere, meal time will be a happy time. Senior citizens are also encouraged to participate in the program's policy council with representatives of community agencies who could assist them with their problems. At the present time, any person over 60 years of age within walking distance of Norton Manor is eligible. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations and best wishes to the senior citizens, Tom Racich, director of the Youngstown Area Community Action Council, and

Dorothy Edl, manager of Norton Manor, for participating in this program.

Mr. Speaker, "Community Meals for the Elderly" is an example of the kind of program which should be supported by the Congress and the American people. If the "Community Meals for the Elderly" pilot project is the success I expect it to be, I am hopeful that it will be expanded to other communities in Ohio and throughout the country. This program is one small but important way we can show our senior citizens that America cares about them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the program from the official opening luncheon of "Community Meals for the Elderly" in the RECORD at this time:

COMMUNITY MEALS FOR THE ELDERLY

A Six-Month Pilot Program Administered by Youngstown Area Community Action Council.

Official Opening Luncheon, Friday, July 6, 1973, 12 Noon at Norton Manor, 1400 Springdale Avenue, Youngstown, Ohio.

PROGRAM

Master of Ceremonies: Thomas P. Racich, Executive Director, Youngstown Area Community Action Council.

Invocation (Walk-In): Rev. Morris W. Lee, Pastor, Third Baptist Church and Past President, YACAC Board of Directors.

Buffet Luncheon.

Welcome: Herman "Pete" Starks, 2nd Ward Councilman; President YACAC Board of Directors.

Introduction of Guests: Mr. Racich.

Keynote Speaker: Thomas Coppola, YACAC Planner.

Impromptu Comments by Officials: (1) City, (2) County, (3) State, (4) National.

Closing Remarks: Mr. Racich.

Benediction: Rev. Lee.

HONORED GUESTS

Congressman Charles J. Carney, 19th Ohio District, U.S. House of Representatives.

State Representatives: George Tablack, 52nd Ohio District; Thomas P. Gilmartin, 51st Ohio District; and son, Brendan J. Gilmartin (Age 13).

State Senator Harry Meshel, 33rd Ohio District.

Mahoning County Commissioners: George J. Bindas, Chairman; Thomas J. Barrett, John Palermo.

City of Youngstown Finance Director Charles J. Ramsey, Representing Mayor Jack C. Hunter.

Mr. Irvin Ryan, President, Northeastern Ohio Senior Citizen Council.

Mr. James Lottier, Representing Youngstown Metropolitan Housing A.

Mrs. Martha Murphy, Director, Mahoning County Area-wide Project on Aging.

Mrs. Dainty Williams, Community Meals Program Director.

Programs courtesy YACAC Public Relations.

HELP ELECTED REPUBLICAN OFFICIALS

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, volunteers are the lifeblood of our political process and all too often, the lack of recognition of their work makes them unsung heroes. It is to one of these groups that I would like to address myself.

We Republicans in Congress are fortunate indeed in having a volunteer group of ladies who have banded together in an organization called Help Elected Republican Officials or HERO, heroes they are indeed.

This group of some 60 women are always on call to provide all types of emergency office services to Republican Members of Congress when they are deluged with a flood of mail from home, get behind in their filing, et cetera.

"Rusty"—Mrs. James G. Michaux—the volunteer chairman of HERO, has reported that in the 92d session of Congress, her group has answered 1,836 calls for assistance from Republican Members of Congress and responded with a total of 3,196 volunteers who worked a total of 43,642 hours on our behalf.

The volunteer women take pride in the job they are accomplishing and in the work they are doing. To each and every one of them should go heartfelt appreciation from all of us who have been on the receiving end of their patriotism.

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced a bill to amend the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 that would carry out to the maximum extent possible, in my opinion, the recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, which President Nixon has referred to as the Nelsen Commission. As that Commission addressed itself to the question of planning and zoning here in the Nation's Capital and the National Capital region.

The bill would restructure to some extent the membership on the Commission. It would at the same time insure regional representation on the Commission, as well as insure strong input from the local government of the District of Columbia. Furthermore, it would insure that there was one comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia, and that that comprehensive plan would be one administered ultimately by the National Capital Planning Commission, as has been the case in recent years since a need for such a plan first arose.

This bill would also provide that the District of Columbia Zoning Commission could not alter the comprehensive plan, but that rather the Zoning Commission would have to follow the comprehensive plan or else the comprehensive plan would have to be amended to reflect that which would be changed by zoning.

There is currently before the full Committee on the District of Columbia a home rule bill which contains a provision on the National Capital Planning Commission. It is without doubt one of the most controversial provisions contained in the home rule bill. I am hope-

ful that this bill will be treated as a separate bill, taken up on the House floor as a separate bill, because I feel that planning for the District of Columbia is important enough in and of itself for the House to treat it as an independent and individual item of legislation. I think it could be an excellent test vehicle to determine the House sentiment on how the Federal and local interest is to be handled in the District of Columbia today and in the years to come, especially as there is an expansion of the voice of local residents over local affairs.

There may be some who will not agree with certain provisions of this bill, which I believe provides for preservation of the Federal interest, in that the comprehensive plan would rest with the National Capital Planning Commission. However, every effort has been made to balance the Federal and local interest, and I believe the result obtained in the bill would provide a structure for a working partnership between the local government and the Federal Government in achieving the best possible planning for the Nation's Capital and the National Capital region, while at the same time providing a voice in that planning, not only for the local District of Columbia government, but for other local planning agencies in the District environs of the National Capital region.

Since the Nelsen Commission report has been made available to the public, the provision contained therein that would have provided finality of decision-making and protection of the Federal interest through the President's office, acting through the Office of Management and Budget, has prompted Congressman FURQUA and me to refine our thinking somewhat on how best we can achieve finality in planning and zoning in the District of Columbia, while at the same time protecting the Federal interest in the Nation's Capital. Rather than setting up a new structure, we have strengthened to some extent, and provided for finality to a greater extent, in the National Capital Planning Commission. At the same time the bill that we introduce today provides for local planning authority in the Mayor and the District Council and provides for the establishment of a Municipal Planning Office which would be the planning agency for the District of Columbia for local and parochial interest.

I urge your support for this bill, and I would request that all those interested individuals and groups in the community review it in detail, because I believe it has much merit and is a bill that the House as a whole could support.

WATERGATE AND THE REPUBLICANS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the June 1973 issue of the Orange County Observer which I was

pleased to write because its subject matter seems so relevant to today's political discussions arising from the Watergate affair. The article follows:

WATERGATE—REPUBLICAN PARTY WAS NOT INVOLVED

(By Congressman Craig Hosmer)

It seems safe to assume that Republicans all over the country are trying to assess the damage Watergate has done to their Party. It is easy to contemplate 'disaster'. To talk of rebuilding the Party from the ground up.

In my judgment, all of this represents over-simplification. In the first place, the Republican Party, as such, had nothing to do with Watergate. As Republicans, we sincerely regret the decisions and actions of certain weak and foolish men who betrayed their President, their Party and legitimate political processes. Criminal acts, in addition to those already adjudicated, will be prosecuted without favor. But there is no remote connection between these individuals and the Republican Party. President Nixon, in his statement of May 23, categorically said he had no prior knowledge of Watergate, never authorized or knew of offers of executive clemency, did not attempt to implicate the CIA in Watergate, never authorized nor encouraged subordinates to engage in illegal or improper campaign tactics. He has initiated what should be a thorough investigation to learn the truth about Watergate.

IMMEDIATE JOB

Final judgment may be years away.

But elections will be held next year. Our immediate job, therefore, is to set the record straight about the Party itself and the men and women who will be seeking office under its banner in 1974.

Already the gleeful wielders of the tar brush are trying to paint all Republicans into the Watergate mess. Ever the opportunists, Democrats and their many friends in the press, are trying to portray anyone who runs as a Republican next year as a kind of Little Eva running across the ice with the blood hounds at her heels.

To separate froth from fact, two things must be borne in mind: First, Republicans in Congress and in their Party's headquarters were not involved in Watergate. We did not run with CREEP, from whose ranks most of the Watergate conspirators evolved. Quite to the contrary—it was a source of consummate rage last fall that House and Senate candidates were left to fend for themselves as CREEP cornered the funds and squandered the President's image.

Second, Republicans in the House and Senate have been in the forefront of those demanding a complete airing of the Watergate affair, a totally impartial prosecution, and punishment of the guilty. Like a woman scorned, Hell hath no fury like that of an honest Party member betrayed by a bunch of amoral political amateurs trying to crowd under the Party's banner.

DEMAND THE TRUTH

Just as we have demanded the truth, we reject the obsessed who seek to negate our democratic election system by forged or anonymous letters and cables slandering any American, regardless of his Party connections. I do not believe you have to beat Democrats with dirty tricks. I think you can beat them by pointing to their records in Congress and the White House for the last 40 years. Which, I concede, may be a kind of 'dirty trick' in itself, albeit a legitimate one.

And the fact is, the Democrats are going to have to run on that record next year. And while they would be delighted—and doubtless will try—to obscure that record by dragging out the Watergate mess, it is my judgment that the public will be sick and tired of that word by then and will begin asking just what it is the Democrats have accomplished in the 93rd Congress. Unless

they do a lot better than they have been doing, the Democrats are going to find that a very embarrassing question.

DRAWING ITS FEET

Only recently evidence came to light in Congress that the Democrats are not exactly crippling themselves with overwork. Sen. Charles Mathias, Jr., (R., Md.) disclosed that the Democratically-controlled Congress has been dragging its feet on funding some 300 major Federal programs that will be broke by June 30, the end of the fiscal year, unless their money is renewed. These include the food stamp program, military research and development, mortgage interest subsidy payments to middle income families, occupational health and safety and the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. Also facing deadlines are the Clean Air Act, public debt limit and maternal and child health services.

The fact is that in this Congress the Democrats have spent most of their time trying to override—without success—Presidential vetoes of inflationary legislation. In 40 years they have not had a new idea. They still have only one solution to domestic problems—spend more money on them. They know that such spending brings a swift kick in the wallet both at the tax counter and from the toll of inflation it spawns.

HAVE DONE NOTHING

People are aware—or should be made aware—that in straight years of Congressional control the Democrats have done nothing about pension reform, the energy crisis, now upon us, transport and budgetary controls—all projects of our current Administration. Their foreign policy has been a tragic series of blunders and frustrations. Every war in this century in which the United States became involved saw a Democrat in the White House. Under Democratic Administrations we became hopelessly mired down in a no-win war in Southeast Asia. A Republican Administration got us out and brought home our prisoners. At this writing, the Democrats, who had precious few cheers for President Nixon's achievements in Vietnam, are still trying to persuade the Communists to live up to their peace agreements. Their contributions to peace in Southeast Asia add up to zero—or less.

Under Democratic Asian policy we fought two no-win wars and remained light years away from any rational working agreement with the government of 800 million people in Mainland China. When President Nixon took office, he inherited 20 years of estrangement and hostility between China and the United States. The problem was not one of a constantly changing relationship, but no relationship at all. The President changed all this. Three years of careful groundwork produced the historic turning point in our relationship with the People's Republic of China. In President Nixon's words: "My conversations with the Chinese leaders in February, 1972, reestablished contact between the world's most powerful and the world's most populous countries, thereby transforming the post-war landscape. The journey to Peking launched a process with immense potential for the betterment of our peoples and the building of peace with Asia and the world."

The May 1972 summit meeting with leaders of the Soviet Union produced the first agreement between the two nations to limit the strategic weapons that are the heart of their national survival. Future opportunities for cooperation and negotiation were opened up, including increased East-West trade.

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

Attainment of an honorable settlement in Vietnam, though still troublesome, was certainly the major achievement of the past year. Much work remains to consolidate peace in Indochina, but the President and his brilliant advisor, Henry Kissinger, are doing all in their power to bring that about.

In Western Europe, we are consulting closely with our allies. As the President said: "Major political, security and economic negotiations are on the agenda."

Incredibly difficult as these achievements seem, the domestic problems confronting Mr. Nixon when he took office, particularly the Federal budget, were hardly more simple.

It has been 40 years since a Democratic President taught the American people they can vote themselves largesse out of the public treasury. That poison is still at work. The Washington walling wall becomes ever more crowded with mayors, governors and all manner of special pleaders for Federal funds.

KEY FACTS

Here are a few key facts about that Federal budget:

—Since 1950 it has nearly doubled, now taking more than 20 percent of all personal income.

—Growth of Federal spending was especially pronounced under the last years of LBJ, growing at an average rate of 17 percent between 1965 and 1968. In 1963, there were only 160 individual grant programs, but now there are more than 1,000.

—So great is the momentum built into the growth of government, that nearly 75 percent of the fiscal 1974 budget is for virtually 'uncontrollable' items. Interest on the public debt is an example. It is now over \$24 billion annually.

At the present rate of growth, the budget of the Federal government will be over \$1 trillion—\$1,000 billion—by the 1990's. That's about equal to the size of our whole economy today.

BIG GOVERNMENT

The major thrust behind these skyrocketing budget figures is the 'big government' philosophy which began with the New Deal and has continued to grow. President Nixon is trying to put the brakes on that growth, and even the Democratic spenders are beginning to admit that some of the big, costly social programs that seemed to promise so much—such as the elimination of poverty—were a bit overblown to put it mildly, and have failed to produce anything commensurate with their cost.

President Nixon is trying to reduce State and local dependency on Washington via his revenue sharing proposals, elimination of some 115 unnecessary programs and reorganization of others. His basic goals as expressed in his fiscal 1974 Budget Message to Congress are:

To hold down Federal spending so that there will be no need for a tax increase;

HIGH EMPLOYMENT

To move the Nation's economy toward a high employment prosperity (it is close to that now);

Most importantly, to help bring about the change demanded by the great majority of the American people by ending the flow of power to Washington, increasing the reliance on State and local governments, and

To assure the taxpayers that their money is used wisely and efficiently by Government.

Thus the 1974 budget is a blend of sensible economic policy and sensible government.

Democrats have given the President little or no help toward these goals—rather the reverse. But the point to bear in mind is that the battle of the budget is not a battle between Congress and the President. It is a battle between the Democratic spenders in Congress and the taxpayers everywhere. Today, the Republican Party is the only major political party in the country that is fighting that battle on the side of the taxpayers.

None of my comments on Watergate are intended to mean that no changes are needed in the American political system. Change is needed, particularly in the matter of campaign reform, most particularly the problem of dealing with big money contributions. President Nixon has proposed creation of a non-partisan Federal election reform com-

mission to examine 'our entire pattern of campaign practices'. He said: 'The Commission's mandate would be as broad as the Federal election process itself. Nothing would be excluded.' The Commission is to report to Congress and the President by December 1, 1973. It will be interesting to see how many of the Democrats now attempting to smear the Republican Party with Watergate will be as enthusiastic about enacting genuine campaign reform.

TWO-PARTY COUNTRY

It is my judgment that the leadership of the Republican Party here in Congress and throughout the nation are not about to pre-empt the dissolution of that Party because of a handful of weak and foolish men over whom they had no control, no matter how much delight that would bring to some Democrats. Truman's 'mess in Washington' did not destroy their Party. Watergate is not going to destroy ours.

We are still a two-party country.

The goals of the Republican Party—limited government, world peace, a sound and expanding economy—remain intact. We have not discarded the Party platform, and we are not going to.

FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT PARK CHUNG HEE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as one who has followed closely Asian affairs for many years, I was impressed and encouraged by the forward-looking foreign policy address delivered by President Park Chung Hee of the Republic of Korea on June 23.

At a time when U.S. forces are completing their withdrawal from Southeast Asia and North and South Korean military forces face each other across the 38th parallel, President Park has offered a statesmanlike plan for peaceful coexistence between the two Koreas and for their eventual reunification.

Acknowledging that a great many difficult problems remain to be resolved, President Park has made clear that their solution must come through negotiation and conciliation, not confrontation.

Changes in relations among the world's big powers place new pressures and new responsibilities on the maintenance of peace on the Korean peninsula, but those responsibilities must be pursued courageously and aggressively, President Park states.

He has outlined a seven-point program for carrying out that goal. While peaceful unification of Korea remains the supreme task of the Korean people, it can be achieved only by gradual steps taken with sincerity and patience, he says.

South Korea, the President states, will not oppose the North's participation in international organizations, including the United Nations, and South Korea will open its doors to friendly and cooperative relations with all nations of the world.

Peace and good neighborliness are the firm basis of the foreign policy of the Republic of Korea, President Park says.

Mr. Speaker, every American should be encouraged by the reasonableness and

foresight of President Park's message. Prospects for a generation of peace in the world are linked closely to the implementation of his plan for peaceful coexistence between the two Koreas. I commend his remarks to you with the hope that every American will join in wishing President Park and his people success.

Today, I wish to announce the guide-lines of our foreign policy for peace and unification to improve substantially conditions for the attainment of our long-cherished national aspiration—the unification of our fatherland. I make this announcement, taking into account our experiences in the south-north dialogue and the recent developments in international situation.

At the conclusion of World War II, Korea was liberated, but our land was divided and our people were separated against their will.

The 38th Parallel, originally known as a military demarcation line for disarming Japanese forces, turned later into an Iron Curtain. As a result, the south and the north were cut off from each other in political, economic, social, cultural and all other fields.

In the meantime, negotiations were conducted at the meetings of the US-USSR Joint Commission to remove the barrier of the 38th Parallel and to establish a unified democratic government. Yet, these negotiations ended in failure due to basic differences in the positions of the two parties. The Korean question was, then, submitted to the United Nations.

At the Second Session of the United Nations General Assembly convened in 1947, a resolution was adopted calling for free general elections throughout the whole of Korea. The United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea (UNTCOK) was then dispatched to Korea to facilitate this objective.

However, the general elections were held only in the southern part of Korea because of the negative attitude on the part of north Korea. Thus, the Government of the Republic of Korea was established on 15th August, 1948 and was subsequently recognized by the United Nations as the only lawful government in Korea.

On 25th June, 1950, the north Korean Communist forces launched an unprovoked aggression against the Republic of Korea. During the Korean War thus caused, an innumerable number of our brethren lost their lives and the whole country was subjected to destruction by warfare. An armistice was put into effect after three years of war, but the country still remained divided and the prospect of unification of the divided country became even dimmer.

In my Commemorative Address delivered on the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of National Liberation on 15th August, 1970, I called for a relaxation of tension between the south and the north with a view to alleviating the sufferings of our compatriots arising from the division of the country and also to building the foundations for a peaceful unification of the fatherland. On 12th August of the following year our side proposed the South-north Red Cross talks, and on 4th July last year the South-north Joint Communiqué was issued.

The south-north dialogue was thus started. Yet, the results of these dialogues lasting for almost two years since their beginning have been far from our expectations.

In our talks with the north, we have taken the position that both sides should endeavor to gradually remove the artificial barriers between the south and the north by solving easier and more practical problems first and to phase out feelings of mutual distrust and replace them with those of mutual confidence through concrete results. We further pointed out that such an approach would best serve

to make the talks productive and would also serve as a short-cut to the eventual unification of the country by peaceful means.

The north Korean side, in disregard of the existence of deep-rooted feelings of distrust between the south and the north, insisted that military and political problems, which might endanger the security of the Republic of Korea, must first be dealt with, as a package, in the talks. While the very problem of re-unification was being discussed at the talks, the north Korean side was continuously engaged in such external activities as would practically perpetuate the division of the country.

In view of the current status of south-north relationship, it is anticipated that not only many difficulties lie in the way of the dialogue, but a considerable length of time will also be required before the results of the dialogue originally expected can be attained.

Moreover, if the present state of affairs were to be left as it is, the existing feelings of distrust might be deepened and even the tension between the south and the north might be aggravated.

Now, as for the recent developments in the international situation, it may be said that the era of Cold War after World War II came to an end. We have embarked upon a new era of peaceful coexistence, based on the status quo, through the balance of power among the major Powers.

Judging also from a series of events witnessed in this part of the World, it seems unlikely that the unification of our fatherland can be attained within a short period of time.

These international trends give rise to a most serious problem in the history of our nation. The problem is how to pursue the national unification—the supreme aspiration and objective of the entire Korean people—in the face of the stark realities of international situation.

My dear Fifty-million Fellow Countrymen! We must tackle these realities in an active and positive way.

We must formulate wise and firm policies for attaining the goal of national unification in the face of internal and external realities. Then, we must assiduously implement such policies.

We should have peace rooted firmly in this land and should achieve, without fail, the ultimate goal of peaceful unification by our own self-reliant efforts.

With these considerations in mind, I now declare the following policies:

1. The peaceful unification of the fatherland is the supreme task of the Korean people. We will continue to exert every effort to accomplish this task.

2. Peace must be maintained in the Korean peninsula by all means. The south and the north should neither interfere with each other's internal affairs nor commit aggression against each other.

3. We will continue to make efforts with sincerity and patience to secure concrete results from the south-north dialogue based on the spirit of the south-north Joint Communiqué dated 4th July, 1972.

4. We shall not oppose north Korea's participation with us in international organizations, if it is conducive to the easing of tension and the furtherance of international cooperation.

5. We shall not object to our admittance into the United Nations together with north Korea, if the majority of the member-states of the United Nations so wish, provided that it does not cause hindrance to our national unification.

Even before our admittance into the United Nations as a member, we shall not be opposed to north Korea also being invited at the time of the U.N. General Assembly's deliberation of the "Korean question" in which the representative of the Republic of Korea is invited to participate.

6. The Republic of Korea will open its door to all the nations of the World on the basis of the principles of reciprocity and equality. At the same time, we urge those countries whose ideologies and social institutions are different from ours to open their doors likewise to us.

7. Peace and good-neighborliness are the firm basis of the foreign policy of the Republic of Korea. It is reaffirmed that we will continue to further strengthen the ties of friendship existing between our friendly nations and our country.

I wish to make it clear that matters concerning north Korea in the policies enumerated above are interim measures during the transition period pending the achievement of our national unification and that the taking of these measures does not signify our recognition of north Korea as a state.

My dear Compatriots in the South and the North!

Upon an objective and realistic appraisal of the internal and external situations surrounding our fatherland, I have a firm conviction that these policies are the only shortcut to the achievement of peaceful unification by our own self-reliant efforts amidst international currents of relaxation of tension without impairing the dignity and pride of our nation.

There can be no despair or frustration for a wise and courageous people.

Let us march together, with hope, courage and wisdom, toward the attainment of peace in the Korean peninsula, prosperity of the nation and unification of our fatherland.

THE RHODESIAN CHROME IMPORTATION QUESTION

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the fresh efforts being made by an impressive group of Congressmen to sponsor H.R. 8005 and S. 1868 to repeal the so-called Byrd amendment of 1971—now section 10 of the Military Procurement Act—deserve an overwhelming support of the Congress for several reasons, principally:

First. The aggregate of economic and industrial advantages far outweighs the disadvantages in repealing the Byrd amendment.

The enactment of the Byrd amendment of 1971 removing the embargo placed on the importation of Rhodesian chrome by public law pursuant to a United Nation's sanction which this country respected for 4 good years, has caused adverse effects on the economic and industrial condition on the domestic front. During the gloomy period in which the Byrd amendment has been in operation, this country has imported much more ferrochrome than it has chrome ore. Imports of low-priced ferrochrome made in Rhodesia and South Africa, using Rhodesian ore, threaten to destroy the American ferrochrome industry. Cutthroat competition from these imports is made possible by the use of cheap forced labor coupled with generous government subsidies. An industrial "backfire" triggered by the Byrd amendment miscalculation has oc-

curred, and the impact has been especially felt by the Foote Mineral Co. of Ohio—a key lobbyist for the legislation. This company has recently announced its intentions to close its Steubenville plant in Ohio, on the obvious excuse that the company can no longer withstand the adverse effects of selling its products at low prices in order to combat the low-priced foreign—Rhodesian—imports "which have taken as much as 50 percent of the domestic low carbon ferrochrome market this year"—(1972). Heavy unemployment will necessarily result from this drastic action on the part of this onetime advocate of the ill-fated Byrd amendment's dubious package. Other companies similarly affected by this sudden turn of events are exploring other sane outlets or alternatives to stay in business. I am sure that any congressional action to avert this turmoil in the metallurgical industry will be wholeheartedly supported by the industry.

The Ferroalloys Association of the United States a couple of months ago, petitioned the Tariff Commission and the Congress for relief from excessive imports, explaining in unequivocal language the plight of the association traceable to the Byrd amendment. "Effective Government action" the association pleaded, "is needed to insure continued domestic production of chromium products and forestall complete dependence on foreign production and supply." Such governmental action should be swift and decisive. The joint efforts of the Congress and the administration on the framework of H.R. 8005 and S. 1868 would surely be the ideal thing to do in the circumstance.

During 1972 alone, some 9,380 tons and 32,782 tons of ferrochrome were imported from Rhodesia and South Africa respectively, totaling 42,162 tons, almost equal to the total imports between 1966 and 1971. Already a total of 18,490 tons of ferrochrome have been imported from these two sources for the first quarter of this year alone. This is by no means a happy trend. These import channels are rapidly expanding while this country's dependence on foreign source of supply is correspondingly increasing. The "strategic" banner under which this trend has reared its ugly head, is no longer strategic—it is a serious aberration which has exposed our domestic chromite producers to possible "extinction." To avoid extinction, it would be necessary and economically expedient for our chrome producers shifting their operations to the sources in southern Africa and leaving the home plants idle. In this period of persistent inflation, nothing should be done to stimulate thoughtless risks and ill-advised deployment of hard-earned capital abroad to salvage the apartheid and minority regime in Southern Africa. We must return to our stand prior to 1971, when we were a law-abiding member of the United Nations.

Second. This country's conduct since 1971 has amounted to a mortgage of our national conscience and decency by deliberately disobeying the U.S. economic sanction on Rhodesia.

The fundamental point to note in this connection is that this country is un-

disputably reputed for its leadership in the permeation of democratic principles and ideals both at home and abroad. Presidential foreign policy reports year in and year out have articulated this disposition. President Nixon in his 1973 report, at page 125 declares as follows:

Our policy goals in Africa are unchanged: political stability, freedom from great power intervention, and peaceful economic and social development. We seek positive bilateral relations with African nations founded on their self-reliance and independence, and on forms of support which we can sustain over the long term. (Emphasis added.)

Admittedly, America is opposed to "great power intervention" in African affairs—America included—and would not attempt to do anything or support any form of activity which is both ephemeral and ideologically suspect. It will be self-defeating and unconscionable if these foreign policy goals were to be subverted by the very instrumentality through which these goals were to be achieved. The President has said in connection with African nationhood:

The birth of Africa's new nations was one of the dramatic features of the postwar period. The assertion of black nationhood in Africa coincided with a new affirmation of black dignity in America, creating a special bond of sympathy between the United States and the new Africa. . . . There was no question about America's continuing commitment to the goals of regional peace, economic development, self-determination, and racial justice in Africa. (Emphasis added.)

If these statements really represent America's attitude toward Africa and America truly recognizes Africa's genuine efforts to survive a harsh period of colonial "tutelage" and its aftermaths, it is difficult to see the rationale in keeping on the Statute Books laws like the Byrd amendment. The present state of the law is anathema to America's foreign policy declarations. It is an open secret that the two notorious regimes in Southern Africa substantially on their survival to large scale investment in their mineral resources. The United Nation's sanctions were designed to positively denounce and "condemn" the regimes in southern Africa on the one hand, and to indicate to them that the twentieth century world community of nations decried oppression and oppressive regimes in whatever forms these may be.

Thus, the arguments already advanced for the continuation of this country's open disobedience of the United Nation's sanction are trite, devious and unwarranted. The strategic needs of this country do not justify this attitude and indeed, similar attitude of American investors in southern Africa. There is an almost unlimited economic potentiality in Africa—excluding southern Africa—into which those zealous American investors can safely sink their capital and look forward to rich returns in the course of a short time. An important fact to note is that America can very well save itself from an inevitable embarrassment, by not creating a situation whereby African nations will have to send an "S.O.S." to our Government, and indeed this Congress to thwart the ignoble roles American capitalists are playing in Africa. Every effort should be made to

avoid unwittingly drifting into such a bottleneck.

In conclusion, I would strongly urge support of the objectives of H.R. 8005 and S. 1868.

TRINITY STUDY INVOLVES PUBLIC

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Dallas Morning News for Sunday, July 8 concerning the studies of the Trinity River. Working on the proven basis that an informed public is an intelligent public, the Trinity River Authority envisions a number of public meetings in conjunction with the required studies on water quality and river basin management.

The article follows:

TRINITY STUDY INVOLVES PUBLIC

(By Dorothie Erwin)

There are few things less thrilling to hear about than a government study—especially a longrange government study.

The water quality management study by the Trinity River Authority (TRA), under way for more than a year and still a year away from completion, certainly lacks dramatic content to attract the public's attention at this point. Can any of us be amazed or informed by news of a mathematical model of the Trinity River system?

But the study is at the public involvement stage now, and those responsible for it think it will produce a better and more workable river-management plan if it can find an interested and informed "public" over the next few months.

TRA's staff and its advisory committee of public officials throughout the diverse river basin need input now from the river's users, to supplement the data collected from official sources and from technicians' monitoring instruments. Those users include the riverside ranchers and the Sunday canoe-paddlers; the land developers, the fishermen and the wildlife protectors.

"What we want is unqualified participation in the planning process," says William R. Brown, TRA basin planning manager who will have charge of this phase of the study. "Where the citizens of the basin have ideas about how to achieve water quality and how to be successful in managing the highest water quality standards, we want to work with them and want them to feel a part of the planning process."

Brown said TRA will increase its contacts with interested citizens' groups. These have been limited in the past by the small size of TRA's staff and the great expanse of the affected area—18,000 square miles and more than 150 cities and towns in the basin.

To be scheduled during the remainder of this summer throughout the basin are some "review and comment" workshops for special interest groups and public officials. These workshops, less formal than public hearings, are intended to provide for an explanation of the study project and an exchange of views about it, Brown said.

Specifically included among the special interest groups will be environmental and sportsmen's organizations. Chambers of Commerce, home owners associations, farm groups and others will also be invited.

Coming within the next few months will be a brochure for wide distribution, containing general information about the water quality plan and its uses; and a newsletter to be sent periodically to interested citizens' groups and to local and state governmental agencies to keep them informed of the progress of the study.

TRA's study director Alan H. Plummer, biologist Dr. Richard Browning and seven other fulltime staff members are at work on the project, whose \$643,000 cost is being shared by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, the Texas Water Quality Board and TRA.

By this time next year they expect to complete the adaptation of a mathematical model to the specific conditions of this river. It will provide the basis for waste-management planning all along the river in the future—and it is at that future stage that the work will have its public effect on recreational uses of the Trinity waters and land use along their banks. The study area includes all or part of 38 counties.

This mathematical model is no tangible object but is a set of data, stored in state and federal agencies' computers and retrievable on demand from computer terminals in this region. Its value is that it should permit informed decision-making for control of pollution in the river and its tributaries.

With this data, cities and enforcement agencies can predict the effects of all types of waste discharges—municipal, industrial, agricultural—on the dissolved oxygen content of the water and therefore on the river's life-sustaining capability.

Other products of the study will include a new mapping and coding of the river system for purposes of systematic monitoring; a diagnosis of the causes of the early-stage eutrophication that is occurring now in Lake Livingston's upper end; a plan for sewage treatment facilities around the lake, and some updating of regional sewage treatment plans already drawn up in other parts of the watershed.

Dates for the first workshops are to be announced soon. Meanwhile, TRA has a program of slides and commentary on the water quality study that is available now for scheduling by interested organizations.

AMERICA'S NEW FRIEND, COMMUNIST CHINA, STANDS WITH SIHANOUK FOR THE CONQUEST OF CAMBODIA

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a published report from Peking states that Chinese Premier Chou En-lai and Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia appear to stand solidly together in Prince Sihanouk's appeal for arms and ammunition to support his forces in Cambodia and the total collapse of the present Phnom Penh Government. The account was published in the Christian Science Monitor for Monday, July 9:

SIHANOUK PLEADS ARMS FOR HIS CAMBODIANS

(By John Burns)

PEKING.—Prince Norodom Sihanouk has issued an impassioned appeal to third-world countries to support his forces in Cambodia, and in effect, break the Paris peace agreement by supplying arms and ammunition.

The need for military supplies was the

principal theme of a banquet speech in which the exiled Cambodian leader repeated his categorical refusal to negotiate a compromise solution to the Cambodian problem and demanded that the United States and its Indo-China allies cease all interference in Cambodia.

Both Samdech Sihanouk and his banquet host, Chinese Premier Chou En-lai, bitterly condemned what they described as plans to introduce Thai and South Vietnamese troops in support of the government of President Lon Nol, which is faced with the prospect of a cutoff of U.S. bombing support on Aug. 15.

But to diplomats, the most intriguing part of Mr. Sihanouk's speech was his plea for arms and ammunition from "all fraternal countries and anti-imperialist comrades-in-arms."

Samdech Sihanouk's pledge that his forces will continue the fight "even if there are left for them only the archaic weapons of their ancestors" left many diplomats with the impression that the military arm of the prince's united front government may be facing an arms and ammunition shortage greater than the Prince previously has been willing to concede.

If directed principally at China, there was nothing in Premier Chou's speech to indicate Peking is ready to comply.

The Chinese leader made no mention of arms, limiting himself to a reiterating the demand that the United States immediately cease all its military activities in Cambodia. The Premier emphasized his government stands solidly behind Samdech Sihanouk's "just struggle."

Diplomats in Peking considered it highly unlikely Peking will agree to Mr. Sihanouk's plea since doing so would involve a breach of an international accord, and cut the ground from China's vigorous condemnation of U.S. military interference in Cambodia.

The Prince seemed to anticipate Chinese inhibitions on the subject by declaring that an effective response to his appeal "will not at all violate the spirit and letter" of the Paris accord, since the entire world knew that the accord and the article in it referring to Cambodia "are being violated from top to bottom and solely by the government of the United States."

EFFORT AT PERSUASION

Samdech Sihanouk seemed to indicate he was preparing for a determined effort to persuade the Chinese the time has come to abandon inhibitions about the Paris agreement. The Prince has spoken before of Chinese insistence on observing the accord, saying that Premier Chou emphasized that an arms consignment delivered shortly before the accord was signed was the last that China could give him.

For his part, the Chinese Premier looked forward confidently to the "total collapse" of the Phnom Penh government.

Prince Sihanouk denounced as a "propaganda trick" and "hypocrisy" suggestions by Washington that secret negotiations to end the war are under way. He said Cambodians would never accept a negotiated settlement that established a coalition government, or one that divided the country.

The U.S. News & World Report on July 16 had this comment about Chou En-lai:

The apparent refusal by Chou En-lai to come to the White House this autumn was a big disappointment to the President who had extended an open invitation to China's Premier. Nixon aides consider Chou's attitude on a trip to the U.S. as a real test of how far China will go to warm relations with this country.

Pretty is as pretty does. We want Communist China's friendship but there is a limit to the price we can afford to pay.

MISS ENID BAA, REMEMBERING THE PAST FOR THE PRESENT

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, the Virgin Islands is extremely proud and fortunate to have, as one of our own, a woman who has distinguished herself in the field of libraries and historic records. In fact, without exaggeration I can attribute the state of the Virgin Islands Library system and fine collection of important papers to the efforts of Miss Enid Baa.

The local and international recognition and honor that has been given to the work of Miss Baa is certainly deserving. She, more than anyone else, is responsible for the existence of our fine public libraries. Additionally, she has made most valuable contributions to the preservation and cataloging of historic documents of the Virgin Islands, most notably the important Von Scholten collection. Miss Baa has also found the time to participate, throughout the world, in the advancement of library science.

On a more personal level, Miss Baa is owed a great debt of gratitude. Perhaps because so much of her life has been immersed in the flow of history, she is always able to maintain her perspective of events in their larger context. For whatever reason, Miss Baa has been a wise and steady counselor to many of us, sharing the lessons of history which she has so well recorded.

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago Gov. Paul M. Pearson recognized the devotion Miss Baa had to books, and appointed her supervising librarian of the Virgin Islands. As such, she was the first woman to hold a cabinet level office in the territory. It was a very wise appointment. To this day, Miss Baa remains responsible for the maintenance of the library system as Director of Libraries, Museums and Archives.

On July 5, the Weekly Journal, a new weekly newspaper distributed throughout the islands, published a profile of Miss Baa. I am sure that Members of this House will be interested to read of the career of this distinguished Virgin Islander who has done so much to prepare us for the present by reminding us of the past:

ENID BAA: 40 YEARS AS V.I. LIBRARIAN, AND STILL GATHERING LITERARY LAURELS
(By Sylvia Stipe)

Miss Enid Baa is a shy, soft-spoken lady with a warm smile. There's a twinkle in her eye that gives away her great sense of humor.

She has a weakness for amethysts, even though they aren't her birthstone. "I just think they're beautiful and I can't resist them," she says, referring to the two amethyst rings and pendant she wears.

But don't let this gentle exterior fool you. Enid Baa is a very prominent woman, and she's proven it many times over, both here in the Virgin Islands and in the international library field.

40TH ANNIVERSARY

Last Sunday, on July 1, Miss Baa celebrated the 40th anniversary of her appointment as Supervising Librarian of the Department of Public Libraries of the V.I. She was the first woman to become a member of the Governor's Cabinet in the history of the territory, and also the youngest.

Her official title now is Director of Libraries, Museums and Archives, but she still has the same passion for books that she developed in high school.

AGE NO SECRET

She was born on St. Thomas, "in the vicinity of the Catholic Church," to Orlanda and Sarah Baa. Her birthdate is Sept. 28, 1911, and she tells it freely. "What difference does it make?" she says. And her serene expression and youthful bearing show that, though she will be 62 this year, the dates really don't matter.

When she was very small, her family moved to Santo Domingo. When asked why they moved there, Miss Baa explains that it was the place to go and try to earn a good living at that time.

However, she adds, "We were Virgin Islanders, and we came back because we belonged here. We got back just in time for the transfer of the Danish West Indies to an American territory on March 31, 1917, and just in time for me to become an American citizen."

FIRST GRAD

Miss Baa's interest in library science goes back to her days at the original Charlotte Amalie High School, where she was one of the first four graduates. She helped establish the first high school library there, and remained involved with it after class hours and during summer and Christmas holidays.

By the way, the other three graduates on the island with Miss Baa included Eric Smith, Albert Commissiong, now vice-president of the V.I. National Bank, and Elin Holst, daughter of the then-president of the Danish West Indian Bank.

At one time, the Baa family occupied the old Danish estate buildings in Dorothea, which Miss Baa's father sold to the government and that now are the site of the Agricultural Station.

Miss Baa says that she really loved that house and has some very happy memories of their life in Dorothea overlooking the Atlantic and Inner and Outer Brass Islands. She laughingly says that she "never quite forgave" her father for selling the place.

HONORS BEGAN EARLY

Books have been Miss Baa's life, and she demonstrated such keen interest in her studies that after graduation from high school in 1931 she was selected for the first Interior Department Scholarship to Howard University in Washington, D.C.

But she only spent one school year there because she was chosen by then-Governor Pearson and the Carnegie Foundation for another scholarship to the Graduate Library School at Hampton Institute.

Despite the fact that she was only in her second year as a university undergraduate, she completed this graduate course among the top third in the class of 1933 and returned to the Virgin Islands to be appointed by Governor Pearson as Supervising Librarian for the territory.

She was the head of the then-Department of Public Libraries, and thus became the first woman to hold a cabinet level office in the V.I. Government. Under her guidance, the libraries of all three islands grew in size and the services they offered increased.

EXCHANGE LIBRARIAN

In January, 1943, Miss Baa was selected as exchange librarian between the University of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Dur-

ing this time she served for five months at the University of Puerto Rico.

In the fall of 1943 Miss Baa returned to the United States to matriculate at Columbia University to complete her undergraduate college work which was interrupted when she accepted the Carnegie scholarship.

She received her Bachelor of Science degree in 1949, and the Graduate School of Library Science at Hampton simultaneously conferred on her the post-graduate degree of Bachelor of Science in Library Science.

Miss Baa held various positions following her Columbia University post. She was Fellow Librarian at Queen's College in the United Nations Library in Lake Success, New York, in 1949 to 1950, where she worked in English, Spanish, Portuguese and French languages.

She was reference librarian and cataloger of the Woodrow Wilson League of Nations Documents presented in July, 1950, to the United Nations, and in 1950-51, she specialized in cataloging Spanish and Portuguese materials for the New York Public Library.

On her return to the islands again, Miss Baa was appointed Library Consultant to the Governor under Governor Morris de Castro, and served until 1954. With the reorganization of the territorial government under the Revised Organic Act, she was appointed Director of Libraries and Museums under Governor Archibald Alexander in 1954, the position that she still holds today.

In 1955 Miss Baa was awarded the John Hay Whitney Foundation Fellowship for her contribution to the preservation of the Sephardic Jewish Records of the Virgin Islands and the re-organization and indexing of these records in a card file.

Her proposal was to continue graduate studies in this field, but unfortunately she couldn't take advantage of these benefits and had to give up the fellowship.

The index, however, is an invaluable research source to genealogists, listing references to the family records of Virgin Islands outstanding Sephardim: Judah Philip Benjamin, Camille Pissaro, the Da Costas, Montanos, de Castros, de Solas, Yulees and other greats who lived in these islands from 1780 to 1954.

Miss Baa still continues to work in this field and has published a paper entitled "Preservation of Sephardic Records" in American Jewish Historical Society Publications. This work organized the births, deaths, and marriages of this ethnic group who migrated to the Virgin Islands from Spain and Portugal in the 17th Century.

Today, as Director of Libraries, Museums and Archives, Miss Baa is credited with the initiation and preservation of one of the rarest collections of Virgin Islands materials housed in the Public Libraries.

This collection, known as the Von Scholten Collection, was so designated by her in 1959 as a tribute to the emancipator of Danish West Indian slaves in 1848.

The collection developed from a legacy of about 30 books in 1933 to include hundreds of rare books, newspapers, periodicals and government publications in several languages, plus records, family photographs, Bibles, manuscripts, coins and much more.

The collection, under the watchful eye of Miss Baa, is growing and in constant use by students from local schools and colleges as well as scholars in the field of Caribbean studies.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Miss Baa is a member of many professional associations that span the globe. They include the American Library Association, where she served for two years on the governing body, plus associations in Britain and Italy. She is also active in historical associations, both local and international, and has been the recipient of honors and prizes almost too numerous to list.

As a speaker, Miss Baa has identified herself as a woman of achievement. She has participated at various national and international conferences, usually representing the Virgin Islands.

She was a member of the first Board of Directors of the Association of Caribbean Universities and Research Institutions and Libraries, and she has many publications to her credit.

AND FIRST IN THE POCKETS OF THEIR COUNTRYMEN

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today America thrashes about in the throes of severe economic distress, ravaged by inflation and haunted by the spectre of shortages in a number of vital areas. Most average families, and I am not speaking of those below the poverty line, are finding it extraordinarily difficult to make ends meet, and this in a time when the average American mother and wife has left the home and found work to add extra dollars to strained budgets.

It almost goes without saying that the administration has created economic chaos through unenlightened tinkering with economic forces it only partially comprehends. Today, as the dollar reels abroad, sustaining two devaluations with a third in the offing, its difficulties are matched by impending catastrophe here at home.

The stock market has taken and is continuing to sustain a pummeling that bids to rival plunges of the Hoover era. Small investors have watched helplessly as a market out of control ravaged their painstakingly acquired stock portfolios. Scandal beclouds Wall Street, as scandals pile upon one another.

While lettuce reaches the unheard-of price of 70 cents a head and we are informed by solemn administration economic wizards that food shortages may be impending, we are confronted by gasoline shortages and potential massive hikes in the price of natural gas. Our oil industry, swollen with profit and unfair tax privileges, unblinkingly informs us we shall have to pay their price for necessities of life.

Housing prices have risen out of sight as building material costs skyrocket. Meanwhile, a lumber industry, allowed unique access to public timber resources, rakes in Japanese payments because so many logs from national forests are being shipped abroad. Simultaneously, almost 70 percent of the American people have been priced out of the housing market.

Industry profits, as press reports of recent months indicate, have hit all-time highs, as a few hundred corporations controlling the Nation's economy rake in fruits of price hikes this administration has allowed.

But the prize for greed should go to America's banks, who have raised their prime interest rates 10 times since the start of this calendar year. Already swollen with profits, banks have just been allowed to hike the prime borrowing rate

to an unheard of 8 1/4 percent and we are breathlessly informed still another interest rate rise is just around the corner.

Can anyone doubt that the average man will pay for every cent of this? Mr. and Mrs. "working citizen" will absorb it all when they shop, apply for a mortgage or buy an auto or appliance. Such rises in the prime rate are merely institutionalized usury.

The manner in which such actions are taken amply illustrate the thinking prevailing in high banking circles.

Now although I cannot hold a candle to economic wizards of high amperage who created this unique situation, as I understand it, this is the interest rate our largest banks charge their best customers; those borrowing massive sums of money.

An average man or family seeking a mortgage or loan would not qualify as a preferred customer. Therefore, it follows he will have to pay more in interest to borrow any sum of money. So home mortgages and other loans will soon carry interest rates in excess of the 8 1/4 percent prime rate.

That spells enormous profits for banks and more economic strain for the citizen. It means our present economic situation will worsen.

I urge the administration to roll back this last prime interest rate hike. However, whether or not the administration heeds such urging, it is vital to inform our people of what is transpiring in their name. We must ensure that the citizenry is aware of what is being done to them, so that when the worm turns, it shall know who to head for.

So here's a big hurrah for America's bankers. If George Washington was first in war and first in peace, then the banks are most assuredly collectively first in the pockets of their countrymen.

EVERYTHING YOU NEED FOR A WAR

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a veteran of Vietnam who writes not just to me but to "the rest of Congress." He tells us why he went, and how he feels about it now. Though it hurts to read it, I feel that all my colleagues will wish to do so:

JULY 10, 1973.

DEAR BELLA (and the rest of Congress): I am writing in support of your bill to grant unconditional amnesty to draft evaders. Any healthy person can see how wrong that war was, but we still continue to punish those who refused to take part in it.

It is so frustrating to hear the arguments against amnesty. Even some of my friends feel that all of the deserters were merely cowards, who deserve their fate because they refused to do what a few politicians and other morons called "their duty." And they go on to say that there was not a moral question involved in their decisions; that they didn't give a damn about right or wrong and were only looking out for their own skins. These are shallow opinions, but even if they were true, would those be good reasons for punish-

ing someone? To punish them simply because they were afraid of dying in a war that not even the politicians could justify? That's crazy!

And here's something just as crazy: I went to that war, though I knew how wrong it was. I was a medic with the infantry and I learned all about the sickness and tragedy of it all. I remember the wise old saying I had printed on my helmet: "What if they gave a war and nobody came." That was the saying, the wise old saying, that I believed in, but didn't follow. I showed up like all the other pea brains, but I have never had any respect for my decision. I could not see any sane reason for the Vietnam war, but I was afraid of consequences. I was afraid of dying, just like everyone else, but I was also afraid of never being able to return to my home if I refused to go. I'm sure there were many others with my type of courage, but I feel that most of the boys who went to Vietnam gave very little thought to what they were doing. They just went and were either blown up or not blown up. They didn't need a reason. It was just something Americans had to do once in a while.

So there you have everything you need for a war. A few mentally ill politicians and millions of children who are full of ignorance and fear. That's really all you need and we had just what it takes.

And today we punish those who were sane enough not to go. It makes you feel the world is crazy.

Sincerely yours,

JIM JANKO.

PRAISE FOR THE VOLUNTEERS

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the worst of weather has brought out the best in the people of Greenville, S.C.

In a recent crisis, the volunteers of the Greenville County Chapter of the American National Red Cross showed great ability and compassion in helping those in need of shelter from the storm, according to the chapter's chairman, Luther Boliek.

I wish to join Mr. Boliek in commending these people for a fine job, and to express on behalf of myself and the community appreciation and admiration for the Red Cross. The complete text of Mr. Boliek's letter follows:

GREENVILLE, S.C., June 1, 1973.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANN: Tuesday, May 22, the Board of the Chapter approved a written Disaster Preparedness and Relief Plan for Greenville County as recommended by Chairman Ray Owens. The plan included the work of subcommittees for Medical and Nursing, Shelter, Food, Clothing, Communications, Transportation, and Family Service. Sunday night, May 27, 1973, the tornado struck!

Within 20 minutes the Chairman and his Vice-Chairmen, Ed M. West and Jim Goldfinch, reported to the Chapter House and began putting into action three shelters and organizing back-up staff.

Before the evening was over, 269 persons were housed and fed. Volunteer nurses assisted at each shelter with a volunteer shelter manager in charge. In addition to small babies who arrived without milk and diapers,

several elderly persons with heart conditions, diabetes, emphysema and the usual trauma that goes with such an experience were aided. Breakfast was served at 7:30 the next morning.

Mr. Owens, the first black man that I know of who holds the position of Disaster Preparedness Chairman, showed skillful leadership in directing the efforts of fifty-six trained Red Cross volunteers as well as volunteers from the Blue Ridge Radio Society, Greenville React, Jaycee-ets and Boy Scouts. He set up relief teams on a six-hour rotating basis.

Monday and Tuesday, Red Cross-trained volunteers assisted 15 families who suffered total loss of their mobile homes and personal possessions with immediate emergency assistance on a need basis. The total of this assistance was \$4,560. In addition, a month's supply of food stamps valued at \$1,084, donated clothing and canned goods were issued.

We are very fortunate that damage was not greater. Weather observers tell us that conditions were right for very severe storms. However, with the capabilities and volunteer manpower resources, the plan Mr. Owens has devised possesses the capacity to meet even greater crisis.

Mr. Owens demonstrated his ability not only to lead, but to inspire others as well. Mr. West and Mr. Goldfinch organized their committees with skill and alertness. Would you as a public official take the time to recognize these outstanding volunteers who served Greenville County so well? Thanks very much.

Sincerely,

LUTHER BOLIEK,
Chapter Chairman.

CALIFORNIA POOR BETTER SERVED
IF STATE OFFICE FOLLOWS LAW:
GAO

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, during a recent session of the Senate select committee's investigation of the Watergate affair Senator HOWARD BAKER made a well-known observation: "There's more than one way to skin a cat." This principle was surely embodied by the Nixon administration's late attempt to dismember the Office of Economic Opportunity. The appointment of Howard Phillips as Acting Director of OEO exemplifies both Mr. Nixon's position and his tactics. But OEO also has other enemies, for example Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California. While Mr. Phillips attempted to dismantle the agency which he commanded, Mr. Reagan has tried to discredit it. This occurred most notably with regard to California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. Yet thankfully, because acting directors can be deposed and slanderous publicity can be proven incorrect, the cat is still alive.

On the 14th of June the General Accounting Office issued a report documenting an invidious series of abuses of the Economic Opportunities Act by the California State Economic Opportunities Office—CSEOO. By flagrantly disregarding the conditions set forth by its funding agreement this office has displayed a callous disregard for the underprivileged in California.

CCIX—1478—Part 18

The Comptroller General's report, prepared at the request of myself and 21 colleagues in the House and Senate, states that in 1972 OEO funded CSEOO in order that it might, "first, provide technical assistance to OEO grantees, primarily community action agencies; second, advise the Governor and OEO about the operation of OEO programs; and third, mobilize State resources to help the poor." Instead of strictly adhering to this dictum CSEOO utilized 30 percent of its grant to "investigate and unilaterally evaluate OEO grantees within the State." These actions were forbidden by the grant after a similar obsession the previous year. The 1972 grant states that—

The CPA's (community program analysts) role as evaluator has not proven to be compatible with his role as a provider of assistance.

The community program analysts are those who continued to carry out CSEOO's investigations.

Since the Department of Human Resources Development was specifically empowered to make such investigations when deemed necessary by the State legislature, community action agency staff or boards, concerned citizens, or by the office of the Governor. I must conclude that CSEOO's activities have reflected the concerns of the Republican administration of California. The antagonism of Gov. Ronald Reagan toward Government antipoverty programs is an unfortunate reality.

The GAO report enumerates several other areas in which CSEOO has violated its Federal guidelines or has simply failed to act conscientiously in behalf of the poor. Most significantly, first, in 1972 CSEOO illegally spent \$60,000 for consultant services; second, CSEOO did not satisfy OEO's non-Federal contribution requirements for 1972; third, CSEOO violated an OEO policy of returning or reprogramming unused funds; fourth, CSEOO did not establish an advisory committee to comply with its 1972 grant; and fifth, almost half of CSEOO's professional staff did not fulfill the conditions set forth by written job descriptions.

In May of this year OEO's then Acting Director stated that OEO has begun correcting these problems. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to this report, under the title "Activities of the California State Economic Opportunities Office," B-130515, in hopes that these reforms will indeed take place and that CSEOO will better serve the needs of poor Californians which, after all, is its duty and privilege. I offer the selection entitled "Digest" for publication in the RECORD:

ACTIVITIES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY OFFICE

DIGEST

Why the review was made

At the request of 22 Members of Congress from California (see apps. I and II), the General Accounting Office examined charges made about certain activities of the California State Economic Opportunity Office—an Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) grantee.

The California State office provides technical assistance to OEO grantees and advises OEO and the Governor regarding the

operations of antipoverty programs within the State.

During program years 1966 through 1972, the State office received \$4 million from OEO including \$1 million for program year 1972.

Findings and conclusions

Investigations and Evaluations

It was charged that the State office had used technical assistance resources to conduct investigations hostile to OEO grantees and not authorized by the grant.

The OEO grant for program year 1972 prohibited the State office from conducting investigations of OEO grantees. The grant did permit the State office to evaluate these same grantees, but only in conjunction with OEO. Investigations were to be conducted by the State Department of Human Resources Development. (See p. 9.)

Investigations are generally initiated in response to complaints of irregularities in the program activities of OEO grantees or individuals associated with or employed by grantees. Evaluations, on the other hand, cover program effectiveness, personnel, and fiscal aspects of grantee operations.

During program year 1972 the State office had an average of 25 professional staff, 9 of whom were used to conduct at least 12 investigations and 13 unilateral evaluations of OEO grantees. These activities accounted for over 30 percent of total staff time at an estimated cost of about \$133,000. (See p. 10.)

The OEO San Francisco regional office was aware of the State office's unilateral evaluation activities. Although such evaluations were prohibited, GAO found no evidence that OEO had sought to prevent the State office from performing them.

Regional office officials said they were in contact with the State office on this matter and that the evaluations were useful to the regional office in discharging its responsibilities.

OEO regional office officials informed GAO they were unaware that the State office was conducting investigations during program year 1972. The State office informed GAO it considered its investigative activities necessary and simply the routine gathering of information to use in making recommendations to the Governor. They further said State Department of Human Resources Development investigators were not used more extensively because they were not trained adequately in OEO regulations. (See p. 10.)

OEO headquarters informed GAO that the evaluations and investigations were performed by the State office with full knowledge on the part of OEO and thus it may be said that these prohibitions were implicitly waived by OEO.

Professional staff qualifications and salaries

It was charged that the State office had filled professional staff positions with persons lacking proper qualifications.

GAO's comparison of the State office's written job qualifications with personnel records showed that it was questionable as to whether 13 of 27 professionals employed as of August 1972 met specific job qualifications relating to education and/or experience at the time they were hired.

However, the ambiguous language of the job descriptions prevented GAO from conclusively determining whether the employees met the qualifications required for their positions. (See p. 17.)

Ten of the 27 employees were hired at salaries, or given salary increases, exceeding OEO's limitations without obtaining OEO's required approval. (See p. 21.)

Consultant contracts

It was charged that the State office had contracted for consultant services in violation of maximum fee regulations.

Section 602(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act provides that consultants may not be paid more than \$100 a day. During pro-

gram year 1972 the State office spent about \$158,000 for 15 consultant contracts—9 with individuals for consultant services on a daily fee basis and 6 with consultant firms on fixed-price contracts.

The \$100 a day limitation applies only to the contracts with individuals; none of the nine contracts with individual consultants provided for payments of fees exceeding the \$100 limitation.

GAO noted, however, that the State office:

Spent at least \$60,657 of technical assistance funds to hire consultants without the necessary authority.

Engaged consultants without competition or without adequate justification for going sole source, contrary to State regulations and OEO instructions.

Issued contracts and authorized contractors to proceed before obtaining the required approval from designated State agencies.

The State office's internal controls over contracting procedures generally were inadequate; the State office consistently went outside normal administrative channels established by the State to obtain consultant services. (See p. 24.)

Unexpended carryover funds

It was charged that OEO had violated its regulations relating to carryover balances in order to increase the State office's funding level.

Although OEO established a policy in April 1970, aimed at having a grantee's unexpended funds returned to the U.S. Treasury or reprogrammed to reduce Federal funding of grantee's operations, the State office was permitted to keep \$64,343 in unexpended funds. This increased the funding level of its technical assistance grant for program year 1972 from \$790,339 to \$854,682.

OEO said its policy represented sound fiscal policy when issued but was not required by law and that OEO was not legally obligated to recover the unexpended funds. OEO said the State office was permitted to use the unexpended funds to cover a disputed claim for expenses incurred in connection with a legal services program. (See p. 30.)

Non-Federal contribution

It was charged that the State office had failed to comply with the non-Federal contribution requirements for program year 1972.

OEO requires State agencies to provide either cash or in-kind contributions of at least 20 percent of program costs.

The State office's non-Federal contribution requirement for program year 1972 amounted to \$249,436, including \$78,436 of mostly non-Federal contributions which had been questioned by OEO audits in previous years. GAO found that the State office's non-Federal contribution for program year 1972 may have been deficient by \$143,585 because of questionable claims. (See p. 33.)

Prior year audit exceptions

In addition to the specific charges GAO examined into the disposition of prior years' OEO audit exceptions.

Two OEO audits of the State office covering program years 1970 and 1971 identified recorded claims of \$101,167 as being questionable (audit exceptions) because they were not considered allowable under OEO's grant terms and regulations.

OEO subsequently determined that \$22,731 was allowable. The remaining \$78,436 was cleared by increasing the State office's non-Federal contribution for program year 1972 for the same amount. (See p. 35.)

Other matters

The State office did not fully comply with the 1972 grant conditions concerning the establishment of an advisory committee and preparation and implementation of an affirmative action plan. (See pp. 37 and 38.)

In four contracts with hotels, the State office spent \$508 more than allowed under the State travel regulations. (See p. 41.)

It was also charged that the State office had used grant funds in partisan political campaigns. This was the subject of a previous report to Congressman John E. Moss; in that report GAO concluded that the charge was not valid. (See app. III.)

Recommendations or suggestions

GAO recommends that the Acting Director OEO see that the corrective action proposed by the State office and the OEO San Francisco regional office is taken. (See p. 43.)

Agency actions and unresolved issues

OEO headquarters stated that corrective actions have begun in response to specific identified problems and that it would continue to monitor these actions.

AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, as we further consider the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 today, I would like to make a few remarks which I feel are important to our consideration of this legislation.

The American agriculture system is not a new subject for me, and I want to explain why a Congressman representing a city area has such a great interest in the so-called farm bill. I was born in the South and was part of that large group of people who were forced to move on when the Florida land boom collapsed, the banks closed, and the great farm depression went into full swing.

I then lived in a small town in Iowa where the surrounding country was renowned for its corn production. I can remember, even though I was very small, the depression sweeping through the Midwest. Corn prices hit a low of 8 cents a bushel. There was no way the farmers in our area could even pay to have the corn harvested.

These were independent farmers mostly from small farms of less than 160 acres. They were then, as they are now, fiercely proud, independent people. I can remember that those farmers were extremely leery of the first Commodity Credit loan programs proposed by the Government to store their corn at 50 cents a bushel. A referendum of farmers was conducted, and if it had not been for a few men who could see these loan programs as the only hope, the farmers would simply have refused the referendum and suffered the loss of not only their crops but, in time, their farms.

When I arrived in Congress in 1965, we soon had a farm bill on the floor. At that time, I was appalled that we were still using the agriculture system of the 1930's as a basis for a farm program in the decade of the 1960's. At that time, I expressed grave reservations about the future course of our farm program and felt that we should consider some major changes immediately. I said then, and still believe:

We should state flatly now that our agricultural programs are not working and we

should look at the problem and make a fresh start.

The farm community of the 1960's and 1970's is far different than the community of the 1930's and 1940's when our present farm policy evolved. The new types of equipment, the fertilizers, insecticides, and weed-icides have changed production drastically in the last 10 years. These items are available to the well-financed large corporate-type farm complexes and are very effective there. They are not as effective in the small family farm. These items provide great productive capacity on the large commercial farms enabling them to receive large subsidy payments while providing only a trickle to the small family farmer. The payment of subsidies under these circumstances without production controls has led to the creation of large surpluses and imbalance of income whereby a small percentage of our farmers receive the great bulk of our farm subsidy payments.

For example, the family farmer must farm "fence to fence" to maintain a bare existence and he cannot participate in voluntary soil bank programs. Whereas the large commercial farmer through use of new techniques and equipment can both maintain his past production and participate in the soil bank program, with the result that we have not reduced surpluses or controlled production or substantially aided the small farmer.

Because I have lived on a farm, I appreciate how much has been done to make conveniences available to farm communities. I have always known, however, that these Commodity Credit Corporation loans and farm set-aside programs have not really helped farm labor or even the very small farmer. On a small farm, there is no acreage to set aside and the subsidy which the small farmer gets is usually just enough to keep him alive until the next year.

The granting of large farm subsidy payments either to support artificially the price of a product or to pay farmers to remove acreage from production rarely benefits even the medium size farmer, but it is a bonanza to the very large farmer. The allotment system drives up the cost of land, forcing farmers to consolidate in order to have set-aside land available. As a result, it makes it almost impossible then for the new young farm family to obtain land to start a small farm enterprise.

I make these remarks to indicate that I know the beginnings of America's farm programs and that I am deeply concerned about the economic well-being of our farmers. I cannot justify, however, using a 1930's program to put a floor under prices and, in the case of this bill, to ask consumers in the cities to spend anywhere from \$1.5 billion to \$7 billion in tax money a year—depending on the market conditions—to raise artificially the price of the food which they must buy in the supermarkets.

The depression of the 1930's justified a parity price system to provide a floor for farm producers. But this bill before us not only provides an artificially high floor or "target price" which taxpayers will have to pay for, but these target prices will also raise the price of food, creating yet more cost to taxpayers. The increase in farm income guarantees, due to target prices, will increase capital costs in farm land, which, in turn, will lead to higher production costs and, finally, to higher food costs.

Initially, higher incomes may seem to be a boon for the farmer, the local feed dealer, the elevator operator, and the other agriculture-related business in small rural towns, but these people will soon find that the sharp rise in costs and prices will further drive out the small- and medium-size farmers. They will find that they cannot compete with the large conglomerates who will both control items sold to the farmer and will receive the maximum benefits from the high prices. Agribusiness will also be the only beneficiary of the rapidly escalating land costs.

We can no longer afford to cater to agribusiness. We must look into the large agricultural conglomerates as potential antitrust violators. We should also investigate the commodity credit exchanges dealing in futures for food. It would appear from an early examination that certain speculators corner large portions of the market in feed grains, soybeans, and many other agricultural commodities, and that this is directly contributing to the high cost of these products.

I believe there should be a control over the supply of food in the United States in order to assure a sufficient surplus of food to feed our people at fair and not artificial prices, as well as providing to farmers a fair return on their investment. But this means balancing, within the farm industry, those who consume against those who produce.

In an attempt to strike a balance between consumer interests and farm interests, I supported the \$20,000 per farmer payment limitation; \$20,000 represents, I believe, a reasonable level for farm income payments. It is also extremely desirable in that it will restore some control in the marketplace by removing much of the incentive for large producers to use artificial pricing.

Finally, and most importantly, this \$20,000 payment limitation will save literally millions in tax dollars. As I stated when the agriculture appropriations bill came up:

American taxpayers, plagued by rising costs in every area, cannot afford to pay the extravagant sums provided for large farm subsidies. Overall, we paid about \$1.9 billion in farm subsidy payments in 1972—a 77% increase over payments in 1971. Specifically, in payments of \$20,000 and over, in 1968 we paid \$273.3 million to 5,914 farmers. In 1972, those payments shot up to \$655.8 million to 18,585 farmers. In addition, since the enactment in 1970 of the \$55,000 per crop subsidy limitation, we will have shovelled out up to \$23.4 million more in tax dollars than if that limitation had never been instituted.

The national list of all those who receive subsidy payments over \$20,000 was recently printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of my distinguished colleague, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY. The list runs 90 pages long. What is even more shocking to me than the fact that this group numbers almost 19,000, is that of this group, many recipients are not even farmers. Oil companies, chemical companies, movie stars, Federal judges, Federal legislators, a bowling alley, a municipal airport, a radio station—the list goes on and on. In fact, if I may reiterate a bit of detective work done by my distinguished colleague Congressman SILVIO CONTE, we went as far

as paying Queen Elizabeth of England a farm subsidy last year in the amount of \$68,000 through a Mississippi company controlled by Her Majesty.

In view of these extravagances, I think you all will agree that a \$20,000 per farmer payment limitation is imperative. But, I submit at this point, that such a limitation alone will not do the job that is necessary to cut the padding out of farm subsidies.

I, therefore, supported my friend Congressman FINDLEY's amendment to prohibit farmers from leasing or selling part of their land—in most cases, cotton allotments—and to delete the provisions excluding from the farm payment limitation "resource adjustment" payments, better known as payments for not growing crops.

Prohibiting the selling or leasing of acreage allotments will cut down tremendously on costs to taxpayers and virtual gifts to agribusiness. Farmers can now transfer their valuable acreage allotments and thus avoid the current \$55,000 per crop payment limitation. Under Congressman FINDLEY's amendment, this practice would be eliminated and would thereby save the taxpayers millions of dollars in farm payments. That is why I opposed the Foley amendment which would avoid that effect by the commodity credit loan system. Another of the subsidy-trimming amendments which I supported was the measure to delete funding now in the amount of \$10 million for Cotton, Inc. It is incredible to me that taxpayers' hard-earned money should be used to promote the sales of one product at a time when apparently we are in short supply of and in high demand for both food and fiber.

Funding for Cotton, Inc. was supposed to be determined by the amount saved through the implementation of the \$55,000 payment limitation. However, instead of waiting to see how much that savings would be in actual dollars—it turned out to be \$2.2 million—the Government went ahead and paid what it estimated that savings might be. So, Cotton, Inc. got \$10 million in 1971, and again in 1972, and has again been authorized that amount this year.

Much has been written about how extravagantly and ineptly that extra money has been used. But the point is that for 2 years, and possibly more, American taxpayers have lost \$7.8 million a year to Cotton, Inc.

It is time to start striking that balance I was talking about between the farmers and the consumers. And I hope we will some day have a bill that will bring some sense and economic justice back into the agriculture system of this great country.

DEDICATED OFFICIALS RETIRE

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Third District of Illinois we have two very fine local village officials who have recently retired from public service.

Mr. Dante L. DeSantis, president of

the village of Glenwood, and Mr. Robert Selvig, mayor of Riverdale, have provided years of service and dedication to their communities. Their efforts have resulted in numerous worthwhile improvements in their respective areas.

Their sincere interest in the problems and needs of our area has made them a valuable asset to the Third Congressional District.

I join with the citizens of Glenwood and Riverdale in their tribute to these fine leaders upon the occasion of their retirement.

THE AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT: LONG OVERDUE—REPEAL OF THE BREAD TAX

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 contains one particularly worthwhile provision—it repeals the 75-cent per bushel processing certificate on wheat. This tax is levied on every bushel of wheat used for domestic human consumption—about 535 million bushels. The elimination of this particularly unwholesome tax may be in large part credited to the forceful and intelligent presentation of the Wheat Users Committee. WUC represents a broad based organization of consumers, industry and labor. It is this alliance which has so effectively pointed out to Congress the absolute necessity of eliminating this tax which has created economic havoc for millers and bakers, which creates intense upward pressure on consumer prices and has resulted in the loss of jobs for industry related workers. Congress has too long avoided confronting this issue. As a result an economic crisis has been created forcing 81 independent bakers into bankruptcy. It is this national organization of wheat users who have directed our attention to this problem.

The wheat processing certificate program was first authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 for the 1964 crop year. It was then extended and amended by succeeding Agriculture Acts of 1964, 1965, and 1970. The Agriculture Act of 1970, as it applies to wheat, continues through the crop year ending June 30, 1974.

In 1965 the Congress, with massive support from the Wheat Users Committee, successfully turned back an administration attempt to increase the certificate to \$1.25 per bushel. However, the tax has continued at 75 cents per bushel until the present. Always unfair and regressive, this program has now become an untenable burden on the industry.

The price of wheat to the consumer has risen steadily over the past year. Today's price is \$2.57½ per bushel compared with \$1.33 last June. If we can assume that this price will remain steady, it is clear that the additional burden of the 75-cent processing certificate is both unnecessary and absolutely unfeasible for the consumer of wheat. H.R. 8860

wisely eliminates this so-called bread tax.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that although this action should have been taken a long time ago, the committee has made a positive and wise decision to proceed now. Although great damage has been done, the wheat users make it clear that a large proportion of the industry may be saved.

Baking is the 10th largest U.S. manufacturing industry, the wholesale baking industry employs more workers than all but four other manufacturing industries, and white panbread alone constitutes an estimated 10 percent of the national food consumption. The Wheat Users Committee has alerted us, not to the special interests of a select few, but to the needs of a broad cross section of the American populace. They speak for an essential portion of the business community—the producers of bread and wheat products, for the independent businessmen being forced out of business, for the workers represented by the labor unions, and for the consumer feeling the pressure of rising food prices.

It is important to note that this action prevents the demise of one of the Nation's last truly competitive industries. Although great damage has been done, a massive portion of this industry, which consists of giant chains and conglomerates as well as tiny independent operators, can now be preserved. The wheat user not only mills flour and bakes bread; he produces soup, pasta, and an infinite range of our Nation's food products.

The Wheat Users Committee has a membership of some 125 companies in the baking, cereal, milling, and other wheat consuming industries, including both large corporations and small independent bakers; WUC further includes unions, the American Bakers Association, the Biscuit and Cracker Manufacturers, the Bakery & Confectionary Union AFL-CIO. They have the support of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the workers employed in the production and distribution of baked goods.

Repeal of the bread tax accomplished by this new farm bill is a tribute to the tireless efforts of this group.

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE BAHAMAS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, a bloodless revolution has occurred in the West Indies. The 40 islands of various sizes and descriptions which comprise the Bahamas and the 173,000 inhabitants of those islands have once again demonstrated the ultimate sovereignty of the people. The Bahamian people, 85 percent of whom are of African descent, have secured from Great Britain the rights of self-government and self-determination after approximately three centuries of foreign occupation.

The history of the Bahamas, like that

of most of the West Indies, is characterized by foreign occupation, exploitation and economic deprivation. But trying times, combined with sporadic periods of economic prosperity and longer periods of severe economic depression have not dampened the spirit of the vibrant Bahamian people. They have forged ahead valiantly to create a prosperous progressive nation and the celebration today of Bahamian Independence Day is the culmination of their successful struggle.

The struggle for self-government in the Bahamas was spearheaded by the Progressive Liberal Party which was formed in 1953 by Mr. William Cartwright. The party was formed to effectively organize black Bahamian workers who had begun their struggle to remedy the inequities of their system resulting from social degradation and political oppression.

The PLP sought to confront the unopposed political bloc which controlled the House of Assembly, which is similar to our House of Representatives. This political bloc was predominately white, whereas whites composed less than one-third of the people. The PLP was the people's party. Its campaign was taken to the streets and meetings were held in places and at times most accessible to the people. The PLP was truly a party of the people, for along with equal representation they championed the cause of female suffrage.

Having developed such a rapport and sense of commonality with the people the success of the PLP party was inevitable. Lynden O. Pindling, a London educated lawyer and now Prime Minister of the Bahamas, was to play an instrumental role in the development of the PLP as the dominant political power.

Lynden Pindling joined the PLP shortly after its creation. His first task was to prepare the party platform for the 1956 election. From then on it was an uphill battle directed first toward equal representation and subsequently toward independence. The struggle, which was supported by the people, was against illegal electioneering, threatened economic reprisals, and the gerrymandering of district boundaries.

In 1962, Lynden Pindling took office as the leader of the PLP members in the House of Assembly. He fought for the equitable redistribution of seats. This idea was rejected in 1965 by the House of Assembly. In an impressive show of conviction to the people, Lynden Pindling threw the mace of authority out the window of the assembly chamber and declared that as a symbol of authority and government, the mace belonged to the people. This incident touched off a wave of events known as the "black Tuesday" demonstrations which evidenced the great degree of support enjoyed by Lynden Pindling and the PLP.

The PLP took its grievances to the United Nation's Special Committee on Colonialism and charged Britain with actively supporting the ethnic minority which controlled the Government. Demands were made upon Britain to remedy this situation. United Nations intervention was not needed however. PLP initiatives resulted in new seats being added and the changing of election

boundaries. As a result the PLP gained a one-seat majority in the House of Assembly in the election of January 1967.

In 1968, the people displayed massive support for the PLP by giving them more than a two-thirds majority in the House of Assembly. Independence was now a concretized goal of the government, because in supporting the government the people supported its goal and one of its goals was self-government.

Increased concessions of power to the Bahamian Government and a public announcement in 1971 by the British Minister of State as to the inevitability of independence for the Bahamas were the types of events which characterized the final transition of the Bahamas from a colony to an independent nation.

The concept of struggle is a key one in the history of developing nations. It is a concept which can join together two nations which otherwise have nothing in common. So it was with the United States and the Bahamas. Important eras in American history have precipitated important eras in Bahamian history. The relationship was usually economic, but nonetheless crucial. Three such relationships occurred during the American War for Independence, the American Civil War and the prohibition era.

The American War for Independence brought an influx of Loyalists from the United States to the Bahamas. The Loyalists brought with them a strong allegiance to Great Britain and their slaves. This great influx of slaves and Loyalists was to have a magnified effect on the future social and political makeup of the Bahamas. Prior to the arrival of the Loyalists, the population of the Bahamas was two-thirds white. By 1790, more than two-thirds of the population was black. For the first time in Bahamian history, the secure position enjoyed by the white settlers was threatened.

The political aspects of the Civil War held very little consequence for the Bahamas. While the war in the United States symbolized the struggle by the President and the Government to save the Union, it brought economic prosperity to the dying Bahamian economy. The Bahamas was one step ahead of the United States in that it had abolished slavery in 1834, an act which dampened thoughts of action against the British Government or the British inhabitants of the islands by the slaves.

Economically, the Bahamas profited from the blockade of southern ports by the U.S. Government. With Nassau serving as a base, Bahamians made the short trip to southern ports to secure cotton, which was badly needed by the British and to deliver sorely needed guns and ammunition provided by the British Government.

The economic relationship between the two countries reached a high during the prohibition era in the United States. The period between the Civil War and the prohibition era saw the Bahamas plagued by detrimental economic trends, with the economy rising and falling but never achieving full prosperity. Prosperity, at least for the merchant class, was achieved during the prohibition era, which created the very profitable industries of bootlegging and smuggling.

The relationship of the United States and the Bahamas has expanded to the cultural and political as well as the socioeconomic arena. The sizeable emigration of Bahamians to the United States during periods of economic depression have brought a new culture to this country. A new culture and tradition to add to the already rich recipe of varied cultures which comprise the United States.

Tourism is a major source of revenue in the Bahamas and the United States provides 90 percent of those tourists. Thus the economic relationship between the two countries is continued.

Prior to its independence, the relationship between the Bahamas and the United States was a subconscious one. It developed as a consequence of political turmoil in one country and economic turmoil in the other. But now that independence has been achieved by the residents of these magnificent islands, let us seek to consciously develop a relationship of equality and mutual respect.

The Bahamas are a set of beautiful islands characterized by magnificent beaches, a warm temperate climate, a rich, bountiful culture and a people whose spirit of friendliness and determination is unsurpassed by any other developing nation.

Thus, on this day, July 10, 1973, Independence Day for the Bahamas, I congratulate the Bahamian people in their relentless struggle for freedom. I thank them for the strength, leadership and hope that they have given to minority groups in America who are fighting for their civil rights. I thank them for the rich dimension they have added to American life.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE FREEZE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the price freeze has been in effect slightly over a month now. During this period we have all received a large volume of mail from farmers, wholesalers, and retail food merchants concerning the effects of the freeze on the food industry. We have heard that the selective application of the freeze exempting the first transaction from controls has created a cost squeeze on processors and has forced suppliers to sell below cost, threatening marginal industries. Stories of poultrymen destroying chicks and dairy farmers sending their herds to slaughter rather than pay soaring feed costs have led to alarming reports of inevitable supply shortages in the near future and increasing inflationary pressure. The export controls on soybean and cottonseed products are very serious measures with implications for our crucial trade relationship with the Japanese. And through all this, the value of the dollar has continued its sharp decline in the international monetary market.

Three articles which appeared in the New York Times and the Washington

Post offer perspectives on the situation with specific emphasis on the necessity for a smooth transition into phase IV. I insert these articles into the RECORD at this time.

BEYOND THE FREEZE

(By Edward Cowan)

WASHINGTON, July 4.—President Nixon's price freeze June 13 was supposed to help the Administration get a leg up on combating the unexpected 1973 burst of inflation.

After three weeks, the freeze appears to have been successful in the most immediate sense. There is no evidence of widespread violation, and officials express confidence that by and large the ceilings, based on June 1-8 prices, are being respected. That is not to say, however, that the freeze is proving to be of significant help in the longer-term attack on rising prices. Indeed, it is evidently working counterproductively, as they say in Washington, in the most sensitive sector of the economy—food.

The Cost of Living Council has been inundated with complaints that the freeze is causing a shrinkage of supply, cutbacks that are said to portend still further upward price pressures in the months ahead.

Although council officials are aware that the complaints may be self-serving and exaggerated, they regard the protests as essentially rooted in fact and not to be ignored. John T. Dunlop, director of the council, acknowledged to reporters on Tuesday that his agency was under tremendous pressure on agricultural products to move from a freeze to phase 4 of the Nixon Administration's wage-price stabilization effort.

A PLEA TO PRESIDENT

Eleven Senators, ten of them Republicans, told President Nixon in a telegram on Tuesday that "commodity processors are being squeezed out of business because their prices are frozen below the cost of their raw materials from the farm." They said that "unless immediate relief is granted, shortages in many basic commodities will arise and food prices will skyrocket."

Mr. Dunlop told reporters to expect "some announcements" on food within two to three weeks. He indicated that the initial announcements might cover only part of the food sector—presumably meat, under ceilings since March 29, feed grains and dairy products.

The argument made by the food industry, one the Administration itself has made for many months, is that the only cure for high prices is more supply. In a time of rising costs for animal feed and breeder animals, it is said, clamping a ceiling on wholesale and retail food prices—though not on farmers' initial-sales prices—tends to discourage expansion of production.

Some consumer advocates have replied that a remedy might be to put ceilings even on farm sales to check the upward trend of feed grain costs. The Administration believes that would only compound the problem.

Mr. Dunlop and others are hopeful that the 50 per cent embargo on soybean exports announced Monday will tend to nudge down prices of that protein-rich feed ingredient and thereby encourage farmers to fatten more chickens, hogs and steers.

Similarly, according to Charles J. Carey, president of the National Canners Association, the freeze should be ended immediately to encourage expansion of farm production of fruits and vegetables for canning. Mr. Carey reported that inventories of canned fruits had fallen to an 18-year-low.

REJECTED ADVICE

Essentially, Mr. Carey was arguing, in a statement to the council's food advisory committee, that the only way to bring prices down is to first let them go up.

This was the same kind of advice Mr. Nixon was getting from his senior economic ad-

visers early in June—but he decided on his second freeze in 22 months anyway. As a political matter, he felt he could not accept a sit-tight position—that the President had to be seen to be taking vigorous measures.

The Administration argued that the freeze would give it time to design a Phase 4 tougher than Phase 3. Mr. Nixon said repeatedly that he disliked controls and would not succumb to the temptation to keep them for the long term.

The ironic discrepancy between rhetoric and action was plain then. In the light of subsequent events, it can be said to have become glaring.

The agricultural export situation deteriorated so rapidly that even before Congress could enact the new export-control authority Mr. Nixon requested, the Administration felt impelled to restrict exports of soybeans and cottonseed under existing statutory authority. It also imposed tough controls on exports of iron and steel scrap.

As for prices, the Cost of Living Council is giving sympathetic attention to proposals that it adopt a more differentiated—that is, more complex—set of regulations than it used during Phase 2, from November, 1971, to January, 1973.

The basic Phase 2 rule was that cost increases may be passed on as price increases, along with a standard mark-up or profit margin. "It was precisely those rules that got us into the trouble we have now," Mr. Dunlop commented.

In light of recent large rises in costs of basic agricultural and industrial commodities, Mr. Dunlop and his associates feel that they must adopt a more restrictive rule—at least for some industries—if Phase 4 is to bite and, equally important, be widely perceived as biting.

RULE FOR CONGLOMERATES

In other words, some industries—food processing, presumably, and perhaps manufacturing in which materials are a large cost component—may be made subject to stiffer cost absorption rules than others.

In addition, thought is being given to separate cost-price treatment for disparate divisions of a single conglomerate corporation—for example, one in hotels, machinery and retailing.

Proliferation of regulations means more officials to check on compliance, to review requests for exceptions, to pursue the never-ending task of policy review.

"The finer you chop it, the larger the staff requirements are," Mr. Dunlop commented the other day.

Telling business that it must absorb part of its cost increases, that it can pass through only two-thirds or three-fourths or some such fraction, is unlikely to win business community support for the Nixon stabilization program. Business executives to whom the idea was broached in San Francisco on Monday reacted initially with "surprise" and "disbelief," according to John W. Larsen of the council's staff.

Meanwhile, there have been indications that labor leaders, still nominally co-operating with the stabilization program, may be preparing to put some distance between themselves and the Administration. Well-placed labor sources have said privately that Mr. Dunlop should quit the Administration to preserve his standing with the labor movement as an honest mediator.

Sources close to labor offer two reasons why leaders who have supported Mr. Nixon are uneasy. One is the Watergate scandal. The other is a desire to erase well in advance of the 1974 Congressional elections the 1972 image of labor as supporting Mr. Nixon.

To generate public and business support for Phase 4, the Cost of Living Council has been talking more openly to the press and has been holding extensive consultations with the business community. It remains to be seen whether such public relations tech-

niques will suffice to win general acceptance of Phase 4.

It may be that policy planners continue to hope, as they did mistakenly all spring, that underlying inflationary forces are about to abate and that therefore Phase 4 does not have to hold together long. At this point, such a conclusion would have to be regarded as a triumph of hope over experience.

NUMERICAL GUIDELINES AND PHASE IV GOALS (By Hobart Rowen)

Sooner or later—and hopefully sooner—the Nixon administration will decide on the price and wage “goals” for Phase IV, and whether or not those goals should be achieved by setting out specific, numerical guidelines.

The biggest issue, at the moment, is whether to publish a specific wage standard, like the 5.5 per cent limit on wage increases that was used in Phase II.

It is no secret that John T. Dunlop, the tough and experienced labor negotiator who heads the Cost of Living Council, views the 5.5 per cent pay standard with distaste. “I do not believe a policy can be encompassed within a single number,” Dunlop says, “and I believe that attempts to identify a policy with a number are a mistake.”

Others disagree. For example, former Pay Board member Arnold Weber, asked to consult on the shape of Phase IV, thinks that the prospective success of Phase IV hinges on the use of “specific and identifiable” standards so that business and labor leaders will know what is expected of them. Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns agrees.

In the fight that is developing over this principle, Dunlop has the support of Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz, who agrees that the real test of responsible wage behavior is continued stabilization of total compensation in the private economy.

What Dunlop and Shultz have going for them is the fact that typical wage behavior has been decidedly “responsible” so far this year, with union leaders concentrating on improving fringe benefits, which don’t get cranked into cash wage percentage gains that make the headlines.

Ruffling through stacks of paper in his COLC office, Dunlop insists that one number can’t handle the complicated, differentiated labor-management problems. The Phase II Pay Board, he insists, paid lip service to 5.5 per cent while sweeping under the rug bigger chunks of increases sneaked through by both union and management representatives who were simply smarter than the Pay Board.

He claims that the Price Commission’s much advertised assertion that it would not approve price increases that reflected wage boosts higher than 5.5 per cent (plus .7 per cent for fringes) is a phony.

“You need a separate wage standard to deal with separate problems, or to deal with inequities,” Dunlop says. “Sometimes, you have to compare a wage request with somebody else’s. Or it may have to be in dollar terms rather than percentages. What it comes down to is that you need a whole family of standards.”

He argues that 5.5 per cent can be too little in dealing with very low levels of pay, as in the dress industry, and too high in others, as for plumbers. “These guys who invented guidelines have never settled a damn strike in their lives,” Dunlop angrily insists.

On the practical side, Dunlop says, the 5.5 per cent tends to become a floor, rather than a ceiling. “It’s a hell of a position to put a union leader in,” he says. “They go back to the rank and file, and they say: ‘S—t, you only took what they offered.’”

Yet, a specific wage standard, accompanied by a specific price goal, is of great symbolic importance. The public has an easy-to-understand concept of what the stabilization program is all about, and the program is easier to administer.

But above all other considerations, the single number, highly publicized, provides a self-enforcing tool for businessmen dealing with non-unionized labor, and for smaller unions not subject to Dunlop’s personal arm-twisting.

For the future, the critical thing will be the behavior of prices. The wage moderation so far this year is unlikely to continue, with or without a specific Phase IV guideline, if inflation in food, gasoline and other raw material prices continues out of hand.

Barry Bosworth of the Brookings Institution has, I think, the right perspective on this issue. The strict 5.5 per cent guideline of Phase II was correct, and a key to its success. That number did in fact provide a ceiling, and helped in the deceleration of wage increases.

But a new number, for Phase IV, could become a target instead of a ceiling. Thus, it probably would make sense to continue the Phase III 5.5 per cent “voluntary” standard unchanged so long as actual wage increases aren’t creating trouble. But this would have to be coupled with a firm commitment to go back to a more rigid guideline if wages, overall, get out of hand.

What would help, more than the rules, would be a tough attitude on both prices and wages by Shultz, Dunlop & Co. Dunlop has done a good job on the wage side. But for prices, Phase III has been a disaster.

We probably need to go back to a separation of the pay and price functions, coupled with an affirmative statement from the price controllers that registers some belief in the controls business, rather than apologies for controls, or promises to get rid of them as fast as possible. If that’s too much for the current crop of controllers to swallow, they should quit and let somebody else take over.

[From the New York Times, July 8, 1973]

PHASE IV IS RACING THE BAD NEWS

WASHINGTON.—The calendar is running for three men who have what may be the most difficult job in the United States today: They must produce President Nixon’s promised Phase 4 price program in time for it to take effect by his self-imposed deadline of August 12.

The three are George P. Shultz, Secretary of the Treasury, John T. Dunlop, director of the Cost of Living Council, and Herbert Stein, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. In the best of times, their tasks would be no easy one. All, like the President, find the controls they will have to impose philosophically distasteful. And they will have to impose them not in some familiar, normal economic situation but as merely the latest step in a roller coaster series of price freezes, partial freezes, tight controls and loose controls.

But last week, even for the architects of the coming Phase 4, the economic atmosphere was so filled with gloom and malaise that the exact nature of the coming controls was not the main preoccupation. Interest rates at home were shooting upward and the value of the dollar, in relation to the main currencies of Europe, was declining at a rate that turned from a crawl to a plunge. One economist who normally takes a calm view of things said, “The situation is hairy.”

It was. The news came from different directions, seemingly unrelated, but nearly all of it was bad:

Several large meat-packing plants, complaining that the freeze forced them to operate at a loss, closed down for the time being in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and Nebraska. The result could be shortages of meat, especially pork, on supermarket shelves in a matter of weeks.

The “prime” lending rate of banks to large corporate borrowers rose in two jumps in a single week to 8¼ per cent, and an investor could obtain an astonishing 8 per cent by

purchasing short-term United States Treasury bills in the money market. In prior periods, such as in 1966 and 1969, such interest rates were the precursors of recession in the economy.

The Government raised the ceilings on interest rates that can be paid on savings accounts, mainly to keep these funds in the institutions that provide most of the nation’s mortgage money and are thus vital to the housing market. The Government also faced the facts of life and raised from 7 to 7½ per cent the interest rate on Federal Housing Administration and Veterans Administration mortgages, with the aim of inducing lenders to participate again in these programs without charging discount “points.”

The Government reported another huge increase of 2.4 per cent in wholesale prices for June, again led by farm prices. While nearly all of the rise presumably occurred before the June 13 freeze, it was a signal of the strong upward pressure on prices that will be ready to burst out when the freeze ends.

In another action aimed at the extraordinary food price increases, the Government sharply limited exports of soybeans and cottonseed and their products, which are big factors in the price of meat, milk and eggs. Then as foreign demand switched to substitutes, controls were put on 41 additional farm commodities. And export controls were also imposed on iron and steel scrap, an important raw material for steelmaking, as huge foreign demand produced a big increase in prices.

The soybean export controls, while succeeding in bringing about a sharp drop in the price of soybeans and soybean meal on the domestic markets, involved the partial abrogation of outstanding contracts between American exporters and foreign buyers.

Most puzzling—and perhaps most ominous—the value of the dollar abroad fell sharply again. It has declined by an amazing 30 per cent in relation to the German mark since the beginning of the year. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary General of the United Nations, said the U.N. might have to change its long-standing system of basing its budget and contributions on the dollar.

Ironically, all of this was happening at a time when business, in the words of former Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., “has never been better.” With factories humming and consumers apparently still spending freely, total employment in June was 2.9 million higher than a year earlier, an enormous increase, and the unemployment rate dipped to 4.8 per cent, the first time in three years it has been less than 5 per cent.

In this generally confusing situation, one thing was clear: the culprit for most of the developments was inflation. The bad inflation news in the United States was a key reason for the decline in the dollar’s exchange rate, and it helped account for the surge in interest rates.

The freeze imposed by President Nixon on June 13 apparently was working in the sense that it was managing to keep a lid on most prices. But the big question was whether the forthcoming Phase 4 would be able to cope with the inflation problem—or whether it would create still worse problems. Messrs. Shultz, Dunlop and Stein were under orders from the President to produce a “tougher” controls program than the largely “voluntary” Phase 3, with special efforts to keep down the price of food and gasoline. Their assignment, in the view of many economists, was difficult if not impossible.

In the case of food, the huge rise in the price of food grains and feed supplements such as soybean meal has created the main problem, which has been dramatized by the freeze. Television screens showed farmers drowning baby chicks because the cost of

feed is so high. The selling price of a broiler is effectively frozen for some farmers at a level below the cost of raising the chick. There were reports of farmers selling pregnant sows for much the same reason.

There were reports that the freeze would soon be ended for many, perhaps most, food items to head off serious shortages in a few months. The entire food industry pleaded for this course of "consultative" hearings last week held by the Cost of Living Council. But an end to the freeze would probably mean, at least temporarily, a new burst of prices in the supermarkets, where average profit margins are already below normal.

As for the vast industrial economy, the dilemma was nearly as difficult. The basic problem was to select a formula that would permit businessmen to pass along at least part of their higher costs for materials and labor. The question was: How much?

If a full "cost pass-through" were allowed, which was the basic rule of Phase 2, there was the danger of a new burst of price increases. But if businesses were required to absorb higher costs, at the expense of lower profits, there was a different danger. It was pointed out last week by Lionel D. Edie & Co., the economic research and consulting arm of the Merrill Lynch brokerage firm: "To drive down corporate profits at this stage in the expansion would probably drive the economy straight into a recession, by undercutting capital spending, the sector we are counting on to buoy total economic activity as consumer spending and housing weaken."

Ultimately the President and his men, in a clearly bad situation, had two main hopes. The first was for a big farm crop. The first good estimate of the crop will be published Tuesday by the Agriculture Department and much will hang upon it. If the crops are big enough, the upward pressure on prices should eventually subside.

The second hope was for a slowdown in the boom pace of the economy without a decline into recession and rising unemployment. Such a slowdown is still regarded by many economists as a likely possibility. Only if the hectic pace of demand slackens can there be any real hope of checking inflation. But these were only hopes. And if they do not materialize, Phase 4 cannot succeed.

EDWIN L. DALE, Jr.

AN ECOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE FLORIDA CANAL MAKES SENSE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in reading the June 30 copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just now, I see that my able colleague, Congressman BAFALIS said on that day that he objects to a statement by me that "no adverse ecological study—of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal—has ever been done by the Government." And he went on to say:

That is simply not a factual statement. Numerous environmental assessments—indicating substantial environmental damage—have been conducted by various governmental agencies.

These are, to name a few:

Following the above statement he lists a number of studies made by the Government and by State agencies and individuals. However, he does not state that any of the U.S. Government reports are adverse to the construction of the

canal and it is my belief that none of these concluded that the canal should not be built, although I have not read all of them.

Congress authorized and funded the ecological study by the Corps of Engineers in 1970 and although it suggested problem areas it also suggested corrective solutions. After the President's action in halting the canal in 1971, Congress authorized and funded a \$150,000 new ecological study of the canal to determine if the canal should be completed, some \$53 million having already been spent on its construction. The President has impounded those funds. I am attempting to get that study made. The legislation proposed by Mr. BAFALIS would prevent that study.

I think that as a Congressman who represents a part of the area that would be helped by the canal it is reasonable that I should ask that this ecological study be made. I cannot understand how anyone interested in ecology would think my position unreasonable in this.

As I said before, I know of no adverse ecological study of this canal that has ever been made by the Government. I think there has never been any such study.

TRIBUTE TO JOE JELIKOVSKY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the dedicated efforts of Mr. Joe Jelkovsky in combating problems of mental health and drug abuse in the Pacific Palisades area of my district and at Camarillo State Hospital. His work can serve as a model to other areas of our Nation at a time when drug abuse threatens to reach crisis proportions.

A veteran of the Korean war, Joe Jelkovsky has volunteered his time and energy in solving problems of human behavior since 1960. In 1961, after a visit to Camarillo State Hospital, he decided to start a weekly closed-circuit television series at the hospital focusing on the social and emotional roots of drug abuse. The program, known as "Break Away," is produced, directed, and moderated by Mr. Jelkovsky and features patients and a diversity of professional guests from outside in free-wheeling encounter sessions. The sessions focus on honesty and self-awareness in coming to grips with emotional problems leading to drug abuse.

Joe has been a pioneer in the use of mass media as a constructive tool in the field of mental health. His program is an invaluable aid in the rehabilitation and treatment program at Camarillo.

Joe Jelkovsky's commitment to openness and honesty in dealing with drug abuse and emotional problems has been expressed in a myriad of ways. In 1972 he founded and is director of the Pacific Palisades Community Action and Advisory Committee on Family Relations,

called PAKT—parents and kids together—a volunteer, action-oriented organization dedicated to the involvement of both parents and teenagers in dealing with such problems as drug abuse, family crises, attempted suicides, and run-aways.

PAKT currently sponsors parent and teen self-awareness groups, housing away from home for youth in crisis, and a "rap" room at Pacific Palisades High School. In addition, PAKT sponsors visits by teenagers from Palisades High School to Camarillo State Hospital in an effort to involve youth directly in the drug rehabilitation process and to counter the public "snake pit" image of the mental hospital. Thus far, over 150 Palisades High School students have toured Camarillo's drug rehabilitation facilities and there is a lengthy waiting list of students eager to visit.

Mr. Jelkovsky has spoken at churches, synagogues, schools, and to youth groups on the causes and effects of drug abuse. He was the director and founder of Teen Forum at the Brentwood Presbyterian Church and also produced a TV special called "Epidemic Narcotics" for a Los Angeles television station. Mr. Jelkovsky's day does not end with his office hours. He makes himself available to families in need of counseling and has been called to the homes of families in crisis on countless occasions. He operates a Stressline at his home to answer calls from disturbed parents and teens.

Mr. Jelkovsky's innovative techniques in dealing with emotional problems and drug abuse have attracted much attention from the media. He has appeared on several radio and television shows, including KLAC's "The Private Line," the Joe Pyne Show, and Regis Philbin's "Tempo." Articles on his programs have appeared in a number of publications, including the Los Angeles Times, the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, and the Pacific Palisades Post.

Mr. Jelkovsky has been the recipient of a Presidential commendation for his dedicated efforts in dealing with mental illness and the prevention and treatment of drug abuse. He has also been commended by Governor Reagan of California and former Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty. Resolutions honoring Joe Jelkovsky have been presented to him by the Los Angeles City Council and the California State Assembly.

Mr. Jelkovsky has been recognized by professionals in the fields of psychology and psychiatry for his special gift and aptitude in helping emotionally disturbed people. He is the only layman to have been commended and recognized for his work in the field of mental health by the Los Angeles County Psychological Association which made a commitment to aid him in a consultative capacity in future work.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Jelkovsky's unselfish concern for his fellow man has resulted in an invaluable service to his community. His uniquely open and direct methods of dealing with mental illness and drug abuse have contributed to a healthier and more humanitarian attitude in dealing with these problems which are so prevalent today.

DR. LAWRENCE J. MIANO—SERVICE
BEYOND PRICE, DEDICATION BE-
YOND RECOMPENSE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the general practitioners of medicine, the family doctors, have always been noted for their dedicated work. They maintain close personal relationships with their patients, easing pain, healing their hurts and sicknesses, providing counsel and comfort. Of them it can be truly said, "Theirs is service beyond price, dedication beyond recompense."

Such a doctor is Dr. Lawrence J. Miano, of Gardenville, N.Y., who this Sunday will be honored during a testimonial for his almost 40 years of devoted service to area residents.

Although the doctor himself underwent major surgery 1½ years ago, he is back again holding regular office hours and making house calls. As Melvin W. Schmidt, chairman of the upcoming testimonial has said—

Dr. Miano is the old-time "country doctor" who always has found time for his patients, and for house calls. When you needed him, he was always there.

I am proud that Dr. Miano lives and practices in my 38th District and I join his many friends and neighbors in paying tribute to him for his many years of dedicated work in our community.

A plaque on the lawn of Dr. Miano's house at 3467 Clinton Street points to the historical significance of the site, but I can think of no more appropriate inscription for the doctor's residence and office than the one inscribed on the lamp which hangs outside the jungle hospital at Lambarené founded by the late Albert Schweitzer. It reads:

Here at whatever hour you come, you will find light and help and human kindness.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this time a recent article from the Buffalo Courier-Express which describes the outstanding life and public record of Dr. Lawrence J. Miano:

"OLD-TIME" G.P. To Be Honored
(By Joan E. Given)

A plaque on the lawn of a neat, gray-shingled home at 3467 Clinton St., Gardenville, points to the historical significance of the site. But, as far as a multitude of area residents are concerned, the illusion is secondary. To them, the most important thing about the place is the fact that it is the home and office of Dr. Lawrence J. Miano, general practitioner.

Their reasoning is simple: During his almost 40 years service to area residents, Dr. Miano has become both village idol and legend.

Dr. Miano delivered many of the area's residents (he, himself, can't remember exactly how many) and in the early days, he delivered quite a few at home. He has gotten up in the middle of the night to make house calls, and he still makes house calls.

In those great blizzards of the '40s and '50s, he made emergency calls in a Town Highway Dept. truck and on one occasion, he broke down a door to reach and aid a stroke victim.

At 6:30 Sunday evening, friends will gather to honor the slender, gracious Dr. Miano for his dedication (which shows little signs of abating) during a testimonial at the H. D. Morin VFW Post in Center Rd., West Seneca.

"Dr. Miano is the old-time 'country doctor' who always has found time for his patients, and for house calls. When you needed him, he was always there," said Melvin W. Schmidt, chairman of the testimonial.

The 67-year-old, soft-spoken physician is most appreciative of the upcoming action on the part of his friends and neighbors, but at the same time admits that he's somewhat dazzled by the whole thing.

"I really don't know what the fuss is about," he said softly. And then added, with a modest smile, "After all, nobody forced me to become a doctor."

He made his own decision to become a doctor, he recalled, when he was 12. So natural did this early commitment seem to him that when a couple of his children, already in college, announced that they didn't know what they wanted to be, he was in a state of mild shock, until a colleague gently explained.

"Larry, not everyone knows what he wants to be when he's young!"

Dr. Miano is a native of Buffalo's West Side. His family lived in Front St. which later became Busti Ave. He remembers the Niagara River waters of his boyhood as "being pure enough to drink."

He also recalled making the rounds with the late Dr. Frank A. Harrington, a general practitioner who had his office on West Ave. Of him he said:

"He never owned a car. He walked with his bag in one hand and his overcoat under his other arm."

As a teen-ager, Dr. Miano moved from his own neighborhood into Buffalo's First Ward.

Many of his First Ward friends became his classmates at Canisius High School and, later, Canisius College. Dr. Miano received his doctor of medicine degree from the Stritch School of Medicine at Loyola University in Chicago in 1934.

On Sept. 24, 1936, the doctor married Margaret Kathleen Anderson, at Fourteen Holy Helpers Church in Indian Church Rd., Gardenville. The couple, as Dr. Miano puts it, has "been blessed with" eight children, Barbara, Kathleen, Roberta, and Paula, all at home, and Mrs. Robert Kresse of Buffalo, Mrs. James Thur of Williamsville, Mrs. Robert Schultz of Johnstown and Lawrence, of Rochester.

Dr. Miano opened an office in 1936 a few doors from his present home. He chose Gardenville because he liked the country and his wife's family came from the area.

In 1939, the couple purchased their present home, which, over the years, they have remodeled in the sprawling, comfortable, tastefully-appointed home it is today.

Two years later, Dr. Miano amazed friends and neighbors alike by trying to enlist in the navy, three days after Pearl Harbor. He was, he recalled, "already 32 years old and no kid."

"But here we were, three days into a war, and nobody seemed to be moving," he said. As a boy, one of his heroes was his father's youngest brother, Frank Miano, who was a Navy man.

For a while it looked like his fervor was being wasted. He weighed 220 pounds (he was 5 ft. 7 in. tall) and was informed, without too much ceremony, that he was overweight and would "never make it." His answer was to go home and lose 45 pounds and it was a trim, 175-pound Lt. Commander Miano that served for the next few years in the South Pacific Theater.

Dr. Miano has never regretted his decision to stick to general practice, even though he has had ample opportunities to enter other facets of medicine. He doesn't minimize the need for specialists, but expresses the hope

that more young men will consider becoming GP's in the future.

"General practice allows you to become closer to your patients," he said.

The Gardenville physician bemoans the current trend toward "trying to reach the pinnacle by age 40 and then retiring."

"What's a man supposed to do after 40 if he doesn't work?" exclaimed Dr. Miano, who himself had a bout with major surgery a year and a half ago and today holds regular office hours and makes house calls.

As far as his favorite areas of general practice go, Dr. Miano favors both ends of the age scale.

"Pediatrics and geriatrics; children and old people are the most appreciative patients," he said.

All indications are that the streets of Gardenville, West Seneca and their environs are apt to be pretty thinly populated next Sunday evening.

Among those expected to attend the testimonial are the doctor's family, his patients, young and old, members of the Union Fire Co. in Gardenville, the H. D. Morin Post, VFW, and the Lions Club of West Seneca and doctors, nurses and nuns from the staff of Mercy Hospital, where he interned.

While practically every person who has known him stands ready to express his admiration and appreciation for Dr. Miano, the doctor himself reserves his own admiration for one other. She is the tall, blonde Mrs. Miano, whom he sometimes refers to as "my girlfriend." He said:

"She's pretty remarkable, you know. She's wife, mother, housekeeper, cook, secretary, treasurer, gardener, scrubber and washer-woman."

NIXON SHOULD STAY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the roar of the Watergate continues to keep the focus of the media here in Washington off the really important matters which face the Nation and the Congress. Problems which, if they are continually ignored, could lead to our undoing as a Nation. I speak, of course, about problems such as energy, inflation, rising prices and other fiscal matters. These are just some of the many complex problems which much of the national media seems to have forgotten.

I am extremely pleased to say that the news media in the Second Congressional District of Indiana have not taken their cue from the Washington media, but continue to keep the public informed on a variety of newsworthy items. They have not ignored the current controversy, but, I believe, they have treated it in its proper context.

Several weeks ago, I presented my colleagues a poll from the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal and Courier which showed that an overwhelming majority of citizens in the southwestern portion of my district believe in and support our President. Now, I present a poll from the eastern part of the Second District which indicates that the majority of people in that part of Indiana strongly support Mr. Nixon. This latest poll was conducted by the North Manchester, Ind., News-Journal.

I believe that these two polls are signif-

icant in showing that Hoosiers support not only Mr. Nixon, but the institution of the Presidency, and that they believe our system is capable of dealing with any crisis without prompting from the national media.

I submit the summary of the News-Journal poll for publication here:

MR. NIXON SHOULD STAY: READERS

(By Doug Frantz)

Here in the Republican belt, the conservative belt, the corn belt, support for Richard Nixon is as strong in his seventh crisis as it was 21 years ago when he was Dwight Eisenhower's vice presidential candidate.

The question of whether President Nixon should resign from office in the face of the Watergate scandal has been answered "en masse" by News-Journal readers: stay in office advise nearly 80 percent of the replies to our June 18 poll; resign demand 21 percent.

There was little ground between as readers poured out thoughts and feelings, with comments penned to ballots and typed in letters. Emotion ran high, with much of it spilling over onto the press.

"It is the lowest trick a newspaper can do to the President," chided one man. "If you plan to keep on printing such articles, cancel our subscription," threatened a husband and wife.

But most of the emotion, like most of the ballots, backed the President unquestioningly. Richard Nixon appears to have won not only most of the votes in Wabash County over the past two decades, but most of the hearts as well.

It is basic to the Nixon doctrine that he can muster the unflinching support of the people, as evidenced in his 1961 "Checkers" speech after the newspapers broke the story of the "Nixon Fund" during the presidential campaign—the \$18,235 collected from wealthy contributors to help pay his political expenses. As pressure mounted over the fund, General Eisenhower threatened to force Nixon to resign from the ticket and he delivered his famous television speech.

"My only hope to win," he wrote in his book *Six Crises*, "rested with millions of people I would never meet, sitting in groups of two or three or four in their living rooms, watching and listening to me on television . . . This time I was determined to tell my story directly to the people rather than to funnel it to them through a press account."

The revelations concerning Watergate and the accompanying campaign activities may crest this week with the testimony of John Dean III before the Senate Select Committee investigating the break-in and subsequent cover-up attempt, but there's no reason to believe, after reading the responses to our poll, the people of this part of the country are about to forsake Richard Nixon.

One unsigned letter offered a fairly accurate consensus of his supporters. It read: "The President should stay in office and the people who care for the good of our country should do all in their power to still those who are trying to put him out . . . Our President needs help and encouragement now more than ever."

There was also a strong current of feeling which dismissed the entire Watergate affair as "part of politics." These people, who feel the scandal has been "blown out of proportion," can be characterized by the letter of a retired school teacher who said, "The 'Watergate Affair' was a stupid attempt to spy, but other similar activities have been performed by politicians in the last 40 years and paid off to keep them undercover. Our government should have more urgent business to perform than to sit day after day and 'dilly dally' over the theft of some worthless papers. In the meantime our economy and moral structure of our country are falling to pieces."

There was also, of course, the voice of the loyal opposition: a voice raised in indignation over the Watergate scandal; a voice calling for the President and, in many cases, the Vice President, too, to resign.

"The resignation of Mr. Nixon and Mr. Agnew is imperative to restore confidence and continued strong function of our government," said one man. While an unsigned reader wrote: "That whole bunch of crooks should resign and that includes Agnew. They stole the 1972 election by using Hitler tactics and other illegal techniques."

Political observers predict that, come 1976, the only presidential candidate from either party seriously hurt by Watergate will be Sen. Edward Kennedy. Every time the issue of Watergate is raised, up will come the specter of Chappaquiddick, goes the theory.

In a section of the country where the Kennedys have never found great support, responses were often bitterly caustic. "What about Teddy Kennedy?" asked one unsigned writer. "A life was lost there." And another queried: "Why should Nixon resign? Ted Kennedy killed a person and nothing was done about it. Why all the fuss about Watergate—no one was killed." This letter was also unsigned, illustrating another thread which ran through the most vehement letters from both sides: a majority who included comments did not sign them.

The President should:

Stay in office—78.8 percent.

Resign—21.2 percent.

HUNGARY AND THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Brezhnev visit again highlights the extremely important talks which are being carried on between us and our NATO allies on the one side, and the Soviet Union and the satellite countries of East-Central Europe on the other about security matters.

These negotiations, if we are not careful, will result in further tilting the military and political balance in Europe in favor of the Soviet Union with grave consequences for our national security. I am referring in this regard primarily to the MBFR negotiations in Vienna, although the legitimization of the enslavement of the countries of East-Central Europe and the division of Germany and Berlin through the instrumentality of the CSCE without counterconcessions by the Soviet side on the free exchange ideas and persons are weighed heavily in favor of Soviet designs in Europe.

MBFR is a politically neutral concept. It means militarily that both sides undertake balanced troop and equipment withdrawal from a specifically limited area of highest armament density and closest to the borders of the two alliances. If this will be the case, and if the agreement reached can be verified without allowing either side the option of cheating, it is a worthwhile undertaking. However, the present stage of the MBFR talks do not bode any great hopes.

Lack of sincerity on the part of the Soviet Union has been repeatedly displayed and the talks are being used to

enhance the position of the Red Army in Europe. Until the convocation of the preliminary talks there was no objection on the part of the Warsaw Pact nations and the U.S.S.R. to include Hungary, which is a central European country and is occupied by four crack Soviet divisions, into the area of the MBFR. When we agreed to seat the flank country as observers, immediately the Soviet Union, with reluctant backing of the satellite Kadar regime, demanded that Hungary be limited to an observer status and that the territory of Hungary be, therefore, excluded from the area of future troop cuts. NATO countries, especially Britain and the Benelux countries objected strenuously and for 14 weeks NATO took the position that Hungary must be seated as a full participant. Finally, according to press reports in the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post at the request of our Government, NATO accepted a temporary compromise of not seating Hungary at the preliminary talks, but retaining the right to raise the issue at a later date; that is, before the beginning of the substantial conference in the fall of 1973.

Exclusion of Hungary would grant the Soviet Union a sanctuary just like Communist China had in Manchuria during the Korean war. Even if the Soviet Union withdrew an equitable number of troops from East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, they could be deployed without any constraint in Hungary, rendering Hungary, besides Western Russia, the major staging area of the Red Army, inhibiting any efforts by the Hungarian people to regain even a modicum of self-determination. In addition, such a step would grant the Soviet Union a free hand to intervene directly in Yugoslavia, should civil disturbances occur after the death of President Tito.

It would also reinforce the neutralist tendencies in West Germany, already a cause for genuine concern among political experts, in the wake of the West-East German treaty and the increasing pro-Communist unrest in the Social Democratic Party's youth auxiliary.

AUDIT THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

HON. DAVID TOWELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, Las Vegas, Nev., newspaper publisher, Hank Greenspun, in his regular page 1 column in the Las Vegas Sun, called for an audit of the Internal Revenue Service.

On the surface, this sounds like the usual chagrined taxpayer's cry of anguish. But Mr. Greenspun raises several extremely relevant points and issues a challenge to the Members of Congress.

I commend Mr. Greenspun's column, "Where I Stand," to my colleagues:

WHERE I STAND

(By Hank Greenspun)

Audit the IRS!

Of all the agencies of government in this

grand old land of ours, none has contributed more to the erosion of public confidence in our democratic institutions than the Internal Revenue Service.

There is nothing just, equitable or even fair in the treatment of the taxpayer, and if anything can shake the faith of the people in their government it is the high-handed, autocratic and even tyrannical methods used by this agency which hits the people in the pocketbook, and when any person feels they are being robbed even by an institution of government which operates with immunity, it is cause for discontent.

Unfortunately, we can expect little help from the people's representative because Watergate has shown how those who are out of favor with the administration can be punished without recourse by what should be a tax collecting agency but in fact is a punitive arm of government.

What congressman or senator would risk similar involvement with this agency by even suggesting that its methods be probed? He whose palm has not been greased, let him throw the first bar of soap.

The Congress must take some action to curb the arbitrary and often unlawful methods employed by the IRS before confidence in the fairness of the American tax structure is totally eroded.

Many taxpayers have been unfairly bankrupted by unjust tax claims while others have been broken in body and spirit by unwarranted tax deficiency determinations.

The IRS has been the biggest boon to the medical profession with their unjust assessments, causing more ulcers and heart attacks than fried food or saturated fats.

If I were in the Congress of the United States, and this is not a declaration of candidacy, I would propose legislation to cure some of the evils of tax collecting and any legislator who would not vote for the bill should be a fit subject of investigation by the IRS.

The taxpayer must be given a fair opportunity to contest determinations made by the IRS because often the legal fees involved are more costly than the assessment and if one doesn't break you, the other surely will.

The little fellow has enough problems paying his taxes, no matter how unfair, without the additional burden of legal fees, which have broken many a person.

I believe Nevada's representatives could do an outstanding service to the people of the country by introducing such legislation.

The government is capable of tortuous conduct just as an individual, but where the average citizen can use judicial process with legal expenses accruing to the victor, governmental agencies are immune from such penalty.

It would therefore be incumbent upon our legislators to institute some rules whereby the injured taxpayer would have some redress from an overzealous IRS.

A possible framework for such legislation can be a requirement that in any controversies involving less than a certain sum of money—for example, \$10,000—the IRS should reimburse the taxpayer for reasonable legal and accounting fees if the taxpayer prevails in court against the Service as to any specific item or legal issue.

Where there is more than one issue involved and the taxpayer prevails on some and loses on others, these costs should be prorated to the extent of the taxes abated over the total tax assessed.

If the taxpayer offers to compromise at a certain dollar figure and the government refuses, then if the taxpayer recovers a greater amount than the compromise figure, the IRS should be required to pay the taxpayer's legal and accounting fees in full.

I believe that if legislation incorporating the above proposals were passed, the Service would be forced to settle more small cases

and it would be a deterrent against unwarranted tax deficiency determinations which, because of the cost involved in contesting the action, forces the taxpayer to accede even if he is 100 per cent right.

Not only would the government be ahead because more taxpayers would be amenable to satisfactory compromises but the tremendous legal costs to the government in prosecuting losing cases would be eliminated. It could also cut the IRS staff in half which could also be a tremendous saving.

The best part of the legislation I purposely saved for the last because it would go far in eliminating political and spiteful fraud and criminal investigations.

In the event the taxpayer is subjected to a special investigation other than civil, and the government does not make a case, the taxpayer should be reimbursed for all the pain, mental anguish, heartbreak, medical, legal and accounting fees with the stipulated damages amounting to 50 per cent of the Service's costs of the investigation.

And if the case should go to trial and the taxpayer is acquitted then whatever the penalty would have been if guilty should be paid by the official of the IRS instituting the investigation.

If the penalty called for 5 years imprisonment and a \$5,000 fine, the head of the IRS division in the taxpayer's area should pay the fine and go to jail.

Such a law could be a deterrent to many unlawful, unjust and politically motivated harassments of the poor taxpayer who is always guilty and has to prove himself innocent in the eyes of the IRS.

And that is not what the Constitution of the U.S. is all about.

FIGHTING TO SAVE CHILD CARE SERVICES

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress has taken a decisive step in preventing the immediate implementation of the administration's HEW social service regulations, including child day care centers, until November 1, 1972. I am hopeful that this 4-month moratorium will provide Congress with the opportunity to revise the administration's regulations and thereby correct many potentially regressive and unjust provisions.

The regulations, if allowed to be implemented, would severely affect child development and child care in California. These regulations would reduce the range of social services to such an extent that some very vital, worthy programs for the poor would no longer be eligible for Federal funds; others would be sharply reduced in a way that would severely restrict needed social services and child care to low-income families in California.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my willingness and desire to work with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee during the next 4 months to develop new legislation that would provide the basic social services to people in need and who are trying to escape the poverty cycle.

I believe campus child care centers which allow mothers to go to school to

better their working and educational skills should be eligible for Federal matching funds even if the school donates some student body funds to the operation of the campus child care program. If the regulations as proposed are adopted, in all likelihood, these needed centers would be forced to close.

I believe that approximately 19,000 children presently in the California preschool education program must be given the educational opportunities which their parents were denied. Indeed, it is hoped that through a program of this nature these children can escape the life of poverty and enjoy the educational benefits provided to more fortunate children.

I also believe the migrant worker and his family should be provided with adequate day care services. The need for this program is demonstrated every day of the growing season by the many related incidences of injury and neglect that affect these children in the absence of organized, supervised day care programs. We need to consider restoring group eligibility for migrants, since their earnings fluctuate monthly, and their average annual income is about \$2,900.

If the administration's social services regulations were allowed to go into effect as scheduled on July 1, 1973, many important social service programs would be all but abandoned. I believe that Congress has the duty and the responsibility to seize this opportunity to write legislation that clearly articulates the type and scope of child care and social services it wants to have for this country.

I believe we have the potential to draft legislation which would move us forward and help many potentially productive people to escape the poverty cycle and to become productive working citizens.

EXTENSION OF THE BOMBING REQUEST—A HOAX

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported over the last few days that the Nixon administration may ask the Congress for an extension of the authority to bomb in Cambodia. I think that it is imperative that we tell the President to forget that idea right now.

In my opinion this body made a grievous error by supporting the August 15 bombing cutoff compromise. Nevertheless, the decision was made with the understanding that August 15 would be the absolute end to the mad bomber activities that have been going on over the skies of Indochina. Let's not compound this mistake by letting the President beguile us into a bombing extension. The Cambodian Government, under Lon Nol, has had 3 years of American support to put its house in order. Instead, in that 3 years the Government of Cambodia has been split apart at the seams by the incompetence and petty bickering of the Lon Nol regime.

It is time that we stop risking Ameri-

can lives, and spending American money to do for the Cambodian Government what they apparently cannot do for themselves. Dr. Kissinger has a little over a month now to work out some kind of solution to the political and military stalemate over there. I wish him the best of luck, but I am not optimistic about the possibility for a successful cease-fire, by August 15, since there was no suggestion that Prince Sihanouk be consulted till Congress mandated the limitation.

As former Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson pointed out, "Cambodia is a messy corner of the world." At the present time there are something like four different factions working against Lon Nol. Observers have testified that when the insurgents finish with Lon Nol they will probably turn on each other.

Given this state of affairs, it is extremely doubtful whether Dr. Kissinger will be able to work out a political compromise, with or without the help of Peking and Moscow. As the Christian Science Monitor recently stated, "local people do not always take kindly to the plans worked out by the distant great powers. Washington, Moscow, and Peking can propose. But those men in the jungles around Phnom Penh are the ones who will dispose of the decision."

We would be making a horrendous mistake if we allow the White House to talk us into extending the bombing under the pretense that we are on the verge of a settlement. We are not on the verge of a concrete settlement, and will not be on August 15. Despite what the White House press secretary says, the fact of the matter is that the struggle in Indochina has been going on since the end of World War II. A few more bombs will not be able to end a conflict in a land that has endured tens of thousands.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert an editorial from the July 5, Christian Science Monitor entitled, "The Last of the Bombs," and an editorial from the July 10 Washington Post entitled, "The Cambodian Bombing Deadline":

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 5, 1973]

THE LAST OF THE BOMBS

Between now and the 15th of August American bombs will, we presume, continue to take lives and pockmark the roads leading in and out of the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh. It is the last of an effort to keep that city out of the hands of rebel forces closing in from all sides on the government there headed by President Lon Nol and backed by Washington.

The official purpose of the continued bombing is to give Henry Kissinger of Washington time for a last-moment effort to work out a political settlement which would neutralize Cambodia. The question is whether at this late date, it is possible to reconcile the three main elements involved in the tangle of Cambodian politics. The alternative would be a decisive victory by the native Cambodian Communist forces now ringing the capital city.

The Nixon administration very much wants a compromise. It has invested heavily in the Lon Nol regime. A total collapse of that regime and a decisive victory for the native Communists would be a foreign policy defeat—at a time when any defeat on any front would be an unhappy event for President Nixon. The chances are not high that Dr. Kissinger can avert such a defeat. The Lon

Nol regime has been singularly unsuccessful in arousing public support. President Thieu in Vietnam has been massively successful—by comparison.

The only serious reason for keeping up the effort is that Soviet Russia also has a small stake in the survival of the same Lon Nol regime. The Soviet ambassador is still in Phnom Penh. Moscow has not recognized the Communist rebels as being a "fraternal" Communist party. The reason, presumably, is that Moscow would prefer Lon Nol with his inadequacies to the victory of a Communist force which is closer to Peking than to itself.

Peking may also favor a compromise way out. A fragmented Indo-China would be a safer neighbor for Peking than a reunited Indo-China capable of defending itself and possibly coming under the influence of Russia. Thus it is possible that Dr. Kissinger is getting some help from both Peking and Moscow in his efforts to reconcile the Lon Nol faction with the native Communists and with the Prince Sihanouk element.

But, as so often in history, the local people do not always take kindly to the plans worked out by the distant great powers. Washington, Moscow, and Peking can propose. But those men in the jungles around Phnom Penh are the ones who will dispose of the decision. At latest reports they are all round the city, mixed in among local civilians, not shooting, not blocking the roads, just waiting patiently for Aug. 15, when, by act of Congress in Washington, the bombers will go away.

The face-saving compromise Dr. Kissinger is seeking is important to President Nixon. It is not important to the Congress. The Congress was most reluctant to give Mr. Nixon even the extra six weeks for his last round of bombing over Cambodia. It was done as part of a deal under which Congress regains its right to be consulted by the White House in the waging of war.

That compromise, at San Clemente, allows Mr. Nixon a last salvo of bombs. They are falling now—perhaps buying Dr. Kissinger a little more time. They also seem strangely anachronistic—a relic of the "cold war"—out of place in Mr. Nixon's own new "multi-power world."

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1973]

THE CAMBODIAN BOMBING DEADLINE

The establishment of an Aug. 15 deadline for American bombing in Cambodia has pushed the diplomatic process there into a higher gear. Previously, while it felt assured that the bombing would go on indefinitely, the American-supported regime in Phnom Penh refused to entertain the idea of negotiations with its Cambodian challengers. Now it has agreed for the first time to talk with "the other side." For his part, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, deposed in 1970, has just completed a two-month tour in Eastern Europe and Africa designed to show that his claim to rule again in Cambodia has a measure of international support. His statement, upon returning to his current base in Peking, that it's "too late" to negotiate with Henry Kissinger, shortly Peking-bound, seems an obvious opening ploy to extract more generous terms.

The principal unknown in the Cambodian equation is whether or to what extent the Prince can speak for the Khmer Rouge Communist insurgents, who control perhaps 90 per cent of the country's territory and who have kept Phnom Penh under continual tight siege despite more than 120 straight days of American aerial bombardment. With the end of the bombing apparently near, however, a situation is being created in which such political questions will be answered by events. Sihanouk is Peking's candidate and the Khmer Rouge are backed by Hanoi, although both he and they have strong credentials as

Cambodian nationalists. Lon Nol, our man in Phnom Penh, seems to lack a significant popular base of his own. But only a negotiation will tell.

The judgment provided the other day by Defense Secretary James Schlesinger—that he has "misgivings" about the capacity of the Lon Nol government to survive without American bombing—may be accurate analysis. But it has mischievous and disturbing implications in terms of policy. Whether the Phnom Penh group supported by the American government can or cannot survive on its own is, from the policy viewpoint, irrelevant, since the United States has no obligation to defend Cambodia and no commitment to prop up Lon Nol or any other Cambodian entity—or at least none that has been revealed or could have any legal standing. As for any obligation growing out of our duty to Saigon, "Vietnamization" has adequately prepared South Vietnam to cope for itself regardless of what happens next door in Cambodia. This last is the mission which Mr. Nixon accepted and discharged, by his own claims, in the years leading up to the Vietnam cease-fire last January.

Secretary Schlesinger went on to say, in response to a question, it was "quite possible" the President might ask Congress for authority to continue bombing after Aug. 15 if the other side escalated the conflict. Such a hint can only strengthen Lon Nol's already strong reluctance to engage in serious negotiations. In this sense, to hold out the prospect that Congress might authorize renewed bombing is to mislead Lon Nol, who deserves at least to be dealt with in a straightforward way. In another sense, the hint that Mr. Nixon may come back to Congress cuts across the plain intent of the compromise by which Mr. Nixon agreed to halt the bombing by Aug. 15 if Congress would authorize him to bomb until then. In fact, that latter authorization was a face-saver for the President, as he must know better than anybody else. Congress was willing to give the President six more weeks of bombing in exchange for a firm terminal date, even though no one has seriously contended that the extra tonnage will have any measurable effect on the political outcome in Phnom Penh. The possibility that Congress would be confronted with a request for sanctioning further warfare was not part of the deal. The point was that this would be the end of it.

A request for renewed bombing authority would be a cynical gesture inviting and deserving to be interpreted as an effort to transfer to Congress, rather than to share, the responsibility for what may unfold in Cambodia after Aug. 15. In any case, we trust that both houses of Congress would have the courage and clarity of vision to turn any such request down. If the bombing was wrong in July—which the Congress rightly insisted it was—then it would be at least as wrong in August. Mr. Schlesinger's threat ought to be seen for what it is—an unrealistic attempt to reinforce the bargaining power of the Lon Nol regime. That is how the other side is sure to see it, for they can count congressional votes. For their own sake, that is how our Cambodian allies ought to view it, as well.

CITIZEN OF THE MONTH

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, last night, Members of the Congress were honored by the Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce at a "Rally America" reception. Citizens of Fort Lauderdale came

to Washington to say thank you and to say that, despite what problems we may have, they have great faith in our country and the men elected to serve the Nation.

In particular, the chamber came to Washington to honor their own Congressman, J. HERBERT BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD an article from the Fort Lauderdale Magazine, the official publication of the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, which honors our distinguished colleague HERB BURKE as its citizen of the month:

CITIZEN OF THE MONTH

When some of the people complain that their elected officials don't have the first hand experience to know their problems, maybe they should look at J. Herbert Burke. Not only is he the U.S. Representative for the 12th Congressional District (most of Central and South Broward), but he has or continues to be a man with "experience money can't buy," a slogan he has used successfully in past campaigns.

BRINGS HOME THE BACON

A compulsive shopper, especially in local supermarkets, Herb Burke literally brings home the bacon every Saturday to his wife Evelyn and their teenage daughter Kelly, at their modern Alexandria, Virginia home located just behind the Mt. Vernon estate of George Washington. They also keep their home in Hollywood.

The sight of a silver haired Congressman in a suit doing battle with the local housewives over a cut of meat may be an unusual picture, but it definitely keeps Congressman Burke directly in touch with the problem of high living costs, the people of the 12th District and the Nation face today.

YOUTHFUL ADVENTURER—HERB HITS THE ROAD

With fashionably cut silver hair and impeccable up-to-date suits, Herb Burke looks the role of a Member of the United States Congress. Women seem to admire the ruggedly handsome good looks of the former blonde, now silver-haired man with a continuous glint in his brown eyes. He always seems to have the style. A style developed from a goodly share of youthful adventures and practical commonsense in the rugged 1930's and 40's. The son of a sheetmetal worker, who was strongly labor oriented, the Congressman today prides himself that he is supported by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and by many other facets of society. His youth was filled by his keen interest in politics and people. While friends found fun in regular boyhood activities, Herb Burke found more excitement in attending the political meetings of the day. His interest in politics made him an early admirer of law professor, turned politician, Paul Douglas. Although they agreed on many of the political issues of that era, they probably wouldn't see eye-to-eye today.

Lacking funds, he delayed going to college and instead wandered westward working at odd jobs in the fields of Oklahoma and Texas, and day-dreaming of a movie career during his journey to Hollywood, (California). Though traveling kept him far from Chicago, he loved and respected his parents and kept close touch with them, sending money whenever he could. When his father became suddenly ill, he quickly halted his odyssey to return home to Chicago to help support his family.

While working by day—he went to school by night—Northwestern University, Y.M.C.A. College, and Kent College of Law.

He passed the Illinois Bar Exams and became a senior associate in one of the largest firms in Chicago, specializing in estate and corporate law. One of the firm's clients was

Esquire Magazine, which ironically is today, leading a fight to have its readers send letters to their respective Congressmen in an effort to keep second class mail rates at their current level. Herb Burke answers those letters and the hundreds of others that flood his Washington office.

He likes to keep in touch with people.

World War II interrupted his career, and the young lawyer spurned a commission with a desk job and entered the Army as an infantry private. However, he was discharged later as a wounded, decorated infantry Captain.

He returned to his law practice following the war with a driving ambition and desire to make the American Dream a reality. Not only did he resume his law practice, but he married Evelyn Krumtinger of Kewanee, Illinois, one of the firm's prettiest secretaries. They now have two children, Michelle Kathleen, who was born in Chicago, and Kelly Ann, who was born in Florida. By 1949 Evelyn and Herb were ready to take Henry Flagler's lead and move to South Florida, and start a new life. They made friends quickly. Many still write or drop by the Washington or Fort Lauderdale offices, just to chat with Herbie. His love of people and his desire to accomplish led him to do bigger and better things.

A POLITICIAN'S POLITICIAN

Some oldtime poll watchers are still scratching their heads about that 1952 election when the newly arrived young fellow from Chicago won a seat on the Broward County Commission. The fact that Herb Burke had just moved from Chicago less than three years earlier wasn't really so unusual since many ex-veterans had also discovered Florida and were moving there to start new careers. The biggest puzzler, however, was the fact that Herb Burke was a Republican in an area where in 1952 the Supervisors of Elections was advising newly registered voters to sign up as Democrats, so as not to lose their vote. There weren't many Republicans in those days, hence, few ran for office. Generally Republicans could not be found on the ballot in a primary much less a general election race.

Against those odds, Herb Burke decided to place his trust in the people and he won. He was the first Republican ever to win a countywide seat in South Florida and he has kept winning since then.

He did, however, lose in a special election in 1955 to Congressman Paul Rogers following the death of Paul's father, Congressman Dwight Rogers.

Although he was still a relative newcomer to what was then the Sixth Congressional District, Herb Burke trudged the byways and highway of "old" Florida from "Broward to Belle Glade" seeking votes. He lost, but not by much, and, today, he proudly serves with Paul Rogers in the U.S. Congress where they represent adjoining districts.

Many politicians wonder how far Herb Burke might have actually gone if he would have won that special Congressional election in 1955. But, in any event, he didn't give up, and, instead, waited until 1966 when a new Congressional District was created, and tried again.

From 1952 to 1966, however, he wanted to become one of the best County Commissioners possible, and there are many who will attest that he succeeded in this goal. He was an early proponent of a countywide park system; strict zoning and building codes; proper land-use planning; and coordinated water and sewer programs to head off pollution of our natural streams. He advocated the need for developing proper roadways, succeeded in setting up a plan whereby the limited funds the county received from the state would be spent to build roads where they were needed. He recognized the need for funds to keep up with the population growth, but he strived, also, to keep Brow-

ard's tax rate one of the best of all taxing bodies around.

As the lone Republican of the Broward County Commissioners for the first four years of his political career, he had his good and bad moments to say the least. He fondly became known by the opposition in the county as "our very own G.O.P."

All the while, the independent Herb Burke style was developing—a style that calls for representation of the people honestly, fairly and impartially. He kept faith with the people and the people kept him in office. In 1966 when the new 10th Congressional seat was established, he became his party's choice. He won that race and subsequently his district boundaries were enlarged on two occasions so that in 1970 it was the third most populous Congressional District in the Nation. He kept winning and became the longest continuous Republican officeholder, in years of service, in the State of Florida. In fact, he may also hold this record in the entire Southeast United States.

Herb Burke is now the senior Florida Republican in point of service in the United States House of Representatives. Does he have other political ambitions? Is it too late to run for U.S. Senate or perhaps Governor? He doesn't say, but one thing is for sure, he is happy serving as a Congressman and today he reflects on the pledge he made when he first ran for public office in 1952—to be the best Commissioner he could be. Now, he is determined to be the best Congressman he can be, and continue to maintain his 95% attendance record in the House.

His face-to-face style, helping anyone who asks, speaking his mind, keeping his people informed, and getting projects moving for Broward County have impressed the people who have kept him in office, and his service to his constituents has brought him closer to a hidden love—Foreign Affairs.

Herb Burke was in Russia just before the famous Nixon-Khrushchev kitchen debates. He was in Peru when a new government took over. He, Evelyn and a Miami newsman were among the last Americans to visit free Cuba attending a New Year's celebration just before Castro moved into Havana.

When the Republican leadership was looking for a qualified, capable member to serve on the prestigious House Foreign Affairs Committee—they found a suitable candidate in Herb Burke, and Herb Burke found one of his dreams fulfilled.

Because the Committee on Foreign Affairs is charged with overseeing relations with other nations, it requires foreign travel by its members.

Some may criticize the missions as junkets—but most will agree the complaints are hardly justified when considering the reports and legislation which are forthcoming by the Committee on these matters.

Congressman Burke's interest in his Committee work earned him, this year, the position of ranking minority members on the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. He has also been appointed to the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.

This year he was elected to serve as Treasurer of the Interparliamentary Union under the Chairmanship of Senator John Sparkman. This is a group which facilitates exchanges of views on common problems among equivalent governmental bodies of many nations. He has been a special delegate to the Organization of American States and has been on some very important foreign assignments. One mission took him directly into the war zone during the Nigerian-Ibo War in a cargo plane, which not only carried him and Representative Charles Diggs, but also several tons of fried fish. The President received a direct report of that trip and was impressed enough to keep the U.S. Government directly out of that civil war.

His job has brought him into contact with many leaders of the World.

The Congressman also serves on the House Internal Security Committee, and is a Vice Chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee.

Notwithstanding the fact he serves on the sought after Foreign Affairs Committee, his first and primary interest is the 12th Congressional District.

His activities in Congress have prompted the majority of local Broward Countians to acclaim their local Congressman, not only for his success in foreign affairs, but his support and introduction of legislation that has earned him awards from the National Associated Businessmen (Watchdog of the Treasury for six consecutive years), Americans for Constitutional Action (Distinguished Service Award), AMVETS, Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Association of Retired Federal Employees, American Association of Retired Persons, Service to Israel Award, Project Close-Up (youth group) and the confidence of the voters for the past twenty-one years.

TAR HEELS IN THE ROOSEVELT ERA: NORTH CAROLINIANS WIELDED INFLUENCE IN CONGRESS

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of Carolina Country, the magazine published by the North Carolina Electric Membership Corp. headquartered in Raleigh, contains a feature story recounting the outstanding service rendered by 12 North Carolina Members of the House and Senate between 1933 and 1945.

The article was written by Philip A. Grant, Jr., and I am pleased to share it with my fellow Members by inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

TAR HEELS IN THE ROOSEVELT ERA: NORTH CAROLINIANS WIELDED INFLUENCE IN CONGRESS

(By Philip A. Grant, Jr.)

On March 9, 1933 the Seventy-Third Congress was called to order. Summoned into emergency session by newly inaugurated President Franklin D. Roosevelt, this Congress was to enact an impressive array of major laws and thus begin the momentous era of the New Deal.

Between March 9, 1933, and the death of Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, the nation was destined to undergo the most sweeping domestic reform movement in its entire history, experience a wide variety of serious economic and social problems, witness the ominous rise of totalitarian aggression in Europe and the Far East, and assume ultimate responsibility for the winning of World War II.

During this historic 12-year period, North Carolinians serving in the House and Senate were perhaps the most influential group in Congress.

Three of these North Carolinians spent their early years in the House during the New Deal and World War II periods, and then emerged as prominent congressional figures during the postwar generation. They were Reps. Carl T. Durham of Chapel Hill, Graham A. Barden of New Bern, and Harold D. Cooley of Nashville.

Durham was initially elected to the House in 1938, after completing a six-year political apprenticeship as an Orange County commissioner. A member of the Committee on Military Affairs, 1941-1947, and the Committee on Armed Services, 1947-1961, he was acknowledged as an authority in the field

of civil defense. Durham also wielded considerable influence as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy between 1957 and 1959.

While a freshman member of the North Carolina House of Representatives, Barden in 1934 was elected to the first of 13 terms in Congress. An outspoken leader of the congressional bloc opposing federal minimum wage bills, he argued that such legislation hampered the economic growth of North Carolina and other southern states. Chairman of the Committees on Education, 1943-1945, and Education and Labor, 1955-1961, Barden was the dominant personality in the lengthy and controversial House debates over whether the national government should extend financial aid to elementary and secondary schools.

Cooley was elected to 17 consecutive terms in the House. Representing a primarily rural district, he chaired the Committee on Agriculture from 1949 to 1953 and again from 1955 to 1967. Cooley authored every farm bill of consequence between the end of World War II and his retirement from public life in January 1967. Although a staunch opponent of federal civil rights legislation, he attracted nationwide attention in 1956 by refusing to join nearly all his Southern colleagues in formally condemning the various school desegregation decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Among the other North Carolina congressmen prominent during and after the Roosevelt Administrations were Reps. Zebulon Weaver of Asheville, Alfred L. Bulwinkle of Gastonia, John H. Kerr of Warrenton, and William B. Umstead of Durham, and Senators Robert R. Reynolds of Asheville and Josiah W. Bailey of Raleigh. Weaver, Bulwinkle, Kerr, Umstead, Reynolds, and Bailey were to serve an average tenure of more than 20 years in Congress.

Prior to entering Congress in 1919, Weaver had served in both houses of the North Carolina legislature. He was the congressman most responsible for the development of the Great Smoky Mountain National Park. A member of the Committee on the Judiciary for two decades, Weaver was deeply involved in the deliberations culminating in such laws as the Crime Control Acts of 1934 and the Judicial Retirement Act of 1937, as well as in numerous additions to the federal criminal code.

Bulwinkle served 14 terms in the House. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 1931-1950, he was instrumental in the passage of such landmark New Deal statutes as the Truth-in-Securities Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Cancer Research Act, and the Civil Aeronautics Act. At various times Bulwinkle chaired the Subcommittees on Public Health, Transportation, and Communications. His principal legislative achievements were the Public Health Service Act of 1944 and the Common Carrier (Reed-Bulwinkle) Act of 1948.

Between 1933 and 1939, Kerr was the ranking Democratic member of the Committees on Immigration and Naturalization and Public Buildings and Grounds. His foremost contribution during this period was the Tobacco Control Act of 1934, a measure which vested the government with authority to regulate all aspects of tobacco production. From 1939 to 1953 Kerr served on the Committee on Appropriations, and in 1949 became both the ranking Democrat on it and chairman of the Subcommittee on War Appropriations. A fitting memorial to his efforts in behalf of the people of his state and nation is the John H. Kerr Reservoir and Dam on the Virginia-North Carolina border.

Umstead was prosecuting attorney of the Durham County Recorders Court, 1922-1926, and solicitor of North Carolina's Tenth Judicial District, 1927-1933. Sworn in as a member of the House in March 1933, he was subse-

quently assigned to the Committee on Appropriations. Chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Navy, 1936-1939, Umstead occupied this post while the United States was engaged in a program of accelerated naval expansion. Temporarily retiring from public affairs in 1939, he was State Democratic chairman, 1944-1947, U.S. Senator, 1946-48, and Governor of North Carolina, 1953-1955.

Before his election to the U.S. Senate in 1932, Reynold's sole political experience consisted of four years as prosecuting attorney of North Carolina's Fifteenth Judicial District. Viewed as one of Congress' most eloquent speakers, he consistently supported President Roosevelt's New Deal programs between 1933 and 1940. During the same period, however, he remained a fervent isolationist on foreign policy matters both as a member of the Committees on Military Affairs and Foreign Affairs and on the floor of the Senate. Between 1941 and 1945 he presided over the Military Affairs panel.

Launching his political career in 1896 as a member of the State Board of Agriculture, Bailey was to be involved in public affairs intermittently for the next half century. During the presidency of Woodrow Wilson (1913-1921), he served as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Eastern District of North Carolina. Defeating veteran incumbent Furnifold M. Simmons in the 1930 Democratic primary, Bailey was elected to the Senate in November of that year. He was chairman of the Committee on Claims, 1934-1939, and the Committee on Commerce, 1939-1946.

Unlike most of his fellow North Carolinians, Bailey was a severe critic of the New Deal and was especially vociferous in his opposition to President Roosevelt's proposal to enlarge the United States Supreme Court. He was the principal author of the "Conservative Manifesto" of 1937, a bipartisan document which questioned the validity of many of the premises of the New Deal. Indeed, Bailey was one of the architects of a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans, which steadfastly resisted the President's domestic programs. Notwithstanding his firm opposition to Roosevelt, he was overwhelmingly renominated and re-elected both in 1936 and 1942.

The three most renowned North Carolinians to serve in Congress between the advent of the New Deal and the end of World War II were Reps. Edward W. Pou of Smithfield, Lindsay C. Warren of Washington, and Robert L. Doughton of Laurel Springs. Pou, Warren, and Doughton served an aggregate total of 140 years in state and national government, and certainly rank among the most outstanding North Carolina political leaders of modern times.

Pou, whose congressional tenure paralleled the administrations of seven Presidents, was the dean of the House of Representatives at the beginning of Roosevelt's presidency. More importantly he was chairman of the Committee on Rules, regarded by many to be the most powerful committee in Congress. As the occupant of this key chairmanship, Pou exerted profound influence over the fate of virtually all bills and resolutions submitted by other standing committees for floor consideration. Fortunately for Roosevelt, Pou was a loyal supporter of the New Deal and systematically expedited the various measures pending before his committee. Leading the tributes to Pou at the time of his death in April 1934 was Rep. Bertrand H. Snell, House Republican Leader. Asserting that the nation could ill-afford to lose an individual of Pou's "fine character and mental equipment," Snell hailed his deceased colleague as representing the "highest-type of twentieth century American manhood."

A former member of the North Carolina House of Representatives and State Senate, Warren first took his oath of office as a

congressman in March 1925. Chairman of the Committee on Accounts, 1931-1940, he was also the ranking Democrat both on the Committee on Roads and the Select Committee on Government Organization between 1937 and 1940. Warren guided to passage the Executive Reorganization Act of 1939, a measure which gave the President authority to streamline or consolidate the various federal departments, boards, and agencies. Highly skilled as a parliamentarian, he was frequently designated Speaker *pro tempore* of the House. In September 1940 Warren was chosen Acting Majority Leader and in the following month he was appointed by President Roosevelt to a 15-year term as Comptroller General of the United States.

Doughton was indisputably the most influential North Carolinian to serve in the House during the first half of the twentieth century. Elected by his constituents to an unprecedented 21 terms, he was widely acclaimed as an expert on federal fiscal policy and foreign trade questions. Doughton was chairman of the prestigious Committee on Ways and Means, 1933-1947 and 1949-1953, and also headed the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in alternate years during these periods. He authored more important New Deal legislation than any other member of Congress. Among the most noteworthy of the laws bearing his name were the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the Social Security Act, and the Revenue Acts of 1935, 1936, and 1938. During World War II and the immediate postwar years Doughton sponsored numerous bills to finance the vastly increased expenditures of the national government.

The 12 aforementioned members of the House and Senate were chosen by the people of North Carolina to serve in Congress during one of the most turbulent periods in the country's history. Beginning in March 1933 and continuing throughout the years of World War II and the postwar era they compiled records of genuine achievement. Collectively these gentlemen not only exercised great influence in national affairs, but also comprised one of the most illustrious delegations ever to represent North Carolina in the halls of Congress.

AN OPEN RESPONSE TO MOBIL OIL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress is aware by now that the Mobil Oil Co., as part of its public relations effort, has chosen to send an open letter addressed to each Member of Congress to our hometown newspapers.

According to Mobil Oil, the letter was sent—

Because many people are being misled by the absolute nonsense, totally unsupported charges, and outright lies being spread around by a variety of people.

I imagine that I, and others of us who are not overly friendly to the oil industry, are being referred to in that statement.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to briefly summarize an ongoing dialog which I have been having with the Mobil Oil Co.

On June 8, 1973, Congressmen MOAKLEY, BURKE, O'NEILL, and I invited nine

large oil companies to an open meeting to discuss the effects of the upcoming gasoline shortage on Massachusetts consumers. Mobil Oil refused to attend the meeting. I then requested Mobil to meet with me in a private meeting in my office. Included in the request was a list of questions on the company's supply and price situation which I wanted to discuss. Identical questions were sent to the eight other companies originally invited to the meeting. The president of Mobil's North American division, Richard Tucker, wrote me back saying that—

I will not discuss or attempt to justify individual business decisions made by Mobil.

Mobil was the only company that refused to answer my questions.

Apparently Mobil feels that it is more profitable to deal with me through my hometown newspaper. Since I am willing to hold discussions with Mobil in whatever forum it chooses, I have written an open response to the company.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD Mobil's open letter to Members of Congress, and my open response to Mobil Oil. Parenthetically, I met briefly with Mobil's Washington representative today, and he will shortly be providing me with the cost of this rather expensive letter writing campaign. The letters follow:

AN OPEN LETTER ON THE GASOLINE SHORTAGE TO SENATOR JOHN DOE AND REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD ROE

We are publishing this letter in your hometown newspaper, and in those of the other Members of Congress, because we want you and your constituents to have the facts about the gasoline shortage as we see them. We are doing this because many people are being misled by the absolute nonsense, totally unsupported charges, and outright lies being spread around by a variety of people. For example:

"There are sufficient supplies available to the oil industry so that there need be no serious shortage of gasoline or any other petroleum product for any purpose in this nation."

"But the fact is, much of the so-called energy crisis is being concocted in the board rooms and public relations offices of the nation's major oil companies."

"I suggest that circumstantial evidence supports the conclusion that the major oil companies are using the fuel shortage they helped create to drive out their competition."

What these and other such statements boil down to is a series of charges that the shortage is contrived. That it is a hoax perpetrated by oil companies to raise prices and drive unbranded marketers out of business. That it is a massive conspiracy, a price gouge to end all price gouges.

Not one of these charges is true. All are based on misinformation. Some are outright lies. Here are the facts.

I. GASOLINE PRODUCTION IS AT AN ALL-TIME HIGH

When they hear the word "shortage," many people think the industry must be supplying less than before. Far from it.

The U.S. oil industry is making more gasoline than ever before—5% more than last year. That translates into an increase of 13,700,000 gallons a day above 1972—which would have been more than enough to meet the demand growth of almost any previous year in history. The problem is that with gasoline production up 5% over last year, demand is up about 6.2%. The shortages, which may come and go due to temporary swings in demand and supply, have shown up in the fact that some service stations occasionally run out of gasoline, and many dealers have

chosen to operate on shorter hours and to close on Sundays.

II. POLITICAL DECISIONS HAVE PRODUCED THE SHORTAGE

The following factors, all essentially resulting from political decisions, have produced today's shortage:

(1) While potentially large oil reserves are believed to lie off the U.S. East and West Coasts—our most promising oil province, since the onshore U.S. has been more heavily drilled-up than any other part of the world—these offshore areas are barred to exploration, and U.S. crude production is dropping. Oil companies had no control over this.

(2) Over five years after the largest oil field ever discovered in North America was found on the North Slope of Alaska, construction of a pipeline to bring this oil to market is still stalled. Oil companies had no control over this.

(3) The United States is short of refining capacity, and will be critically short in a year or two, as a result of erratic government import policies, environmental constraints, and inability to bring the largest, most economical tankers into U.S. ports. Oil companies had no control over this.

(4) In terms of volumes, demand for gasoline is growing well over twice as much as it did during the 1960s, with pollution-control equipment and convenience devices such as air-conditioners accounting for a large part of this year's increase. Oil companies had no control over this.

(5) The shortage of natural gas caused by ill-advised government regulatory policies has forced industrial users to use large quantities of heating oil, which has caused a shortage of that product for the consumer. Oil companies had no control over this.

(6) Two of the major oil-exporting countries in the Middle East and North Africa have reduced crude oil production. Oil companies had no control over this.

(7) Price controls are impeding the importation of higher-priced oil products into our country. Oil companies had no control over this.

III. IS THERE A CONSPIRACY? IS THE SHORTAGE CONTRIVED?

If there was ever an industry in which it would be impossible to conspire, it's oil. Conspiracy requires secrecy. If you stop to think of all the bodies of government—in every branch of government, at every level—that have long involved themselves in our business, you'll realize we couldn't conspire if we wanted to. We operate in a fish bowl.

Dozens of agencies of the federal government, a horde of Congressional committees, and agencies of the 50 states and various municipalities regulate, investigate, or monitor the oil industry's activities.

Further, oil companies—even the largest ones—are so widely divergent in their size, their interests, their needs, their opportunities, and their views that it would be impossible to put a conspiracy together. Oil is one of the least-concentrated major industries in the world. No oil company supplies as much as 9% of the U.S. gasoline market.

IV. THE "INDEPENDENT" MARKETERS

You have doubtless seen charges that "the major oil companies" are cutting off gasoline supplies to non-major-brand ("independent") marketers to drive them out of business.

You should know that the overwhelming majority of service station dealers in this country are independent businessmen, whether they sell under the Mobil brand name or the brand of one of our major competitors or under their own private brand. All these dealers set their own retail prices, their working conditions, and usually their hours of operation.

Many non-major-brand marketers have in the past chosen to rely on day-to-day purchases of gasoline from oil companies in-

stead of entering into long-term supply arrangements. This policy worked to their advantage as long as supplies were adequate, and especially when there were surpluses. Now that the surplus has disappeared, they are having difficulty obtaining gasoline.

As for Mobil, we have established an allocation system to ensure fair treatment of our customers. We believe this system will enable us to supply these customers at least as much gasoline and other refined products this year as last year.

V. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

It's going to take several years to remedy the situation. A pipeline has to be built to move the oil discovered over five years ago on the North Slope of Alaska. The outer continental shelf off the U.S. East and West Coasts has to be opened to exploration for new reserves of oil and natural gas. Superports have to be built. Oil companies must be enabled to obtain satisfactory sites for new refineries. Massive research and development programs have to be undertaken to make the production of non-conventional oil and gas from oil shale and coal economically feasible and environmentally safe. Construction of nuclear power plants to generate electricity must be accelerated. All of these require long lead times, and they can't be accomplished by the oil industry alone.

This is why Mobil has been running newspaper ads across the country, and doing a good many other things, to urge people to conserve gasoline and to use all energy more efficiently. As a further step in this direction, we have totally eliminated our gasoline advertising and are focusing our efforts on providing greater public information on how our country can tackle its energy problems rationally and equitably.

VI. WHY THIS LETTER

Our intention is not to get into a posture of charges and counter-charges, but rather to accomplish two things:

(1) To set the record straight on the gasoline shortage and to put the lie to the charge of conspiracy; to help people understand the shortage is real and will be with us for some while; and to suggest practical ways to cope with it.

(2) To try to elicit from you and your constituents a national effort, such as our country has not seen since World War II, to use wisely the energy resources available to us and to establish new policies to alleviate energy problems in the years just ahead.

AN "OPEN" RESPONSE TO MOBIL OIL FROM CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

Recently, Mobil Oil sent "open letters" to myself and all other members of Congress on the gasoline shortage. The purpose of the letter was to set the record straight on what Mobil terms the "absolute nonsense, totally unsupported charges, and outright lies being spread around by a variety of people."

Since Mobil has, as has the rest of the oil industry, chosen to present its case through the public media, I would like to respond to the letter in the same medium. And I would like to reiterate my belief that the present shortage has been created by the actions of the largest major oil companies; that the independent sector of the oil industry is being threatened by the actions of the major oil companies; that the present situation is largely attributable to government regulations and decisions sought by, paid for, and supported by the oil industry; and that the solution to the shortage problem is not to give still more concessions to the oil industry, but to change its structure to assure real competition in the industry.

The view that the closed structure of the petroleum industry is a major cause of our present energy difficulties is not a view held by misinformed Congressmen and crackpots alone. The Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Competition recently completed an

in-depth two year study of the petroleum industry. Among its, as yet, unpublished findings are the following:

1. The oil industry operates much like a cartel with 15 to 20 integrated firms being the beneficiaries of much federal and state policy.

2. The major firms seek to consolidate market power by various exclusionary tactics.

3. The major firms, which consistently appear to cooperate rather than compete in all phases of their operation, have behaved in a similar fashion as would a classical monopolist.

4. The major firms have attempted to increase profits by restricting output. The majors have used the shortage as an occasion to attempt to debilitate, if not eradicate, the independent marketing sector.

To me, the FTC study confirms what has been empirically obvious to a great many of us—that when the major oil companies do something, they do it together.

In the open letter, Mobil publishes some "facts" on the gasoline shortage. I have discovered that, in this issue as in others, the "facts" differ significantly depending on one's point of view.

Mobil cites the fact that gasoline production is at an all-time high. Today, this is true—responding to public pressure, American refineries are finally beginning to operate at close to rated capacity. However, other "facts" should also be considered: first, while the major's refineries are being operated at top capacity, independent refineries are operating considerably below capacity because of a crude oil shortage. 80% of crude oil production is controlled by the 8 largest oil companies of which Mobil is one. Second, while refineries are now operating at near top capacity, last year they were being operated at only around 85% of capacity, although the American Petroleum Institutes' "a country that runs on oil, can't afford to run short" campaign was going full swing. Third, and finally, at the beginning of this summer, gasoline stocks were actually 600,000,000 gallons below 1971 levels of gasoline, and 400,000,000 gallons below 1972 levels.

Mobil claims "political decisions" have produced the shortage. Unfortunately, this is basically correct. First, the decision by the government to institute oil import quotas is by far the most important factor contributing to our present difficulties. The major oil companies lobbied for and have blindly supported this price fixing system for 15 years until the system finally collapsed.

Second, the government's decision to give the oil industry foreign tax credits and depletion allowances have resulted in a steady 10 year decrease in the amount of exploration done by the oil companies. The industry supports these credits.

Third, the government's decision to permit the major oil companies to form a cartel to deal with the Arab countries has left the government helpless in the area of international oil policies and have made the oil companies little more than tax collectors for Arab potentates.

Mobil claims environmental regulations have prevented refinery construction. In point of fact, the oil companies have not bothered to plan refinery construction. To quote from the FTC study: "Spokesmen for several majors argue that the lack of expansion can be attributed directly to environmental problems. However, now that import controls have been removed, and governmental intervention into the industry has become a strong threat, these companies have suddenly overcome their environmental problems. Exxon has announced plans to build additional refining capacity of 800,000 barrels per day. Other large firms also plan new refineries in the near future."

Finally, Mobil argues that independents are not being treated unfairly by the majors. The 1,000 independents who have been per-

manently forced out of business might disagree. I have talked with the so-called "independent businessmen" who do business under the major oil companies' flags, and have determined that it is extremely unwise for these independent businessmen to disregard the major companies' "suggestions" as to price, profits, service, and company promotions. Today, I have 20 identical letters from independent owners of Gulf stations complaining about mandatory allocations.

There is a need for cooperation between the industry and government if we are to solve our energy problem. Recently, I, together with Congressman Moakley, invited representatives of nine major oil companies to Boston to discuss the gasoline shortage in Massachusetts.

Mobil refused to attend the meeting. I then followed up the meeting with a questionnaire concerning each of the nine companies' position with regard to supply, prices, and plans for meeting the shortage. Only one company refused to supply me with this information. Mobil.

It is not my intention to single out Mobil as a villain in this scenario. But Mobil did, after having refused to meet a group of Congressmen in an open meeting, and refusing to answer some simple written questions on the company's situation, decide that it was necessary to send a letter to my hometown newspaper informing me of the "facts" on the situation.

I can only guess as to how much money Mobil spent to send the same message to the hometown constituents of each of the 434 other members of Congress, but I would assume it runs into hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars.

At this point, I remain perfectly willing to discuss the energy shortage, in my office, in the newspapers, or in any other forum Mobil might want to suggest.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.

ABUSE OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we complete processing of the Agriculture Act today, I believe that special attention must be given to the abuse of the food stamp program.

A very kindly article by Bill Anderson, in the Chicago Tribune of July 7, discusses the administrative abnormalities of the program as well properly questions the value of food stamps for strikers. The article presents the point in a very effective fashion:

WHO CAN AND CANNOT GET FOOD STAMPS
(By Bill Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—A handful of school teachers in Florida have been cut from the federal food stamp program, but a loophole which allows striking workers to get the good-as-cash coupons remains wide open.

This dichotomy of standards, we learn, is the result of an angry request by Rep. W. R. Poage [D., Tex.], chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and the clout of organized labor on Capitol Hill.

The Agriculture Department tipped its hand in the Federal Register published yesterday. In fluent bureaucratese, both in the Register and an accompanying press release, the department made it appear that there were going to be some major and wholesome

changes in the controversial food for the needy program.

"Certain individuals," according to the press release, had been abusing the program by signing up for stamps even though they were making an annual income way above the poverty level. A new amendment to the food stamp regulations will keep these individuals off the dole, the department said.

The bad guys in question, the press release explained, were "those individuals, such as teachers, who are under a contract which is renewable each year or longer."

The key operative word is "contract," according to our sources at the Agriculture Department. Since most union members are not under a contract in the sense teachers are, the rule does not apply to strikers, the department explained after consulting with its lawyers.

Agriculture Department spokesmen said that the change was implemented within the bureaucracy because the same attorneys had decided that the law which established the program allows that much latitude. The attorneys also decided that the law is not "broad" enough to allow the department to cut off strikers without the permission of Congress.

The department has been deluged with complaints that strikers use food stamps to tide themselves over while the picket lines are up. Several members of Congress have proposed changes in the law to eliminate strikers from the program. The last such congressional effort bowed to labor's influence by a one-vote margin in the House Agriculture Committee.

Poage initiated the present change after reading stories in two Florida newspapers revealing that some teachers in St. Petersburg and Tampa had been signing up for food stamps during their summer vacations. The reason teachers could do this, the department explained, is that applicants are selected on the basis of their anticipated income during the three months following the date they apply. Teachers can arrange to be paid their entire year's salary over the nine months they work and were therefore formerly eligible, the department spokesmen said.

A creature of the Great Society programs of the late President Johnson, the food stamp program began as a test in 1961 but never really got going until 1965, when 561,261 persons received \$9.5 million in food buying assistance.

From those "humble" beginnings, food stamps have boomed into a \$2 billion plus yearly outlay, supplying beefed up buying power for 12.5 million Americans in 48 states. New Hampshire and Delaware do not participate.

To qualify, the familiar maximum income standards apply. A family of four can earn \$387 per month and still qualify for \$24 per month in assistance.

The program works by allowing those enrolled to buy stamps which are negotiable in food stores. The maximum amount of stamps a family can buy is \$116. But a person with a zero monthly income can buy the stamps for \$41 while a family with the maximum allowable income must pay \$92 for the same \$116 worth of stamps.

The stamps can be redeemed only at grocery stores which agree to participate and only for domestically-produced foodstuffs intended for human consumption.

Critics of the program range from those who think it is abused because people like strikers use it to those who say that it does no good for truly poor people who don't even have enough money to buy the stamps even at the highly discounted rate. Advocates say simply the program keeps food in stomachs of many people who otherwise would go hungry.

INTRODUCES BILL TO DISCOURAGE THE USE OF CRUEL ANIMAL TRAPS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill for myself and 36 other Congressmen which would discourage the use of inhumane devices in the trapping of animals and birds.

Annually, millions of wild and domestic animals suffer needlessly due to steel leghold animal traps. The model trap used most frequently today was designed some 150 years ago. Capturing of animals, most often painfully, is the only purpose of such a trap. The killing is supposedly put off until the hunter arrives.

However, the deep jaws of steel leghold traps cause excruciating pain and numbness. A trapped animal may remain in captivity for days, or it may choose to chew through its own leg to attain freedom. Thus, a victim of a steel leghold trap may die of starvation, infections, or his condition can render him easy prey for other animals. In the best instances, writhing by a caught animal will result in torn flesh and ligaments.

Steel leghold traps are not selective. Whether useful as furbearers or not, an animal can be easily captured. Hunting dogs and even species of animals nearing extinction are not safe. Numerous surveys by humane groups have found that animals unwanted as furbearers outnumber by 2 or 3 to 1 the number of furbearers found in traps.

A very high proportion of U.S. trappers are not professionals. As hobbyists, these hunters check their traps sporadically. One provision of this bill is to require trappers to inspect their devices once a day and promote humane trapping by preventing starvation and other suffering.

We do not intend to discourage the animal pelt industry with this bill. Inexpensive alternative traps, which painlessly capture, are easily available. These alternative traps can be produced by simply wrapping weather stripping across the jaws of an original steel leghold animal trap. This additional cost is only about 40 cents per trap. Traps which instantaneously kill are also readily available. By breaking its back or neck, these traps kill an animal quickly, without pain.

A few States, as well as a number of foreign countries, have successfully implemented laws which ban the use of painful animal traps. Thus, empirical evidence has proven the feasibility of allowing on the market only traps which are painless or traps which instantaneously kill.

MORE HUMANE MEANS

Mr. Speaker, more humane means to trap animals must now be initiated. Economic excuses are no longer valid in rationalizing outmoded methods. Hu-

mane trapping can be instigated at very low cost, and with innumerable benefits to all involved.

First, this bill seeks to discourage the use of cruel traps by instructing the Secretary of Interior to set up criteria for establishing traps which will painlessly capture or instantaneously kill.

Second, it would set up a seven person commission appointed by the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, including some experienced trappers, to help the Secretary in determining "approved traps."

Third, this proposal is intended to halt entrance into interstate commerce all unapproved traps beginning six months after promulgation of regulations by the Secretary.

Fourth, it would halt the use of unapproved traps on Federal lands 6 months after the date of promulgation of regulations.

Fifth, our bill would impose labeling requirements for interstate shipments of furs and hides.

Sixth, it would halt the entrance into interstate commerce of animals or products thereof trapped or captured by other than approved traps, beginning 2 years after promulgation of regulations.

Seventh, this measure would authorize the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with States or political subdivisions to assist them financially, or otherwise enable them to comply with the requirements of the act.

Finally, it is intended to provide aids and penalties to enforcement.

This bill does not:

One, interfere with predator control programs, except that the Secretary is to establish criteria for trapping in a manner which captures painlessly or instantaneously kills animals;

Two, halt commercial trapping on Federal lands except that such trapping must be conducted with traps approved by the Secretary and must be carried out in accordance with a program conducted by or supervised by Federal or State personnel;

Three, interfere with the right of private landowners to protect private property against damage and depredation.

ENDORSEMENTS

In addition, this bill has been endorsed by the following humane and environmental groups:

Friends of the Earth;
The Sierra Club;
Defenders of Wildlife;
Humane Society of the United States;
National Park and Conservation Association;
Fund for Animals;
Society for Animal Protective Associations;
American Protection Institute of America;
National Association for Humane Legislation; and
International Society for Protection of Animals.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone to great lengths to see that this bill is as strong as possible, yet reasonable. It is our pur-

pose to insure nationally consistent and high standards of humaneness and care in our trapping policies, and I believe that Congress should enact legislation such as this which would establish such a policy.

ROOTING FOR THE HOME TEAM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission is reported in the news media as concerned over the objectivity of sportscasters and considering a full-scale investigation to determine how much the fans are being misled.

It seems to me that there are more pressing problems than this one awaiting FCC attention, including the quality of television and radio programming generally, the multiplicity and tedious repetition of commercials, and the fairness or lack of it in what purports in some cases to be "straight" news reporting.

Sportscasting, especially that done by the hometown play-by-play callers, is seldom unbiased and this, in my judgment, is how the sports followers like it. In my district, where the Pittsburgh Pirates and Steelers hold forth, we would not want it any other way. We have a long tradition of rooting for the home teams, both in the stands and over the airwaves.

The question the FCC may raise, according to the news reports, is whether sportscasts are news or entertainment. It should require no study in depth to determine this. Such broadcasts to the home folks at least are entertainment, pure, and simple, and not, of course, to be accepted with more seriousness than the circumstances warrant. And this, I feel, is good.

We once had a radio sportscaster in Pittsburgh, the late and still lamented Rosey Rowswell, who made no apologies for his partiality to the Pirates. In his broadcasts, they were his "Bucs" and Rosey painted rosy word pictures of their exploits even back in the 1950's when they were habitual league tail-enders. But in the process, Rosey made new baseball fans by the thousands, taught the game to hosts of women listeners, and left a legacy of delighted interest which prevails to this day.

Rosey's former helper and successor, Bob Prince has carried on the tradition. To Mr. Prince, the Pirates all are men of baseball distinction who, in bad days, are victims of a cruel fate and, on good days, are world's champions who, in his most notable expression, "had 'em all the way." Seldom, if ever, in Mr. Prince's assessment, does a Pirate turn in a sloppy performance which, in truth, occurs on occasions in Pittsburgh as elsewhere.

I believe the "hometown" announcers, by soft-pedaling the Pirate errors and rationalizing all Steeler setbacks, have

made big league baseball and football matters of marked personal importance to the people of western Pennsylvania. I doubt if the fans would be as loyal, or the interest as keen if, through some FCC meddling, the sportscasters were compelled to call everything straight. My hope, therefore, is that Government regulation, so badly needed in so much that has to do with radio and TV, will be confined to real problems and not to inhibiting the game callers from boosting their heroes and creating their supermen, no matter how stretched the evidence. Who is being hurt by this? Nobody.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last year, a distinguished law enforcement official, Peter J. Pitchess, sheriff of Los Angeles County, testified in favor of gun control legislation before the House Committee on the Judiciary.

He said:

Let me begin by telling you my position regarding the handgun,

It is made for killing people, and I challenge any one to disprove that statement.

The statistics demonstrate the terrible accuracy of Sheriff Pitchess' statement: they prove indisputably that handguns kill and wound an increasingly large number of Americans each year. Here are a few key facts about handgun murders:

More than 21,000 people in this country die annually by gunfire.

Every 58 minutes, a handgun is used to kill a human being in America.

Last year, 80,000 Americans were injured in assaults by gun-wielding assailants, and 220,000 were robbed at gunpoint.

Handgun murders jumped 87 percent between 1966 and 1971, while murders with other types of weapons rose at less than half that rate.

Guns were used in 65 percent of all homicides, 63 percent of all robberies, and 24 percent of all aggravated assaults.

Guns have killed a large number of policemen in the performance of their duty: from 1961 to 1970, 604 policemen were killed by firearms, and 466 of that group were killed by handguns.

Guns are by no means used exclusively in criminal activity. In Washington, D.C., 81 percent of all homicide cases involve a victim and a suspect who are either friends, relatives, acquaintances, or husbands and wives—86 percent of those murders stemmed directly from an argument or lovers' quarrel.

Handguns account for three-quarters of all firearm homicides in the Nation, although they comprise only one-fourth of all the guns.

But alarming as those statistics are, they tend to obscure a very central fact: those 21,000 people who died by gunfire last year were 21,000 distinct, separate

individuals. They had unique personalities and histories. They left behind them grieving parents, sorrowing husbands and wives, children who will have to be raised without a parent, friends, colleagues.

The article from the Boston Globe which I am inserting into the RECORD today is the story of one man murdered by a pistol. If you read the newspapers any day of the week, you will find an account of a murder by handgun, so in that sense, this article is not unusual.

But James B. Miller of Brook Avenue in Roxbury, Mass., was a human being, and that fact alone makes his death important. He was killed by a robber who shot him from a moving car with a .357 magnum pistol after Miller had fired several shots at the criminal and missed.

Perhaps Miller would be alive today had the robber not had easy access to a .357 magnum pistol. Perhaps Miller would be alive today had he not kept that handgun in the backroom of his restaurant.

But Miller is dead, and he leaves behind a wife, two daughters, and a group of Roxbury teenagers who liked him because he let them stay around his restaurant at night when they had no place else to go.

Beginning today, I plan to insert into the RECORD a daily account of a handgun murder. Perhaps these articles will make us understand that our handguns are not merely killing "statistics," they are killing human beings.

The need for strong legislation to control the sale and possession of handguns is clearer today than it ever has been. The argument that "Guns don't kill, people kill," is sheer rhetoric. The availability of guns has made it frighteningly easy for people to kill people. In fact, the very presence of a gun is often a strong stimulus to violence, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation has reported a strong correlation between handgun ownership and handgun crime.

James B. Miller of Roxbury, Mass., is dead now. Someone else—another American—will be killed within the next hour.

The next victim is unknown. He may be young or old, rich or poor. But the murder weapon is generally known: in three cases out of four, it will be a handgun.

The article from the July 11 Boston Globe follows:

VICTIM OF SHOOTOUT HAD TRIED TO MAKE NEIGHBORHOOD SAFER

(By Al Larkin)

J. B. Miller used to let the teenagers along Blue Hill avenue hang around his restaurant at night when they had no place else to go.

And when they were hungry but didn't have any money, he'd give them a sandwich—on credit.

And sometimes late at night or early in the morning, J. B. Miller, who didn't look his 58 years, would go out on the sidewalk and talk with the kids because he was concerned about his neighborhood and the people in it.

So, when James B. Miller—the man the kids called "JB"—was shot to death by a holdup man early yesterday, the teenagers along Blue Hill avenue knew the killer was not one of them.

Last night, they stood outside Miller's Fish and Chips restaurant at 1140 Blue Hill av. near Morton street, and cursed the person who killed their friend.

Miller, of 47 Brook av., Roxbury, was gunned down by a robber who had come into the store shortly before the 1 a.m. closing time. The thief leaped across a counter, emptied the cash register and fled with \$200.

Spotting the commotion from a back room, Miller reached for a pistol he kept handy and fired a single shot at the fleeing bandit. The bullet missed.

Miller then ran out a back door and fired two more shots at the robber fleeing along Livingstone street in a stolen car. He missed again.

The car slowed for a minute and the man behind the wheel fired a single shot, from a powerful .357 magnum pistol, hitting Miller in the head.

The car then slammed into the rear of a parked truck and the gunman was forced to flee on foot.

Miller, still alive despite the serious wound, walked back through the restaurant, past his wife, grandson and a waitress without saying a word, and got into his car.

He drove a half mile to the police station on Morton street and told officers of the robbery. Suddenly he slumped to the floor and 25 minutes later at Carney Hospital he died.

"He was a very strong and brave man," his wife, Harriet, said last night. "I told him it was a bad place to be running a store, but he wanted to be there. He felt it was his duty."

Miller was among a group of Morton street area businessmen who have been trying to make the neighborhood a safer place. Yesterday, his fellow merchants met with police officials and again asked for more police protection.

For Miller, the restaurant had been his life. He first opened it three years ago, but it was burned down by local kids. He then moved next door and tried again.

"The kids still broke in every once and awhile and stole little things," Mrs. Miller said yesterday. "But then they'd come back and say they were sorry and we'd understand."

The couple had run the store together for the past two years, sometimes working 12 and 15 hours daily, and things had begun to look better.

"We were feeling secure. We were even thinking of taking a little vacation, if we just didn't have to worry about someone breaking into the store. That's the way it always was," she said.

"James always thought he could make a go of it. But he didn't. No one on that street seems to make it anymore," Mrs. Miller said.

Miller had worked for many years as an automobile simonizer at several auto firms in Belmont. He opened his first restaurant three years ago "because he was getting old," Mrs. Miller said.

"He'd be pleased to know that I'm going to keep that restaurant open," she said yesterday. "I'll be brave too. You only die once."

Besides his wife, Miller leaves two daughters, Mrs. Lenore Showers of Jacksonville, Fla., and Belena Miller of Lowell. Funeral arrangements are incomplete.

JIM SMITH

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying tribute to our departed col-

league, Jim Smith. My friends from Oklahoma have given the story of Jim's public career and I heartily endorse their praise of his personal and professional accomplishments. Jim and I were first elected to the 90th Congress and we both became Members of the 90th Club. I will always remember Jim as a warm and helpful friend as a Member of this House and as Administrator of Farmers' Home Administration. I can also testify that no one was more knowledgeable in the field of agricultural affairs and so staunch a defender.

Before being elected to the 90th Congress, Jim was a farmer and cattle rancher and upon his unsuccessful bid for reelection, it was only appropriate that Jim be appointed by President Nixon to serve as Administrator in a field he so deeply loved and understood. Jim earned the respect and admiration of not only those who worked with him, but most importantly, that of the people who he served. Jim was dedicated to his position and distinguished himself among the citizens of his native Oklahoma and the Nation by advocating the position and importance of agriculture today. His untimely death is unfortunate in that it deprives us of the contributions he would undoubtedly have made to the future.

I am proud to have known Jim Smith and I join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his wife and family and to the many friends who knew and admired him.

CHILD ABUSES

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the shocking rate of child abuse in this country is a matter of national scandal. Year after year hundreds of thousands of defenseless children are burned, beaten, sexually attacked, and at times killed by their parents and guardians. This malady is one of the most difficult to understand and one of the hardest to forgive.

There are over 60,000 cases of neglect and abuse reported each year, and this is only the beginning of the hidden total. Meantime, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare continues to express its opposition to legislation which would attempt to lower this astronomical rate of incidence. I have introduced such a bill on the House side which would grant \$60 million to the States over a 3-year period for programs involved with treatment and rehabilitation, training and public education in the child abuse prevention and control area.

The main consultant who helped me prepare this bill and who has for many years been known countrywide as perhaps the most knowledgeable expert in the field is Dr. Vincent Fontana. Dr. Fontana has led the New York City Task

Force on Child Abuse in its excellent work and has directed the treatment of innumerable cases of child abuse at St. Vincent's Hospital in that city.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star-News recently ran an article on Dr. Fontana which I would like to read into the Record for the edification of my colleagues. This man is a leader in his field and has demonstrated the kind of sensitivity, intelligence, and stamina which are so critically needed in the fight against child abuse and neglect. I commend Dr. Fontana for his ongoing work and am proud to be closely associated with him and his crusade against senseless child maltreatment.

The article follows:

CHILD ABUSE: A MANY GENERATION SYNDROME

(By Judith Randal)

NEW YORK.—The pediatrician who heads this city's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect says that child battering has become an epidemic that could predispose American society to crime and violence for generations to come.

"People who as children are abused either physically or psychologically are more likely than people who have normal childhoods to become drug addicts, muggers and murderers as teenagers and adults," Dr. Vincent J. Fontana told a news conference held here yesterday at the 122nd annual meeting of the American Medical Association.

"Yet we are not willing as a society to accept this. We keep assuming that child battering is a low-income ghetto problem involving only people with mental disease."

"It's not so," Fontana continued. "And unless the masses recognize this problem and give the great amount of money needed to support programs to help the battering parent and child, there will come a time when very few of us will be able to go out on the street."

Fontana, director of pediatrics at St. Vincent's Hospital and Medical Center here said that in New York City alone last year 200 children died from battering and that as many as 50,000 a year die nationwide—more than from any other single cause. But, in addition, he noted, more than a million a year survive physical or psychological punishment which disables them for life.

All of the 50 states, Fontana reported, have child-abuse laws. But their provisions and enforcement powers vary and most agencies dealing with the problem are short of trained personnel and funds. Furthermore, he said, child battering is often overlooked by doctors either because they do not recognize it when they see it or are reluctant to report it to the authorities.

Fontana and Dr. Arthur Green, a child psychiatrist at the Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn who was also at the news conference pointed out that it is a mistake to assume that mothering a child is instinctive. If a mother was abused in childhood, her children are apt to be abused, they said. The same is said to apply to fathers.

Explaining in more detail, the two physicians said that most battering parents have in common a tendency to treat other people—particularly those who cannot retaliate—the way they themselves have been treated in the past.

For this reason, they said, they may see a child as "a hateful little creature", rather than a cherished extension of themselves. Thus, they expect a baby to satisfy their needs instead of the reverse.

Green and Fontana are among the handful of physicians and other health personnel who direct programs which help parents who batter their children to develop self-esteem and other personality attributes

which enable them to become adequate mothers and fathers.

But the number of such programs is too small to meet the need and besides most have been federally funded and the money is running out with little prospect of renewal.

At present, Fontana said, the Nixon administration plans to spend \$3 million to combat the problem, but the money is to be used only to establish a nationwide information clearinghouse and for a re-examination of the 1962 model child abuse law.

What is needed, he said, is \$60 million to train personnel and set up a network of treatment centers across the nation. The Nixon administration is opposed in principle to the proposal because it does not believe that federal funds should be spent for the delivery of health-care services. However, several bills directed at the child-abuse problem are pending in Congress.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have completed the tabulation of the results of my recent questionnaire and for the information of the Members and other interested persons, I am pleased to present it today. The results of the questionnaire are set out in the form of a newsletter containing the following caption: "Newsletter From Your Open Door in Washington—Congressman Albert W. Johnson—23d District of Pennsylvania, Newsletter 24, July 1973". In addition to the questionnaire results, the newsletter also lists the times of my weekly 5-minute radio program on the stations in my district.

The newsletter also contains a picture of myself at the open door of my office. The newsletter then continues as follows:

DEAR FOLKS IN THE 23D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: I am pleased to send you this newsletter which presents the results of the Questionnaire that I issued this spring. I want to thank those who took the time to give me the benefit of their opinions. The picture above was taken at the open door of my new office in Suite 2351 of the Rayburn Building, telephone number (202) 225-5121. The results and my comments on the 14 questions are as follows:

Question No. 1—Would you vote to compel the President to spend impounded appropriations?

The answer: Yes: 23 percent; no: 73.5 percent; no answer: 3.5 percent.

The impoundment of over \$10 billion in appropriations by the President has commenced to pay off. Congress during June for the first time in a good many years voted to keep the debt ceiling at \$465 billion for another six months. However, the courts in 3 recent cases have ruled that the President cannot impound appropriated funds, even though there is no tax money available to cover the appropriations, and regardless of whether the expenditures will mean a raise in the national debt.

In the Congress, Senator Ervin, the Watergate committee Chairman, has an anti-impoundment measure moving, which would forbid impoundment by the President, unless Congress gives its consent. The measure would force the spending even though there is a budget deficit. I personally believe that the President has the power and the duty to impound funds, if the spending will result

in a deficit. A large majority of the people in the district are on the right side of this issue.

Question No. 2—Should I vote to sustain a Presidential veto on bills which would substantially exceed the Federal budget?

The answer: Yes: 71.1 percent; no: 25.4 percent; no answer: 3.5 percent.

An historic confrontation between an angry Democratic Congress and a determined Republican President over spending is now in progress. This Congress is re-passing spending bills previously vetoed by the President and then the Republicans, joined by Southern Democrats, are refusing to override the President's vetoes. Despite Presidential budget cut-backs, Federal spending continues to climb. In 1949, just 24 years ago, the Federal budget in Truman's first year was \$40.6 billion. In 1959, under President Eisenhower it reached \$100 billion. Under President Johnson, it reached \$200 billion, and now under President Nixon for FY 1974, the budget figure is \$268.7 billion. The President is trying to hold the spending for FY 1973 to \$250 billion. But, Congress wants to increase that sum by \$10 billion. If the Congress does this, over the veto of the President, new taxes will be necessary or the national debt ceiling will have to go up.

Question No. 3—Do you (a) favor Congress freezing all prices for 1 year, or (b) continuing to allow the President the power to impose controls?

The answer: A: 51.9 percent; B: 38.3 percent; no answer: 9.8 percent.

Since your receipt of my questionnaire, Congress has resolved this issue and has continued the power in the President to fix prices for one more year. The President does not like controls. After all, they are a real drastic curtailment of freedom of contract, contrary to the American way. So after Phase II, strict controls in January of this year were switched to Phase III—a voluntary plan. No one lived up to the guidelines. Food prices shot up and up. It was necessary to again devalue the dollar. Prices of industrial commodities under supply and demand pressures rose rapidly. Congress was flooded with complaints as rent and gasoline prices soared. The nation was in a real boom. Not in a decade had prices shot up so fast. On March 29, the President froze the price of meats, a departure from Phase III.

In May the President ordered all companies to notify him of all proposed price increases over 1.5%. By mid June it was painfully apparent that Phase III was not working. So the President went on national television and scrapped Phase III and imposed the second freeze since August 1971. It covers all prices, except raw agriculture prices and wages. The rising inflation must cease, and here's hoping that this new freeze will do it, providing Congress has the courage to hold down the budget. I supported retaining the power to fix prices in the President, as I am convinced a freeze imposed by Congress would be inflexible and would shackle the economy.

Question No. 4—Would you include wages and salaries in a price freeze?

The answer: Yes: 71.1 percent; no: 22.1 percent; no answer: 6.8 percent.

Even though the President has imposed a second freeze on prices, wages escaped a clamp down. However, both President Nixon and Treasury Secretary George Shultz have stressed that post-freeze controls in Phase IV will treat wages and prices in a consistent and fair manner. Both have acknowledged that the new freeze on prices but not wages involves inequitable treatment. I agree. A reason for not including wages is that the freeze would have complicated the negotiations of major industries now underway.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns recently made a speech on how taxes, wages, prices and profits have changed in the period from 1952 through 1972. Using 1967 as a norm, or 100%, the index on wages

in 1952, was 45.7%. However, at the end of 1972, it had gone up to 134.9%, or an increase of 192%. Wholesale prices on the same index were 84.1% in 1952 and 114.9% on December 31, 1972, or an increase of 40.2%. During the same period Corporate profits rose 168.6%. I will push for equal treatment of wages under Phase IV. The response from my constituents, like yourself, indicate that mandatory controls must be imposed on wages also.

Question No. 5—Should the United States relinquish its jurisdictional powers over the Panama Canal Zone?

The answer: Yes: 18.3 percent; no: 76.4 percent; no answer: 5.3 percent.

The serious situation confronting the United States in its relations with Panama and the Canal was brought into focus in March of this year when the U.N. Security Council held a session in Panama and a resolution was offered in the nature of a condemnation of the U.S. for its control over the Panama Canal Zone. The United States exercised its veto over this resolution. I have co-sponsored a resolution stating that it is the sense of Congress that the U.S. should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the Canal. This strong 76 per cent vote indicates district concern over the possibility of ceding to Panama any of our rights. After all, American taxpayers have invested over \$5 billion in the Canal since the 1903 treaty was signed that totally legitimized our control over the Canal Zone. Such control is a prerequisite for the proper defense of the Continental United States and the Western Hemisphere.

Question No. 6—Do you favor the phasing out of the Office of Economic Opportunity (The Anti-Poverty Program)?

The answer: Yes: 57.5 percent; no: 35.1 percent; no answer: 7.4 percent.

In my February 1971 Questionnaire I asked a similar question, and the answer was Yes: 49.9%; No: 28.4%. The 57.5% figure above represents an increase in sentiment against the agency by 7.6%. In the eight year life of the Poverty Program, it has cost the government almost \$15 billion, reached millions of people, and employed thousands of administrators. It has fallen far short, however, of eliminating poverty. Now the President wants to dismantle the program. The plan is to keep the good parts and discard the unproductive. Other agencies will take over many programs, and some will receive increased funds. The greatest casualty will be the Community Action agencies—907 in all, employing 180,000 people. The President feels that the old OEO has not proved worth its cost. The President explained his action in a nationwide radio speech on February 24th. He said that too much money has been going to those who were supposed to help the needy and too little to the needy themselves.

Naturally, a vigorous protest has been exhibited. 20,000 demonstrated in Washington against the cut, led by Mrs. Martin Luther King, and Rev. Ralph Abernathy. A U.S. District Judge of Washington, D.C., William B. Jones, has ruled Nixon cannot eliminate OEO. And in another case, Judge Jones ruled that Howard Phillips, the former acting director of OEO, was serving illegally as a dismantler, as he had not been confirmed by the U.S. Senate. The role of the budget cutter is hard.

Question No. 7—Should postal workers be allowed to strike?

The answer: Yes: 28.3 percent; no: 68 percent; no answer: 3.7 percent.

Postal workers were given the right by law to have a union and now they want the law amended to give them the right to strike. They have testified that they should have this right so as to enjoy the freedom that other American workers in industry have. Those against the proposal stated that public employees should not have the right

to strike because they are serving in the public interest. The Post Office Committee was asked by the opposition to consider what would happen to the American economy if there was a serious delay in mail service. Bank deposits would be held up. Social Security checks would not be delivered. Meaningful arbitration seems like the best solution.

Question No. 8—Should Congress repeal the law which turned the Post Office Department over to an independent corporation?

The answer: Yes: 47.8 percent; no: 44.4 percent; no answer: 7.8 percent.

I am not surprised at the closely divided opinion on this question in view of the decline in postal service generally. The House Post Office Committee is now conducting oversight hearings in key cities in the nation and are asking the question whether the new corporation is a success, and whether the American people should have more say through their Congressman in the operation of the Postal Service.

The new postal corporation is an entirely independent entity and only comes to Congress for a public service appropriation. The law contemplates the corporation to break even. A great deal of the trouble has been caused by the corporation being forced to this break even point too fast. The present Congress is awaiting the report of this investigating committee.

Question No. 9—Do you feel that the United Nations contributes to world peace?

The answer: Yes: 52.4 percent; no: 38.2 percent; no answer: 9.4 percent.

This answer indicates that the people of the 23rd District still have faith in the United Nations and hope that it will have greater influence in promoting peace. I was delighted to receive so many letters, in addition to the comments on the questionnaire. One in particular is from an outstanding young citizen of Bellefonte, named Randy Van Scyoc, who is 13 years old.

"Dear Sir: I am a member of Boy Scout Troop 35 of Bellefonte. I am presently working on my Citizenship in the Nation merit badge, and one of the requirements is to write to your Representative on a national issue of the day. I recently saw a questionnaire sent out by your office to my Dad, asking his opinion on some key issues to go before the 93rd Congress. I realize that I am not old enough to vote, but I would like to express my opinion on the 9th issue concerning the United Nations contribution to world peace. I feel very strongly that the United Nations does contribute to world peace for the following reasons. First and most important, it is the only means that nations, large or small, can get together, talk in peace, and cooperate in solving their problems. Another important goal of the United Nations is to make the world a better and safer place to live in by providing aid for countries and different groups of people. They have encouraged trade and have suggested ways for countries to become more productive. They have provided aid for refugees, and have raised millions of dollars through UNICEF to aid needy children. The United Nations is also working for progress in many other fields, including human rights, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and pollution control. I am aware that the United Nations has its problems as to finances, membership, and limited abilities to maintain peace. However, I feel that these problems can be overcome with time, patience, and cooperation among the nations. Now, more than ever, countries must strive to live in peace." Sincerely yours, Randy Van Scyoc.

Question No. 10—Would you vote for the proposed trade bill which grants power to the President to eliminate, reduce, or raise tariffs?

The answer: Yes: 61.2 percent; no: 33.7 percent; no answer: 5.1 percent.

In this complex world of trade, especially facing the multitude of nations, our President has to have the power to retaliate against trade barriers abroad, or to grant concessions where a nation gives us a favorable trade concession. The bill before Congress would give the President this flexibility. The President would submit to the Congress the agreement he has made under the law. Congress would then have 60 days to approve or disapprove of it.

Question No. 11—Do you favor U.S. financial aid to North Vietnam to aid rebuilding destroyed areas?

The answer: Yes: 9.7 percent; no: 85.5 percent; no answer: 4.8 percent.

We are fortunate to be living in a time of peace for the first time in more than 20 years. As you can see the percentage of opinions in this question is the highest of all those asked. Certainly it exhibits a very strong and determined opposition of the people of the 23rd District against helping North Vietnam. I intend to oppose financial aid to rebuild the destroyed areas of North Vietnam, when the issue comes before the House for a vote.

Question No. 12—Would you vote to widen the right-of-way in Alaska so that the Alaskan pipeline can be built?

The answer: Yes: 72.8 percent; no: 22.8 percent; no answer: 4.4 percent.

As you all know, in February 1968, there was discovered a rich oil field on the frozen North slope of Alaska at Prudhoe Bay. Conservative estimates place the oil producible at 10 billion to 40 billion barrels, and gas at 26 trillion cubic feet. What a great assist to our energy problem! The oil companies thought that a pipeline right-of-way through Alaska would be granted as a matter of course. How fooled they were. Environmentalists have successfully stopped the pipeline by court actions, stating that the pipeline would impede the migration of Caribou and cause pollution. The Courts have held that the pipeline right-of-way is only 50' wide—not wide enough for 48"-in-diameter pipe. Now, Congress is being asked to widen the right-of-way. The bill is frozen in a subcommittee by selfish interests, thus stopping the importation of 2 million barrels of oil a day into the United States.

There has been a change in sentiment in the 23rd District. In 1971, only 57.9% favored the pipeline. Now in face of a serious energy crisis, 72.8% favor it. I do too! Those against the Alaska pipeline say, "Build it through Canada." Canada so far is not too enthusiastic, and would exact a high charge for the privilege. They could easily shut off the flow of oil. The free flow of oil from Alaska would free us somewhat from total dependence on the Mid-East, and help our severe balance-of-payments problem.

Question No. 13—Should allowable tree cutting in the national forests be increased as one way to lower prices?

The answer: Yes: 31.2 percent; no: 62.3 percent; no answer: 6.5 percent.

Early this year lumber prices took off with the speed of a forest fire. Lumber was in very short supply by reason of two record years of home building—a 42% hike to 2,052,000 units in 1971 and an additional one of 15% to 2,366,000 units in 1972. President Nixon came up with a package to ease the price pressure. He announced that log sales from the national forests would be increased in 1973 by 1.8 billion board feet, an 18% hike over 1972. He also stated that talks with the Japanese would be held to get them to reduce their heavy buying of logs. The railroads would be asked to make available more freight cars to move the logs and lumber.

Now after 4 months, the price of lumber and plywood has fallen. This is because of a slowdown in home building in 1973, a huge step up in plywood production, the railroad response in needed freight cars, and the planned step up in log sales from the national forest, thus restoring mill operator

confidence. The Japanese agreed to a 15% curtailment of buying, too. The House Banking and Currency Committee also has reported out a bill limiting the export or softwood logs to 2.5 billion board feet a year, and hardwood to 1 billion board feet a year to ease the pressure.

Question No. 14—Now that the United States has signed an antihijacking accord with Cuba, do you favor beginning negotiations to normalize relations with Cuba?

The answer: Yes: 71 percent; no: 24.7 percent; no answer: 4.3 percent.

This is a very significant result. We all know that since Castro established his Communist regime, it has been the American goal to push for his downfall by cutting Cuba off from the rest of Latin America and by at least partially isolating Havana from other world capitals. The people in the 23rd District are generally ahead of the Congress or the President. For example, back in November 1971, 76.5 per cent voted in favor of the establishment of friendlier relations with mainland China. Secretary of State William P. Rogers when asked about U.S. recognition of Cuba had this to say: "The U.S. is ready to deal with any country that shows it wants relations and is willing to respect America and its system in the way that the U.S. is willing to respect theirs."

In closing, I want to thank those who took the time to complete and return the questionnaire, and I trust you have found the Newsletter both interesting and informative.

Each week, my five-minute radio program entitled "Commentary on Congress" is aired on 16 stations in our 11-county district. Tune in to:

WBLF-Bellefonte: 8:40 a.m., Sundays; WESB-Bradford: between 10 and 12 noon, weekdays; WWCW-Clarion: 12:15 p.m., Saturdays; WRFM-Coudersport: 12:15 p.m., Sundays; WCED-DuBois: afternoons, time varies; WLEM-Emporium: 12:30 p.m., Saturdays; WFRF-Franklin: excerpts aired, time varies; and WKZA-Kane: 5:05 p.m., Sundays.

WBPZ-Lock Haven: 6:25 p.m., Saturdays; WKRZ-Oil City: 2:30 p.m., Sundays; WPHB-Philipsburg: 3:35 p.m., Thursdays; WKBI-St. Marys: 10:35 p.m., Sundays; WKBI-FM-Ridgway: 10:35 p.m., Sundays; WMAJ-State College: 11:30 p.m., Sundays; WRSC-State College: 8:10 p.m., Sundays, and WNAE-Warren: 5:05 p.m., Sundays.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

WHAT DID BREZHNEV WANT?

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me I include the following article by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., which was published in the issue dated Sunday, July 15, 1973, of the National Catholic Register:

AT HOME AND ABROAD—WHAT DID BREZHNEV WANT?

(By Father Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

"The vice of capitalism," said Churchill, "is its inequitable distribution of wealth. The virtue of socialism is its equitable distribution of misery." If there was ever an argument against socialism it is seeing Brezhnev come to the United States desperately pleading for goods. Since all socialist countries are poor, he had to come to Washington, D.C., capitalist headquarters.

As I toured the Soviet Union last fall, it was obvious that the living standards of the U.S.S.R. are not yet up to those in this

country in 1933, during the worst period of the Depression.

During the first four months of this year we sent \$413 million worth of goods to Moscow, nearly all of it on credit. The Soviet Union has very little money and very little goods she can sell us except the prospect of natural gas that she wants us to help develop.

Brezhnev came seeking long-term credit. He also came to talk us into abandoning most of our nuclear power in Western Europe. The non-nuclear forces of the Moscow Pact nations are vastly superior to ours, whereas the nuclear forces of NATO are about the same. So he wants us to give up the nuclear strength behind NATO.

Is the Kremlin thinking of moving into Western Europe? We do not know. It has the power to do so. Moscow has turned East Germany into an armed camp, capable of conquering West Germany within a week. Will it do so? Jacob Beam, who was our Ambassador to Moscow for the past four years, claims that the leaders in the Kremlin "are not revolutionaries any more."

When U.S. News & World Report asked him whether this is the same Soviet leadership that was out to conquer the world some years ago, he replied categorically: "No, not really." They would be satisfied, he said, with "a dominating or at least equal role in world affairs. . . . A Communist world—they recognize that as impractical as an immediate and realistic goal."

If that is the type of muddled thinking we have in the State Department, it is no wonder so many countries have been lost to the free world, while none has been lost to the Communist world. Ambassador Beam and his colleagues in the State Department can talk all they want about the Soviet leadership. They know only a few of the leaders, and they have no idea who will be leading the Kremlin in the future.

The first thing to remember about Brezhnev is that he is tough. He fought his way through Stalin's bloody purges, overthrew Khrushchev, and succeeded in keeping the power away from Kosygin and other rivals in the Politburo. He supplied North Vietnam with all of the rockets and most of the guns, bullets and other supplies to fight the U.S. to a standstill in South Vietnam. To think for a moment he would not like to rule the world is to engage in fantasy. To think he could not do it, when he has the power to destroy 150 million Americans in one all-out strike, is to indulge in a flight from reality. To throw ourselves on the mercy of the Russians is a dangerous way to see if they have any.

Brezhnev said he wants peace, yet he finances almost all of the aggression in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. He gives \$500 million to Castro to support guerilla wars in Latin America. He is still financing terrorism in the Middle East and other parts of the world. He still keeps all of Central and Eastern Europe in bondage.

He keeps countless thousands of Soviet citizens in prison for political purposes. To say that he runs a police state is the understatement of the year. The idea that Catholic Poland, Catholic Hungary, Catholic Lithuania, Catholic Czechoslovakia, Protestant East Germany, and Orthodox Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Albania have no right to freedom is the very essence of the Brezhnev Doctrine.

According to him they must be colonies forever. Just ask the Czechs. It was Brezhnev who sent 650,000 troops into their country. It is Brezhnev who keeps 80,000 Russian troops near Prague today.

Brezhnev spoke of "spiritual values" in his talk to the American people. Yet he is totally dedicated to destroying belief in God from the world. He bitterly discriminates against anyone who goes to church. He tolerates only two Catholic priests in Moscow, keeping them both under wraps. He spoke of peace, yet he finances aggressive wars and

revolutions. He spoke of freedom, yet every phone in Moscow is subject to bugging. He spends hundreds of millions of dollars maintaining a 2,000-mile Iron Curtain, shooting anyone who attempts to escape.

Are we coming into a new era in our relations with the Kremlin? It is impossible to say. All we can do is try to view Mr. Brezhnev realistically, something the TV networks and most of our press seem unwilling to do.

WOMEN FOR SURVIVAL OF AGRICULTURE IN MICHIGAN

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of having a visit in my office this morning by a group of charming ladies from Michigan and New York.

I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a letter which states their mission and I commend them for their efforts.

And hope that the Cost of Living Council will wake up and get rid of these idiotic dictatorial, controls, or wages and prices that are not part of a free society.

The letter follows:

WOMEN FOR THE SURVIVAL OF

AGRICULTURE IN MICHIGAN,

July 10, 1973.

DR. FEDOR,
Policy Review Group,
Cost of Living Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. FEDOR: We are a delegation from the Women for the Survival of Agriculture in Michigan and New York. We come on behalf of the red tart cherry industry speaking for both growers and processors and at the fervent urging of both. Cherries are one of our most important crops.

Growers are faced with an impossible situation. Under the price freeze, the processors of our product cannot pay us enough for cherries to cover our cost of production. The price freeze has frozen our wages at a level where we will be forced to take a loss, export the cherries to eager foreign markets, sell on the black market or let them fall to the ground and rot. We cannot, and will not, harvest these cherries another year and lose money on them. We have done so 7 years out of the last 11.

The processors of our cherries have finally recognized that we must profit to survive and are making a sincere effort to pay a realistic price for our product. They cannot, however, operate at a loss themselves and stay in business. The prices at which the Presidential Executive Order 11723 of June 13th, 1973, has placed the red tart cherry crop are neither realistic nor logical. A product that costs 19¢ per pound to produce and harvest cannot be harvested for 7½¢ per pound as was paid on last year's crop. This is precisely what you are asking us to do. In 1972 when the crop was twice as large raw product prices paid to the grower were then below the cost of production and harvesting. We are now locked in at this ridiculously unrealistic price with a shorter crop costing still more to produce and harvest. Last year's crop, according to a study by Michigan State University, required 12¢ per pound for producing and harvesting. This year's crop, the shortest in over 20 years now, is costing 19¢ a pound to produce and harvest. The obvious conclusion is that it cannot be harvested without an increase in price.

We ask the Cost of Living Council, whom do you plan to absorb the loss? We demand an answer to this question. According to Michigan State University and industry spe-

cialists, a 19¢ per pound raw product price is needed to break even on this year's crop. It is ludicrous that we should have to beg for a chance to break even.

We are not an isolated case, to be sure. But numbers do not justify an injustice. We are weathervanes for an industry. We are fully cognizant of this administration's desperate need for the greatest production possible from the American farmer, and all the economic implications, both foreign and domestic, dependent on that production.

How, in all sanity and justice, can an executive order force a group of unprotected workers, namely farmers, to work for no wage, or even worse, lose money for each hour of work? Many groups who contribute nothing to the Gross National Product have received much more consideration than the farmer who works so long and diligently to help provide the high standard of living our nation enjoys.

We find it impossible to believe that intelligent persons, after reviewing documented information, can refuse to make an effort to resolve the situation. We cannot agree that an exception to the tart cherry industry would only shift the pressure caused by the freeze to smaller firms and ultimately the consumer and user. We are the small family farmer and the pressure on us is untenable. We are consumers and users. We are in grave economic danger and find this situation imposes serious hardship and gross inequity upon us.

We have our backs to the wall. Our money has run out, as is glaringly shown by the attached letters from our local bankers.

We implore you to review our situation and then make an honest decision as to whether or not the red tart cherry industry should be allowed to establish realistic prices for a product that is far short of being enough to fill the demands of our consumers, and that is, in reality, priced now far below the cost of production.

With utter sincerity,

LAURA HEUSER, President.

MONOPOLY WARNINGS CALLED ON TARGET

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessean newspaper in Nashville in a recent editorial pointed out that the House Select Small Business Committee—which I am honored to serve as chairman—had warned after hearings last summer that major oil companies were developing a pattern of concentration and monopoly with acquisition of other energy sources.

Certainly subsequent events—including a recent report by the staff of the Federal Trade Commission—have confirmed that these oil companies have evolved concentrations in the "classical monopolist" tradition.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this subject, I place the editorial from the Tennessean in the RECORD:

CONGRESS FINALLY REALIZES "URGENCY" OF OIL REVIEW

Acting in what Senator Henry Jackson termed "a new mood of urgency," the Senate has taken several steps toward dealing with the gasoline shortage situation and discovering what lies behind the so-called "energy crisis."

The Senate voted 86-10 for mandatory government fuel allocation regulations to re-

place the administration's voluntary guidelines. The bill also contains provisions for gathering more information from oil companies on reserves and distribution.

In response to a request by Senator Jackson, the Federal Trade Commission is expected to report by July 1 on a probe of Big Oil practices. Concern has been growing in Congress that the shortages have been contrived or at least made more acute by industry practices.

In a related move, the Justice Department has filed suit in U.S. District Court in Washington to compel oil companies to back up their claims of natural gas shortages. There is also a suspicion that reports have been manipulated by companies to reflect shortages and thus drive up prices. If that is the case, it has been a successful scheme. The Federal Power Commission recently approved a 73% hike in wellhead rates.

All of the congressional interest and activity by the FTC is certainly welcome, but if the warnings of Tennessee Congressmen Joe L. Evins and Richard Fulton had been heeded several years ago, the problems might never have reached "urgency" proportions. Mr. Fulton sponsored a measure in 1971 that would have created a special House committee to study energy resources. After the defeat of that proposal, Rep. Evins has been among the very few committee chairmen to investigate what many now agree may be a "monopolistic concentration or a conspiracy to increase rates by creating artificial shortages of coal and gas supplies."

In hearings of his House Select Committee on Small Business last summer, Mr. Evins said, "Testimony (has shown) that major oil companies account for approximately 84% of the refining capacity, 72% of the natural gas production and reserve ownership. Evidence has been produced that 30% of domestic coal reserves and over 20% of production, and over 50% of the uranium reserves are now in limited corporate holdings. This committee is concerned over this trend of concentration and monopoly in the power and fuel industry."

Since Mr. Nixon's April energy message it has been obvious that Congress itself must take the initiative in accumulating the facts about the shortage problem. The President

all but caved in to Big Oil influence by supporting an end to the 14-year-old import quota system on terms that provide incentives for domestic refinery construction. Prior to that prod, refinery building had ground to a halt.

Also, Mr. Nixon supported the ideas advanced by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association for drastic deregulation of new gas wells. "Prices paid to producers for natural gas in interstate trade must increase," he said, to provide incentive for new exploration. The AGA has phrased it differently, insisting that drilling operations had declined "primarily because prices at the wells have been regulated at artificially low levels." The effect of the presidential message and FPC action will be increased profits in return for increased exploration.

With tenacles reaching all domestic energy sources and holdings in large multinational operations, the major oil companies reported enormous profit gains in the first quarter of this year. The Wall Street Journal reported on May 1 that petroleum products gained 27.6% in net earnings over the first quarter of 1972. Exxon jumped over 40% and Atlantic Richfield Co. soared 52%. The industry says the first quarter of last year was "depressed."

How much the monopolistic tendencies of Big Oil firms have contributed to the "energy crisis," if at all, is a question that must be answered as the public faces higher prices and spot shortages. The House should support the Senate action and both houses should pursue an in-depth probe of all industry practices. Mr. Fulton's concern and Mr. Evins' warnings may have been on target all along.

THE 1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 4

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of Members,

[In millions]

	House	Senate	Enacted		House	Senate	Enacted
1974 budget authority requested.....	\$288, 135	\$288, 135	\$288, 135	1974 budget outlay estimate.....	\$268, 671	\$268, 671	\$268, 671
Congressional changes to date (committee and floor action):				Congressional changes to date (committee and floor action):			
Appropriation bills.....	+1, 267	+1, 172		Appropriation bills.....	+799	+1, 108	+454
Legislative bills:				Legislative bills:			
Backdoor and mandatory increases.....	+1, 704	+1, 166	+39	Backdoor and mandatory increases.....	+280	+1, 189	+737
Adjustments and other changes.....	-1, 139	-601	-1, 139	Adjustments and other changes.....	-157	-41	-157
Total changes (see table 1, for details).....	+1, 832	+1, 737	-1, 100	Total changes (see table 1, for details).....	+923	+2, 257	+1, 034
1974 budget authority as adjusted by congressional changes to date.....	289, 967	289, 872	287, 035	1974 budget outlays as adjusted by congressional changes to date.....	269, 594	270, 928	269, 705

Deficit position:

The 1974 unified budget deficit, as revised June 1, is estimated at \$2.7 billion—a decrease of \$10 billion from the original January estimate of \$12.7 billion. This current deficit estimate reflects a federal funds deficit of \$18.8 billion and a trust fund surplus of \$16.1 billion.

On the basis of changes to date (including committee action) by the respective Houses of Congress in budget outlay and revenue requests, the 1974 unified budget deficit would be:

Budget estimate (revised June 1), \$2.7 billion.
Based on House changes to date, \$4.6 billion.
Based on Senate changes to date, \$4.8 billion.
Based on changes enacted to date, \$4.5 billion.

Appropriation bills (see table 1, for details):

Completed action to date on appropriation legislation reflects the 1974 outlay impact of actions taken with respect to 1973 supplemental appropriations and other requests in the Urgent and Second Supplemental bills.

Incomplete action on 9 regular 1974 appropriation bills is reflected in this report, with the major impact as follows:

Passed House and Senate:

Agriculture bill: House reduction of \$120 million in budget authority an increase of \$140 million in outlays; Senate increase of \$671 million in budget authority an increase of \$643 million in outlays.

HUD-Space-Science-Veterans Bill: House increase of \$454 million in budget authority with no change in outlays; Senate increase of \$501 million in budget authority and decrease of \$29 million in outlays.

their staffs, and others who are interested, excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 4, as of June 30," prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

This report reflects the revisions of June 1 as transmitted in the "Midsession Review of the 1974 Budget." These revisions indicate a deficit of \$2.7 billion for fiscal 1974 on the unified budget basis—a reduction of \$10 billion from the original deficit estimate of \$12.7 billion. The revised Federal funds deficit estimate is \$18.8 billion. For fiscal 1973 the revised deficit is \$17.8 billion on the unified budget basis—a reduction of \$7 billion from the revised January estimate. The revised Federal funds deficit estimate is \$27.9 billion.

The excerpts that I am inserting here include the scorekeeping highlights from the text of the report and the main scorekeeping table.

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

The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM 1974 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 4, AS OF JUNE 30, 1973

FISCAL YEAR 1974—SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

The impact of Congressional action to June 30 on the President's fiscal year 1974 requests (revised June 1) for budget authority and budget outlays, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

Passed House:

Transportation bill: decrease of \$140 million in budget authority and \$70 million in outlays.

Labor-HEW bill: increase of \$1,264 million in budget authority and \$490 million in outlays (committee action).

Legislative bills—"backdoor" and mandatory (see table 1, for detail):

Completed actions: To date, there has been completed action on 6 legislative bills carrying backdoor or mandatory authorizations affecting fiscal 1974. The major items are:

Welfare and medical amendments: mandatory increases of \$391 million in budget authority and outlays.

Social security—exempt wages: backdoor increase of \$100 million in outlays.

Unemployment benefit extension: backdoor increase of \$116 million in outlays.

Veterans national cemeteries: mandatory

veterans benefits of \$110 million in budget authority and outlays.

Pending actions: In addition, there are 17 legislative bills carrying backdoor or mandatory authorizations which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress.

House action pertaining to 9 measures would increase budget authority by \$2.2 billion, having an outlay impact of at least \$184 million excluding the undetermined effect of increased contract authority.

Senate action pertaining to 11 such measures would increase budget authority by \$1.1 billion, having an outlay impact of at least \$452 million excluding the undetermined effect of increased contract authority.

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

Highway programs: additional backdoor contract authority of \$1,115 million as passed by the House, and \$405 million as passed by the Senate. The 1974 outlay impact is undetermined. (Pending conference.)

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

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

Legislative bills—adjustments and other changes (see table 1, for detail):

Completed action has been taken on 2 additional legislative bills having impact on the 1974 budget totals:

REA loans: removes lending program from the budget, thereby decreasing budget totals by \$579 million in budget authority and \$157 million in outlays.

Airport development: enactment of this contract authority in fiscal 1973, instead of 1974 as requested, has the effect of reducing 1974 budget authority by \$560 million and shifting it into 1973.

Revenue legislation (see table 2, for detail):

The June 1 budget revisions estimate revenue for fiscal year 1974 will total \$266 billion. This is an increase of \$10 billion over the original January estimate of \$256 billion.

To date, legislation has reduced 1974 revenue estimates (revised June 1) by \$810 million, as follows:

Railroad Retirement: decrease of \$612 million due to failure on part of the House and Senate to provide additional trust fund receipts requested.

REA loan repayments: decreased receipts by \$348 million by removal of program from budget totals.

Social security wage taxes: increase of \$150 million in trust fund revenue due to a wage base increase.

FISCAL YEAR 1973—SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

The impact of Congressional action in the current session on the President's revised (June 1) fiscal year 1973 requests for budget authority and budget outlays, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions]							
	House	Senate	Enacted		House	Senate	Enacted
1973 budget authority requested (revised to June 1).....	\$283,824	\$283,824	\$283,824	1973 budget outlay estimate.....	\$249,796	\$249,796	\$249,796
Congressional changes to date:				Congressional changes to date:			
Appropriation bills.....	+1,024	+1,507	+1,019	Appropriation bills.....	-212	-167	-212
Legislative bills.....	+2,815	+2,564	+615	Legislative bills.....	+244	+338	+153
Total changes.....	+3,839	+4,070	+1,634	Total changes.....	+32	+171	-59
1973 budget authority as adjusted by congressional changes to date.....	287,663	287,894	285,458	1973 budget outlays as adjusted by congressional changes to date.....	249,828	249,967	249,737

The scored impact of appropriation and other legislation affecting fiscal 1973 budget requests includes the following major items:

Inaction on proposed amendments reducing requests for certain vetoed Labor-HEW bill items by \$966 million with little or no outlay impact due to the lateness in the fiscal year.

Second Supplemental appropriation: reduction in items in the bill offset by inaction on proposed rescissions has the effect of increasing budget authority by a net of \$52

million, with estimated outlay reductions of \$213 million in 1973.

Airport development: enactment of this contract authority in fiscal 1973, instead of 1974 as requested, has the effect of increasing 1973 budget authority by \$620 million shifted from 1974.

Impoundment restoration:

In addition, there has been legislation to restore 1973 funds impounded for four rural loan and grant programs. Impoundment restoration legislation has been enacted relat-

ing to the rural emergency loan program, and this is expected to have the effect of increasing 1973 outlays by \$154 million. The impounded rural electrification loan program has been restored, but as this legislation was enacted it was removed from the budget authority, outlay and revenue totals. Another bill has been vetoed.

Any actions affecting fiscal 1974 related to impounded program funds are reflected for scorekeeping purposes against the respective appropriation bills for fiscal 1974.

TABLE NO. 1.—ESTIMATED EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE 1ST SESS. OF THE 93D CONG. ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF JUNE 30, 1973)

[In thousands of dollars]						
Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House (1)	Senate (2)	Enacted (3)	House (4)	Senate (5)	Enacted (6)
FISCAL YEAR 1974						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1974 budget):						
1973 bills:						
1973 Labor-HEW appropriations (continuing resolution, P.L. 93-9).....				(1)	(1)	(1)
Urgent supplemental, 1973 (P.L. 93-25).....				+1,300	+1,300	+1,300
Second supplemental, 1973 (P.L. 93-50).....				-25,000	+150,000	+110,000
Inaction on proposed rescissions.....				*+342,653	*+342,653	*+342,653
1974 regular bills:						
Legislative Branch (H.R. 6691).....	-16,900			-16,000		
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection (H.R. 8619).....	-120,013	+671,175	(†)	+140,000	+642,788	(†)
District of Columbia (H.R. 8658).....	-5,281			-5,000		
Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 8760).....	-140,101			-70,000		
Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, Veterans (H.R. 8825).....	+453,501	+500,920	(†)		-28,821	(†)
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 8877).....	+1,264,352			+490,000		
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 8917).....	-4,877			+9,000		
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary (H.R. 8916).....	-82,128			-51,339		
Public Works and Atomic Energy (H.R. 8947).....	-81,074			-16,402		
Subtotal, appropriation bills.....	+1,267,479	+1,172,095		+799,212	+1,107,920	+453,953
Legislative bills (changes from the 1974 budget):						
"Backdoor" spending authorizations (not requiring further appropriation action):						
Federal Financing Bank (contract authority) (S. 925).....	+25,000	+25,000		N.A.	N.A.	
Social security—exempt wages (H.R. 7445).....		+150,000	†+150,000		+100,000	†+100,000
Flood insurance (borrowing authority) (H.R. 8449).....	†indefinite			†N.A.		
Unemployment benefits—extension (P.L. 93-53).....					+115,700	+115,700
Federal-aid Highway Act of 1973 (contract authority) (S. 502).....	+1,115,500	+405,270	(†)	N.A.	N.A.	(†)
Airport development (contract authority) (P.L. 93-44).....				+20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Traffic safety (contract authority) (S. 893, S. 502).....	+915,000	+245,000	(†)	N.A.	N.A.	(†)
Subtotal, "backdoor".....	+2,055,500	+825,270	+150,000	+20,000	+235,700	+235,700

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE NO. 1.—ESTIMATED EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE 1ST SESS. OF THE 93D CONG. ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF JUNE 30, 1973)—Continued

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Legislative bills (changes from the 1974 budget)—Continued						
Mandatory spending authorizations (requiring payments over which there is little or no control through the appropriation process):						
Uniform relocation assistance (S. 261)		+95,000			+95,000	
Feed grain program (H.R. 6791)	+89,000			+89,000		
Eucalyptus tree fire hazard (S. 1697)		+16,000			+16,000	
Peanut support (H.R. 6646)	+8,600			+8,600		
Winema Forest expansion (H.R. 3867)	+60,000		(†)	+60,000		(†)
Welfare—medicaid amendments (H.R. 7445)		+391,000	†+391,000		+391,000	†+391,000
Public safety officers death gratuity (S. 15)		+6,000			+6,000	
Public safety officers group life insurance (S. 33)		+20,000			+20,000	
Victims of crime—payments (S. 300)		+7,000			+7,000	
Deputy marshals pay raise (H.R. 5094)	+2,070			+2,070		
Early retirement—customs inspectors (H.R. 6078)	+3,900			+3,900		
Veterans drug and alcohol treatment (S. 284)		+144,136			+144,136	
Veterans dependents' health care (S. 59)		+103,800			+103,800	
Veterans national cemeteries (P.L. 93-43)	+96,720	+110,000	+110,000	+96,720	+110,000	+110,000
Railroad retirement (revenue) (H.R. 7200)	-612,000	-612,000	†-612,000	N.A.	N.A.	†N.A.
Subtotal, mandatory	-351,710	+340,936	-111,000	+260,290	+952,936	+501,000
Other legislative bills (with provisions having impact on budget totals):						
Rural electrification loans—remove from budget (P.L. 93-32)	-579,000		-579,000	-157,000		-157,000
Forest roads and trails—repeal of permanent appropriation (S. 1775)		+40,900			+40,900	
Airport development (contract authority)—shift to 1973 (P.L. 93-44)	-560,000	-560,000	-560,000			
Subtotal, other	-1,139,000	-600,900	-1,139,000	-157,000	-40,900	-157,000
Subtotal, legislative bills	+564,790	+565,306	-1,100,000	+123,290	+1,147,736	+579,700
Total, fiscal year 1974	+1,832,269	+1,737,401	-1,100,000	+922,502	+2,255,656	+1,033,653
FISCAL YEAR 1973						
Appropriation bills (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
1973 Labor-HEW appropriations (continuing resolution, P.L. 93-9)	+966,000	+966,000	+966,000	(†)	(†)	(†)
Urgent supplemental, 1973 (P.L. 92-25)	+1,800	+1,800	+1,800	+500	+500	+500
Second supplemental, 1973 (P.L. 93-50)	-326,196	+155,885	-331,196	+225,000	+180,000	+225,000
Inaction on proposed rescissions	+382,888	+382,888	+382,888	+12,354	+12,354	+12,354
Legislative bills (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
Federal-aid Highway Act (contract authority) (S. 502)	+1,575,000	+1,323,550	(†)	N.A.	N.A.	(†)
Traffic safety (contract authority) (S. 893, S. 502)	+685,000	+405,000	(†)	N.A.	N.A.	(†)
Airport development (contract authority)—Shift from 1974 (P.L. 93-44)	+560,000	+840,000	+620,000			
Legislative bills directing restoration of certain program reductions (impoundments) contemplated in the budget (changes from the revised 1973 budget):						
Rural electrification loans (P.L. 93-32)	N.A.		N.A.	N.A.	+84,000	N.A.
Rural environmental assistance (REAP) (H.R. 2107)			(†)	+41,000	+51,000	N.A.
Rural emergency loans (P.L. 93-24)				+154,000	+154,000	+154,000
Rural water and sewer grants (H.R. 3298)			Vetoed	+50,000	+50,000	Vetoed
Inaction on legislative proposals in the 1973 budget (see table 5)	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000
Total, fiscal year 1973	+3,839,492	+4,070,123	+1,634,492	+31,854	+170,854	-59,146

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

² Replaces vetoed bill, H.R. 7447.

³ Includes increases of approximately \$192 million in the nature of re-appropriation of impounded 1973 funds.

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

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

⁶ Enacted figure used for comparability.

[†] Committee action.

[‡] Subject to or in conference.

^{*} Maximum estimate; preliminary and subject to revision.

N.A.—Cost estimate not available or undetermined at this time.

†† Pending signature.

AGRICULTURE EFFORTS ARE NEEDED TO SOLVE BALANCE-OF- PAYMENTS TRADE DEFICIT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming round of trade negotiations on GATT will have an effect on virtually every segment of American life. When trade matters come up for discussion, many people think of its effect on the industrial portion of our society; however, agriculture will be a prominent feature of these talks, and our European trading partners are showing early in the proceedings that they are aware of this fact.

Many of our own farmers feel that

their products were not adequately represented in the GATT negotiations of 10 years ago. Recent trends in world agriculture make it clear that this mistake can be repeated only at great cost to American farmers and consumers. As the most efficient farming nation in the world, it behooves us to take advantage of our expertise in the future. Recent statements by the administration asking for blanket open-book authority to restrict, rather than expand American exports to control domestic prices, constitutes a 180-degree turn in U.S. policy.

What gaineth the United States if we restrict exports to bloat U. S. markets to reduce U. S. consumer prices only to have U.S. trade deficits reach astronomical heights as a result of the export restriction.

At this point in my remarks I would like to include a recent editorial from the Willows Daily Journal:

TRADE ERA FOR AGRICULTURE?

(By Richard Johnsen, Jr., executive vice president, Agricultural Council of Calif.)

California agriculture has a stake in the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations in GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

The over-all view on these trade negotiations of the Commission of the European Communities was recently expressed in a paper by its vice president, Christopher Soames. He made the point that, in addition to concrete economic issues, the GATT negotiations will have political significance far beyond the material issues.

Recognizing how the European Community looks at the forthcoming GATT negotiations should help us to understand the intricacies and overall broad aspects.

Vice President Soames said: "We in the Commission believe that the moment is right for a major step forward in the freeing of world trade and that we should make the most of the opportunity. We believe that the Community has a great deal to contribute and also a great deal to gain."

Citing specific aims, he went on to say: "In the trade negotiations, we believe that the Community should have two paramount aims. Between the industrialized countries we must consolidate and continue the process of liberalization and do so on a reciprocal basis to our mutual advantage. For the less developed world, we must insure not simply that their interests are not damaged, but, on the contrary, that they secure greater opportunities for their economic expansion as a result of what we do.

"... the negotiations on agriculture will be different in character from those on tariffs and non-tariff barriers on trade in industrial goods.

We have to take into account the special characteristics of agriculture. Both the Community and our main trading partners each apply support policies of one kind or another for the benefit of their own farmers.

"We have to take into account, too, the instability of world markets. The Commission believes that our over-all objective must be to negotiate measures on a reciprocal basis to permit the regular expansion of agricultural trade.

"We shall resist any attack on the principles of the common agricultural policy, but we must equally be prepared to apply the instruments of that policy in such a way that our broad objective of expanding agricultural trade in the world can be achieved.

"We will be suggesting that in the negotiations we should consider drawing up with our partners a code of good conduct on agricultural export practices. We shall also propose that international arrangements should be considered for certain commodities."

Agricultural exports are vital to California and the United States.

Many leaders in agriculture feel that our products were not properly represented in the GATT negotiations of a decade ago.

It is sincerely hoped that the U.S. leaders in GATT will recognize the importance of agriculture in the forthcoming negotiations and employ the expertise necessary to assure a favorable decade ahead for agricultural trade.

OUR FLAG

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention and great pleasure recently, that three young students in my district who attend John F. Kennedy Elementary School in Newark, Calif., under the dedicated and able guidance of their teacher, Mrs. Lorraine Wallace, made a clean sweep of the top three honors awarded by the American Legion in the regional 1973 American Flag Essay Contest.

These three students, Gregory Terzian, Brook Goss, and Betsy Lunger, all of whom live in Newark, are certainly deserving of the awards, for they grasp and hold the basic concepts of our Nation as precious ones, which should be held above all else.

I am proud and honored to have these students in my district and know that my colleagues here will appreciate their honesty and patriotism as I share the students' essays with them:

[FIRST PLACE]

THE FLAG—A SYMBOL OF PRIDE TO ME
(By Greg Terzian)

Our flag is a symbol of pride to me. I show

my pride to the flag by singing the Star Spangled Banner. I also show my pride to the flag by saying the Pledge of Allegiance.

I am very proud to have a flag that is so glorious fly over the country I live in. I am proud when I look at our flag and define what all its parts stand for in my mind. I am also proud when I think of the long and glorious history of our flag.

The one thing that I am probably proud of more than anything else is that our flag has flown free over our country for almost two hundred years. Since 1776, no flag has flown over all of our country in leadership except our flag.

I feel proud when I think of the millions of men and women who have fought for our country to keep our flag waving free. Many of the millions of people who fought for our country lost their lives. I feel proud to know that our flag has recognition for these people with the red stripes standing for bloodshed.

I am proud that there are certain ways of displaying our flag, such as: it should always be in the middle and highest when displayed with other flags. When hung in a parade, it should be hanging over the middle of the street with the stars facing east on a north to south street and north on an east street.

All of these are ways I am proud of the flag. I am proud about the history of the flag. I am proud of everywhere the flag has gone, everywhere it ever will go, everybody that has fought to keep our flag flying and everyone that ever will fight to keep it flying free forever.

[SECOND PLACE]

THE FLAG—A SYMBOL OF PRIDE TO ME
(By Brook Goss)

I am proud to be an American and to live in such a free country. I am proud to go to church as I please. I am proud of all the pleasures that I get from being an American, and serving the flag. All of these things are wonderful and I am proud to have them.

The flag means something special to me. It's a symbol of freedom and righteousness for all. It shows an understanding government that tries to please and protect its countrymen. For me it's grand and really should be respected!

When I say The Pledge of Allegiance I say it with pride and dignity, for without the flag and such a well-organized government this country would be a shambles.

I have my own belief of what the pledge means to me.

I: me, myself, an individual.

Pledge: dedicate all of my possessions; to give without self pity.

Allegiance: my love and devotion to the flag; our standard, a symbol of freedom.

Of the United: means we have come together.

States: individual communities that have united into fifty great states.

Of America: this nation.

And to the Republic; a state where representatives are chosen by the people to govern. And a government that is from the people to the leaders and not from the leaders to the people.

For which it stands: it stands as a symbol of freedom for all.

One nation under God: so blessed by God.

Indivisible: unable to be divided.

With liberty: freedom and the right to live your own life without fear of some sort.

And justice: the principle of dealing fairly with others.

For all: it's as much your country as it is mine!

[THIRD PLACE]

THE FLAG—A SYMBOL OF PRIDE TO ME
(By Betsy Lunger)

"One nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all." How many times

have we heard these lines? And yet only some of us live by them. When you see that flag waving in the air what does it remind you of? A thing we pledge to in the morning or a way of freedom? Stop to think about it.

That flag stands for the United States, our own country to do as we please, to worship as we please and to live in, freely.

When the Pilgrims came to America, they wanted freedom. They wanted a country to live in peacefully and without ruling power over them every second.

That flag represented them. That was their aim in life, freedom to do anything within power. That flag meant everything their life was worth.

Thirteen colonies became thirteen states, fourteen states, fifteen, sixteen on and on with freedom for every person. Let it wave, high above the earth and let people know what it's about! Not some hocus pocus we dreamed but the flag of our country, to represent us, to prove us and to stand before us.

That's what it's for. People shouldn't repeat the lines to the Pledge of Allegiance because they have to. The flag is a symbol of liberty for all mankind—Black Americans, Chinese Americans, every American, who believes.

Every citizen of the United States has this freedom, and if he uses it right he'll stay free. Remember what our flag stands for and you'll be proud!

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE: THE SEABED TREATY, LEGALIZED PIRACY OF THE HIGH SEAS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government is currently negotiating treaty arrangements with the other members of the United Nations which, if it becomes law, will turn over control of the high seas and the ocean floor to an "international regime" operated and controlled by the U.N. The treaty would pour millions of dollars in independent revenue into the U.N. treasury, and provide the emerging nations, who control the voting power of the General Assembly, with the largest deposits of strategic minerals in the world. It would also skim off revenue produced by companies which operate on and under the seas into the treasuries of the emerging nations.

This international revenue sharing scheme, called the Seabed Treaty, was proposed by President Nixon in 1970, and during this session of Congress it received the enthusiastic support of the House and the Senate. It is our Government's official position to:

"Renounce all national claims to natural resources of the seabed beyond a point where the high seas reach a depth of 200 meters... and agree to regard these resources as the common heritage of mankind.

This is the biggest international power grab scheme the world has ever seen yet the American public knows very little about the Seabed Treaty and the threat it poses to this country's industry, territory, and sovereignty. This is due in part to the virtual news blackout of the subject. A few limited-circulation publications have discussed the proposal in some

depth, but the mass media opinionmakers in this country have seen fit to ignore the subject.

The idea that the seas are the "common heritage of mankind" originated in the U.N. in 1967, and since that time it has gained momentum, especially among the underdeveloped countries of the world. Former Secretary of State Dean Rusk told a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee that—

The developing countries have taken a strong view that they are entitled to share in the returns from this common heritage of mankind.

This position of providing the have-not nations with an international welfare check, was quickly picked up and parroted by the giveaway specialists in Washington.

The "common heritage of mankind" idea has no basis in law or in fact. It is merely a philosophy—a thinly veiled rehash of the Marxist notion that men and nations are, by their mere existence, entitled to a part of the wealth produced by other men and nations. This is utter nonsense. As one noted columnist said recently:

The seabed isn't the "common heritage of mankind" any more than Saudi Arabian oil belongs to all Arab nations. It is ludicrous to assert that landlocked Chad in Africa, for example, is entitled to share in the profits from the undersea gas field off the Norwegian coast.

But ludicrous as it may sound, this is the policy that the U.S. Government has adopted and is pursuing with your tax money.

What is it about the seabed that attracts the United Nations and the emerging nations which control the "world body"? Obviously the oil and natural gas deposits that lie on the ocean bottom are part of the attraction. These two resources alone represent billions of dollars in potential revenue. But the seabed also contains the largest deposits of strategic minerals in the world. Three minerals basic to steel production are found in abundance on the ocean floor under 10,000 feet or more of water. The small rocks which contain the metals range in size from as small as a golf ball to as large as a grapefruit and are commonly referred to as manganese nodules. Basically, they contain not only manganese, but nickel and cobalt as well. These three elements are essential to the future technological advancement of the entire world, especially steel production.

Oceanographers agree that not only do these nodules make up the largest deposits of the minerals, they also are forming at a rate faster than we could ever harvest them. They are, therefore, a renewable natural resource. And since they are found in a lifeless environment, extraction of the nodules, even in large quantities, would not endanger the ecological balance of the oceans.

Ironically, the top steel-producing giants of the developed nations of the world, the United States, Japan, West Germany, England, and France, must import these basic industrial metals. With the exception of Canada, none of the land-based deposits of manganese, nickel, and cobalt exist in **major non-**

Communist countries. Each of the world's steel producers must import their stocks of cobalt, manganese, and nickel from the Communists or the unstable regimes in the emerging nations. To get an idea of how dependent Western technology is upon the Soviets and the emerging nations, let us look at some figures from the U.S. Geological Survey.

At the present time, the United States imports 80 percent of its cobalt from the Congo. Our other sources for the mineral are such unstable countries as Zambia and Morocco. The world's supply of nickel, which the United States spent \$426 million to import in 1970, comes from Canada, New Caledonia, the U.S.S.R., and Cuba. Russia produces 60 percent of the world's manganese, followed by Brazil, Republic of South Africa, India, and Ghana.

These minerals are used in the production of guided missile systems, jet aircraft engines, high temperature alloys, turbosuperchargers, and a wide range of other defense-oriented needs. Virtually the entire economic well-being of this country is dependent to some degree on these three essential elements, each of which must now be imported. We have the opportunity, the technology, and the need to begin to develop the greatest natural resource in the world—the seabed. We can become self-sufficient in the minerals we need by utilizing the seabed around our shores. Our Federal Government however, is following a policy of relinquishing whatever claim we may have to the seabed, and turning it over to some vaguely defined U.N.-controlled regime. This regime is designed to share the wealth among the underdeveloped nations which have not contributed to its production.

Voting domination of the U.N.'s Seabed Committee, which meets next year in Santiago, Chile, is clearly in the hands of the Communist bloc nations and the underdeveloped states. Of the 91 members of the committee, only 9 can be considered as industrialized countries. The African states, which possess the bloc voting power to control issues on the floor of the General Assembly, have 25 votes on the Committee. Communist and Marxist countries are heavily represented with 11 voting members. One additional seat is authorized for the Eastern European bloc, but has not yet been filled. All three of the Soviet's votes in the U.N., Byelorussia, Ukraine, and the U.S.S.R., are also represented on the Seabed Committee.

The U.S. proposal for the makeup of the international regime would continue this lopsided representation in favor of the third world countries. Under the proposal, industrialized nations would have 6 representatives, at least 2 for land-locked or shelf-locked states, and at least 12 for votes for the developing countries.

The United States, Japan, and the few other world powers with the advanced technology to mine the resources of the seabed each have a single vote on the committee, with which to control the destiny of the oceans around their shores. Even taken collectively, technologically

advanced nations can expect to be hopelessly outvoted on issues of critical importance.

If the Seabed Treaty is adopted by the U.N. members, ratified by the Senate and becomes U.S. law, the continued technological advancement of the United States and the rest of the industrialized world is put in the tenuous position of purchasing the materials needed for steel production from the Communist bloc and the emerging nations, or buying them from the international regime controlled by the Communist bloc and the emerging nations. Either way, steel production in Western nations would exist at the whim and discretion of avowed enemies of capitalism and progress.

As a matter of national security, the United States must develop independent sources of the minerals, free from international control. Mining of the seabed for the manganese nodules offers the most economical method to become self-sufficient.

If the U.N. gains control of the high seas, and thus an independent source of inexhaustible income free from taxation of its members, it would move from the position of a mere "international organization" to that of an independent sovereign, answerable to no nation. Adoption of the Seabed Treaty would allow the U.N. to meet both criteria of a sovereign—undisputed control of territory, and command of sufficient wealth to finance its one-world activities. With millions of dollars coming into its treasury every year from the sale of mineral rights or oil leases on the seabed, the U.N. would be able to finance, equip, and maintain an international police force necessary to enforce whatever restrictions it decides to place on the oceans around our shores.

The Seabed Treaty and its common heritage of mankind notion are such extreme ideas, so alien to our American ideals of individualism and independence, that the American public would reject them immediately. That is, if the American people has the opportunity to become completely informed as to the great ripoff behind the mask of the common heritage of mankind.

FOOD PRICES

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I realize there is some concern on the part of some of this body and on the part of many in America that there may be some great conspiracy either on the part of the producers or others in the food industry which has caused food prices to increase during the past year and a half and especially in the first quarter of this year.

Unfortunately farmers have not done a very good job of telling their side of the story. Until now it has not been necessary. Our biggest problem is that urban America does not know what encourages or discourages farm produc-

tion. Because of this the consumer is being used and things advocated that while politically expedient are economically idiotic. These things are one of the reasons why we are going to have food shortages unless this Congress and the President start to level with the consumer. Much of what is being said for the ears of the consumer supposedly to lower or freeze food prices result in higher food prices or food shortages.

I was back in my district in northwest Missouri in February. At that time in anticipation of higher beef and pork prices farmers in my district were keeping back heifer replacements, buying cows to build their cow herd numbers, keeping back more than the usual number of sows and preparing to produce record numbers of pork and beef.

I was back in early April. This was at the time of the consumer boycotts. At this time we heard comments of boycotts, ceilings, freezes, price rollbacks and intimidations from both the consumer and the Congress. Farmers who were earlier keeping back heifer replacements were selling. Those who were looking for cows and sows were no longer looking. Statements made by well meaning politicians in Washington and threats by unknown consumers had eliminated the confidence these farmers once had in the market. They were not prepared to make costly investments in anticipation of higher prices, because they were not sure higher prices would be there by the time they had a product to sell.

What then did the ill-conceived and poorly timed threats of boycotts and price rollbacks do for the consumer? They assured the consumer that she would have less meat to buy and this meant higher—not lower meat prices.

I do not think urban America realizes what causes farmers to decide to increase or decrease their production levels. If they did, they would not make the kind of threats they make or support Members of Congress who make such threats at critical times knowing that these threats at critical decisionmaking times are the very things that turn down the spigot that produces food.

Just imagine for a minute that you are a farmer. You have room to keep 10 or as many as 100 sows. You have other livestock as well as crops. Do you keep 10 sows or 20 or 100? Do you buy an expensive picker-sheller to harvest your corn for your hogs? This depends on how many sows you decide to keep. Whether you buy the picker-sheller determines whether or not you plant more corn or put the land in grass.

Hog estimates cause you to want to keep more sows. A report of a crop failure indicating higher corn prices may cause you to back off. Another report that Japan may be increasing their hog quota causes you to think of keeping more sows. This coupled with increasing per capita consumption of pork and reduced numbers of beef on feed cause you to think of 100 sows. But, now you hear talk of boycotts or possible food price freezes. Now you are back down to the idea of keeping only 10 sows.

These are the kind of things that enter a farmer's mind when he considers in-

creasing or decreasing production. When he keeps back fewer sows it is not to hurt the consumer. He is not holding his product from the market. If General Motors thinks it cannot sell a million cars this month, they do not produce a million cars. They do not hold them off the market to punish the consumer.

Unfortunately marketing decisions on the part of the producer influence supply more than the month in which the decision is made. When the farmer decides—because of some Washington statement—to keep 10 instead of 100 sows that represents nearly 1,000 pigs that would not be produced. If a farmer wants to cut back on beef production he saves fewer heifer replacements and that would not show up in the production figures at the supermarket level for more than 2 years.

After President Nixon's speech where he mentioned high food prices 10 times in less than 15 minutes and how he was going to see to it that food prices did not continue to go up, I visited with one farmer who shipped six pregnant sows the next day. What did Nixon's statement do? It was meant to help the consumer. On just one of 2 million farms it resulted in six sows going to market which is 50 or 60 pigs the consumer will never see and that is a lot of bacon. Did the farmer do it to hurt the consumer? No, he did it because he was afraid the Government action suggested would force down prices and he would lose money.

In a demonstration in the House galleries yesterday there was a consumer group carrying a sign which read, "Milk is for children, not for profit." I wonder if these women and others should realize that the only thing which will bring food prices down is the likelihood of higher food prices. Give farmers the likelihood of higher food prices—instead of lower food prices as producers might expect based on Washington statements—and farmers will produce more food. When they do prices will go down—but not until.

Remember Nixon's TV statement that if food prices got too high he wanted the authority—he already has that authority—to stop food exports? Again this was a statement designed to soothe the consumer. What did it do? It hurt the consumer. I have since visited with many grain farmers who in anticipation of higher grain prices were going to make long-range investments in big machinery which would have made it possible for them to produce far more grain. After that statement they decided against these long-range investments. Why? Because they had already been told that if the high prices they were anticipating were realized the Government would step in and shut off exports. How many people would have joined your congressional staffs if at the time they were considering joining your staff they heard rumors that staff salary reductions were on their way?

Two weeks ago I was back in northwest Missouri. This has been a bad winter. Farmers were late planting corn and beans. Keep in mind soybean prices are two or three times higher than they have ever been in history and predictions are

for a continued world shortage of soybeans. I visited with many a farmer who with 30 or 50 acres of crops not yet planted had decided not to plant the additional acres. Sure soybean prices were high. But with bean seed high, it already being late in the season and a government already talking of future export embargoes, they were deciding not to plant.

That may not sound like much, but 50 acres on one farm, 30 on another, et cetera, it soon adds up to the 5 percent less crop which makes the big 20 percent difference in price that consumers cry about. What caused it? Was it conspiracy? No, just foolish statements from Washington from people unaware of what causes farmers to decide to produce more or less.

And I might add that statements from this body and its Members may also have a bearing on future food prices. Statements which may come from this body designed to reassure the consumer that she will have lower food prices—due to action you are going to suggest—may simply assure the consumer of higher food prices if in the process they cause the producer to think his prices will be going down in the future when he markets his product.

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

Among those economic factors which brought about increased demand for food is that of increasing income. In the last 25 years, per capita disposable income in this country has increased 223 percent. In the last 20 years, wages have gone up 2½ times. Since 1965, per capita income has increased 62 percent. Minimum wage laws—recently increased by this body—have increased the ability of those in the lower earning bracket to buy more food. A higher proportion of each new dollar added to those in lower income levels go for food than do comparable dollar increases to those in higher income levels. A person in the higher income bracket can eat only so much food.

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

Last year we had a 17-percent increase in the volume of food stamps issued. Of course, all of this went into the market to bid up food. We had a change of policy in Russia and China relative to their attitudes in feeding their people which was accompanied by a change in their trade attitudes toward the United States.

which was also accompanied by bad crop years in these two as well as other countries. Had they bought grain elsewhere instead of the United States, it would have had a similar effect of driving up the price of grain on the world market.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Because of inelastic demand for food, this also means that a slight increase in food supply results in sharply decreasing prices. Again this is true because one can only eat so much food. By the same token, slight decreases in food supply result in sharply increasing food prices. It is thought a 1-percent decrease in the supply of food results in a 3- or 4-percent increase in price. If demand for food were elastic like demand for many other products, we would find a 1-percent decrease in supply would bring about a comparable 1-percent increase in price.

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

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

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

also priced low in relation to what it does for the consumer.

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

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

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

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

Our Government has also been involved, because it knows the important role farm exports play in our balance of trade and that to maintain a good export market we must be able to guarantee our foreign buyers a steady supply. A foreign business can tell its buyer to wait a few weeks for a particular manufactured product, but it cannot tell its buyer it is out of food and to come back in a few weeks. Food demand abroad is inelastic too, you know.

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

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

The answer to all three is "no." When traveling abroad an often asked question is—Why do Americans have so many nice things? Of course, there are

many reasons. One big reason is because only around 16 percent of the disposable income of the American consumer goes for food. In England it is 25 percent, in Japan it is 35 percent, in Russia it is 58 percent, and in Asia it is 80 percent. When 50 to 80 percent of your disposable income goes for food, you do not have much left over. But when only 16 percent goes for food, you have enough left over to buy such things as a second car, a color TV, and many of the things Americans are known to own. Why do Americans have so many of these luxury items—one reason is because of low food prices—the lowest in terms of percent of disposable income of any country in the world.

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

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

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

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

The 16 percent of the disposable income buys a chicken cut in the pieces desired, cooked, seasoned, and ready to serve. The 80 percent of income in Asia buys a chicken hanging by its neck from a roadside market.

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

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

cent, but during this same period, per capita income has increased 62 percent.

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

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

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

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

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

For example, farm prices for food are only up 6 percent over 20 years ago while wholesale food prices are up 20 percent and retail food prices are up 43 percent. While the total cost of a loaf of bread rose from 13½ cents in 1947 to 24.8 cents in 1971, the total wheat cost per loaf dropped from 2.7 to 2.6 cents. If the farmer gave his corn away, we could reduce the cost of a 32-cent box of corn flakes by 8.2 cents. The box costs more than that. We could also reduce the cost of a dollar's worth of canned corn by 11 cents.

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

For example, a farmer with assets of \$200,000 should receive \$14,000 a year income—a 7-percent return on his investment—before you even start figuring his return for management or labor. Some economists use 5 percent of gross to establish a return for management in some fields. Many who compute the farmer's income omit consideration for either management or return on his investment

and compare his return on an identical base with the average workingman, including omission of consideration for hours worked on the farm by members of the family.

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

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

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

Inflation has caused higher food prices as well as higher prices of other goods and services. Is the farmer to blame? What causes inflation? It is caused by a shortage of goods and services in relation to dollars. The man-hour output of the farmworker has increased more than twice as much as the nonfarmworker in the past 20 years. If the nonfarmworker has increased his productivity as much as the farmworker, inflation would not be a problem in America today and neither would we be experiencing such a trade deficit.

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

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

I might add that in most cases, foreign countries are far tougher on our farm exports—in terms of quotas and duties—than they are on our manufactured goods, and they often do far more to sub-

sidize their producers. In spite of this, our farm goods still compete. As a group, if they can compete under these conditions and produce a surplus in trade while manufactured goods represent a \$10 billion deficit, how can anyone say our farm goods are too high? How can they be too high if they represent the one area of production in this country priced cheaply enough to compete on the world market?

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

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

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

IN GOD WE TRUST

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, as I enter this Chamber each day and see the words, "In God We Trust" emblazoned above the Speaker's desk, I feel pride and I feel confidence for the Nation.

As long as we continue to strive for the principles of honesty and morality in Government, in business, in the home and in the church, we will continue to be the great Nation we are today.

An inspirational message with this same theme has recently come to my attention, and I would like to share it with my colleagues today.

It is a sermon by Dr. Charles R. Standridge, delivered on Sunday, May 27, at the First Baptist Church of Arlington, Va. The text follows:

A VIEW FROM THE MOUNTAIN—1 KINGS
19: 1-18

(By Dr. Charles R. Standridge, Th. D.)

The word for this day is one of hope! But lest you say, "alas, it is false hope", let me give you some background. This day is not the only day that was ever beset by trial, public scandal, lack of decency in high place, breach of etiquette or ethics, an abandonment of true and honest principles, the forsaking of the high roads of virtue and decency.

A little recollection will help you to recall that Ahab had been essentially a weak king. He had married a dominating woman and to make it all the worse, he was regimented in

it. She gave him a hard time to say the least. Ahab was not exactly the man of the house. There was a woman with whom he had to reckon. She was one who had so little principle and so little of integrity that she would kill a man to take a piece of land that he would not sell for money or love. But she, ruthless as she was, would put Ahab up to a lot of foolishness.

The times when he, with his weak knees and lack of conviction, would continually give in to the propagation and the disposition of Baalism, God was calling to a halt. It was to begin in an unassuming way, but it would lead to a climax that would be ominous and red. Jezebel might rule the people with high-handed disregard for the precepts and for the directives of God, but she could not twiddle heaven around by her thumb nor could she command the Almighty. The day of reckoning would surely come. It approached when Elijah was prompted by God to go and duel the prophets of Baal on the Mount of Carmel. There they were chagrined and embarrassed by their own impotence.

They screamed, they cried, they danced, they whipped themselves into frenzy and called on Baal; but Baal's ineptness was immediately obvious. He had no power to send fire to consume a sacrifice. Adding his taunt, Elijah added all the more to their embarrassment by saying to them, "Let's rebuild the altar and pour barrel after barrel after barrel of water upon it to utterly quench any idea that somehow by any move or trick that sacrifice would be consumed with fire other than by the power of God. And then at prayer time, when he would be saying: 'Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy might, with all thy strength, with all thy soul.'"

This was the commitment of Israel to the Almighty that they had rejected and forsaken. He now offers it at prayer time and kneels and says, "O Lord of Hosts, send now thy fire that they shall know all the truth that Thou art God of Israel." And the fire fell and the altar was consumed and the water was licked up and Judaism in its historical stance, a commitment with the Almighty Jehovah, Lord of Hosts, was once more exalted. And, the prophets of Baal were beheaded and Jezebel was embarrassed and Ahab stood weak and inept.

Now I offer this not as a reasonable facsimile of our day at all, but to tell you that this is not the first time in the life of the world or the life of nations when there has been either indiscretion or indecency or moral derangement in high places. But, whenever it comes, it is easy for the hearts of people to become dismayed, disillusioned and frightened. Our land has felt something of the sickness and there has been, deep in the vitals of our own nature, revulsion and repulsion that has been the result of the kinds of defaults that have been brought to light in recent days. No man in his right mind could condone it and no man of reasoned faith would tolerate it.

But, let us look again at some options that have been considered as being legal and right. It is one thing to condemn evil—it is another to lead a stoning party that would massacre or deface or defame. None of us would either intend or suggest that to be the proper thing for us to do. It is right, however, for us to seek courage to recognize sin and to condemn it for what it is and to resolve with full commitment to be no part of it.

It is an astonishing thing that most great scandals begin in a small lapse of character. But it is imperative in this day as in that that we understand that historically every king in Judah and Israel were judged by one great standard: their faithfulness to the Lord and to the faith delivered to them through Moses. It was embodied in the Law and the Deuteronomic formula by which all kings were judged . . . that if they were

obedient, they were blessed; if they were disobedient, they were judged. It was simplistically stated, but it was faithfully followed. An appraisal of every king in Israel and Judah is to be found in I and II Samuel, I and II Kings, and I and II Chronicles. Ahab was one of them who was soundly denounced and soundly rejected and was replaced by one who would rid the nation of Baalism—Jehu.

Now, let us look a little further. Notice the reaction of Elijah. An understandable thing. He had assumed after he had borne the weight of public abuse and kingly rejection for three years that he was, indeed, the only one who championed the cause of decency and honor in Israel. He had fought alone. He had had curses from men far and wide, great and small. They were holding him responsible for the drought in the land. But now that rains have come, they will be slow to come again to seek out the prophet of God and right those wrongs. Alone he felt; rejected he felt. And while it has been our temptation to condemn him for fleeing from Jezebel, lesser men have fled from lesser tyrants than she. Consider, though, what he did. He made his way down to Horeb.

Now, in the event you have forgotten the importance of Horeb, great mountains have always played an important part in the life of the nation Israel. First there was Moriah, where Abraham had intended to sacrifice Isaac until the intervention of the angel. Next there was Sinai where God had communicated his covenant to Moses. Horeb and Sinai are duplicate names for the same mountain, but one the name for one emphasis from one writing group and the other another group. It was to that mountain Moses had gone . . . where he had met with the Almighty, face to face. The mountain that had smoked with the holiness of God. It had been electrified by the Presence of God . . . where the people of God has been admonished, "Touch it not lest you die."

It was there that Elijah now goes, for he needs to touch again a recommitment to the law, a renewing reality made possible in a restoration of fellowship and a renewal of his own energy and mind through association with that great spirit, Moses. Moses, too, had known rejection and loneliness and public abuse and popular renunciation. And now Elijah reaches out for hope and help, and makes his retreat into a cave in the side of Horeb.

God would not leave him alone—He loves him too much, and he wants Elijah now to see a demonstration that will never again be forgotten. Men have looked for God in the bright and in brilliance. The mountain seemed ablaze with fire and glory, but God was not in it. Men have thought of God as being in the colossal, the stupendous, the extraordinary, the gigantic, the frightfully powerful . . . but God is not in the earthquake or the wind. And, about the time that Elijah was dazed, wondering where he was, God spoke to Elijah in a still, small voice, and said, "Elijah, what are you doing here?" "Ah, Lord, I have fled for my life. They have slain thy prophets, torn down thy altars, and I, even I alone am left." How understandable!

There are people who tell themselves they are alone so often that they come to believe it. And, Elijah was as human as we and we as human as he. It is an easy thing for us in our aloneness to imagine that we are the only one who cares a whit whether decency is again more than just a hope, or honor has any virtue or whether honesty is to be had or found anywhere. Elijah insisted: "I alone am left." Well, that too needed to be dispelled. And God says to him, "Elijah, there are seven thousand in this world who have never bowed a knee to Baal or kissed him." And now to find again a camaraderie with people who want the Lord, who rejoice in his Presence and who pray for His King-

dom's extension. This is fellowship. It is renewal! It is strength! It is blessedness! It is worship. And Elijah found it so. And in it is strength to go back to the paths that were his, to tasks that awaited him.

Now, let us make some deductions. First, we ought to recognize that in times of crisis or national scandal, whether in Britain or here or any other land on earth, or whether they be circumstances that may immediately impinge upon our life style and life situation or not, that God is never indifferent to the power and the presence of evil. It may appear that He is indifferent or that He is preoccupied with other sights. But, alas, the Provident One, the Almighty never loses view of you, never ceases to be aware of any of us, whose kindness seeks us out, whose goodwill and wish it is that every child of His should be well in mind, in body, in spirit. How reassuring that He is not preoccupied with those little dots called planets orbiting around some sun, if not ours, that He loses sight of you or me. Be thrilled in this. That one with whom we have to do always has us in His view. Not one of us is forgotten by our Heavenly Father. He who notes when the sparrow falls, surely knows every servant's call. Forget it not. He is God with us. He is still the Almighty made knowable in His Son, enabling us in His spirit.

But, there is another thing that ought to bring reassurance to us and it is this: That this great God of ours whose wisdom must permeate all the ages, whose will must be ours in this age, has something yet for each of us to do. Let me give you an illustration of this. It is easy for us and it is now a very popular thing to do to unleash invectives and indictments upon those who have erred in their judgment and in their practice in terms of the Watergate scandal. I pray that all who are guilty will be found out and properly judged and that they who are innocent should be exonerated. But, let me point out this. If you think that it is necessary and good for men in high positions to have character and courage and integrity, you are exactly right. Our land is not an exception. In Israel it was understood that the character of the king determined the character of the nation. It is an assumption on our part that if ever there is a place where character and integrity ought to be, it is in the Presidency and in high officials in our land. So that whether it be home, an institution, or the national life, there must be character. There is no substitute for it. There is nothing that ties our tongues into condemnation of evil quite so much as participation in evil.

Now the application. As necessary and as urgent as it is that there should be character in the leadership of our national life, it is just as necessary to the world of which you are a part that you should be a person of integrity, of character, of impeccable honesty, of truth and of decency. If there is disarray in the nation because of corruption in the places of high officials, think of that world of home or work where you are a participant.

Now for our moments of disillusionment. There comes again by clear directive of the Almighty to us as to Elijah, "Go, stand on the Mountain" and see again that God is not indifferent, nor unknowing, nor disinterested, nor detached, nor has he wound this little thing called earth up, set it in motion and withdrawn to see how long it will run. He is in the midst of us. He is the Almighty before whom the nations are "As a drop on the lip of the bucket" as Isaiah said. He is the one who rules in righteousness, who judges with equity. He has not lost grip upon His creation, nor concern for His creatures. It is He who reaches out to the last and to the least of us. He it is who waits to extend a clear call to the wandering sinner and says: "This is the way, walk ye in it." He is the one who providentially cares and

provides and, with a fatherly disposition, waits for the prodigal to arrive. He is the One in Whom we have our hope.

"Go, stand on the Mountain" for God is our hope!

**JOHN N. DYER, PRESIDENT OF AIL,
A DIVISION OF CUTLER-HAMMER,
RETIRES**

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, Mr. John N. Dyer will retire as president of AIL, a division of Cutler-Hammer, Deer Park, N.Y.

So that my colleagues will know of Mr. Dyer's outstanding service to his country and community, I insert in the RECORD the highlights of his career:

**JOHN NEWTON DYER, PRESIDENT OF AIL, A
DIVISION OF CUTLER-HAMMER, DEER PARK,
N.Y.**

Mr. Dyer was born in Haverhill, Massachusetts, 14 July 1910. After graduation from Haverhill High School, he entered Massachusetts Institute of Technology, graduating with a B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering in 1931.

Mr. Dyer served as an engineer for the Columbia Broadcasting System in the 1930's, becoming assistant chief television engineer in 1936. During the period 1933-1935, he was a member of the Byrd expedition to the Antarctic.

During World War II, he was a leader of a group developing electronic countermeasures equipment at the Radio Research Laboratory at Harvard University and later served as director of the America-British Laboratory at Malvern, England.

He joined AIL (formerly called Airborne Instruments Laboratory) in 1945 as a supervising engineer of the Radar and Air Navigation Section. He became Director of the Research and Engineering Division in 1950, and in 1955 was appointed Vice President and a member of the Board of Directors of AIL. In 1960, he was named Technical Director of AIL. In July 1964, he was promoted to Executive Vice President of AIL, in which capacity he directed all research and engineering for the AIL Division. He was simultaneously elected a Vice President of Cutler-Hammer, Incorporated and a member of the Board of Directors. He became President of AIL on 1 July 1968.

Active in civic and educational areas, Mr. Dyer is a Trustee and former Treasurer of the Community Foundation of Oyster Bay and former President of the Community Social Action Council in Oyster Bay. He was Chairman of the Oyster Bay Housing Authority and is presently serving as secretary. He retired from the Board of Education of Oyster Bay after having been President from 1957 to 1958 and serving on the Board for thirteen years.

Mr. Dyer is a Fellow of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers and an Associate Fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. He formerly served as Vice President and member of the Board of Directors of the IEEE and was a member of the Institute of Navigation and the Society of Moving Picture Engineers. He was a Trustee of the IEEE Employee Retirement Plan and has been active as a member of the IEEE Navigation Aids, Appointments, Education, Nominations, Policy Advisory, Fellow, Awards, Professional Groups, Awards Board, Founders Award, Field Awards and Sections Committees.

Mr. Dyer was Campaign Chairman of the United Fund of Long Island for the 1971 and 1972 campaigns. He also was Director of UFLI's 1969 and 1972 Major Corporate Gifts Division, Vice President of Administration in 1969 and is a trustee and member of the Executive Committee.

He is a member of the Policy Planning Board of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. He is a member of the Advisory Committee of the National Alliance of Businessmen, a former Director of the Long Island Association and is a member of the Stony Brook University Associates.

Mr. Dyer has been a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science since 1963.

He received the Presidential Certificate of Merit in 1946. For his contributions to the Community of Oyster Bay, he received an award in 1968 from the Community Social Action Council.

Mr. Dyer and his wife, Priscilla, have lived in Oyster Bay, Long Island for almost 25 years, but they will be residing in Center Sandwich, New Hampshire beginning in August 1973. His plans for the future, in his own words, consist of: "After we (he and Mrs. Dyer) get settled in New Hampshire, we will see what needs doing and try to help in the community where we will be living. We don't intend to 'retire' and we want to be doing things that are useful."

The Dyers have three daughters—Ann, Sally, and Mary, and five grandchildren—David and Eric Songaylo, Robert and Charles Austin, and Daryl Parker.

INTERSTATE OIL PIPELINES PERFORM ECONOMIC MIRACLE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article and recommend it to my colleagues for their reading as the Congress considers matters relating to the energy crisis:

[From Oil & Gas Journal, June 11, 1973]

WHY?

(By John P. O'Donnell)

Back in 1957, the interstate oil pipelines got 16.3¢ for each bbl of oil they delivered. In 1972, 15 years later, they got 15.1¢/bbl.

To be able to perform a service in 1972 for less than you did in 1957 has to be some sort of economic miracle.

It's an accomplishment in which the pipelines could take some thoroughly justifiable pride. Unfortunately, it will be recognized by only a few people in the industry and, certainly, by none outside of it.

This lack of recognition is really unfortunate not only for the pipelines but also for those who benefit from the service the pipelines perform. The principal beneficiaries are, of course, the consumers of oil products.

Since the consumer is unaware of the pipelines' service, he cannot be expected to rise to their defense when they are under attack. And that's too bad, for it's good to have vocal consumers on your side.

Take a Manhattan motorist who pays 41.9¢/gal for regular gasoline. The odds are good that that gallon of gasoline got to New York by pipeline from a Texas or Louisiana refinery, some 1,500 miles away.

If the motorist were aware of that fact, he surely would not believe that the cost of moving that gallon those 1,500 miles was well under 2% of the price he paid. If he were aware of just how little effect pipeline trans-

portation has on consumer prices, he'd have to be sympathetic.

This economy of operation was attained by constantly improving the efficiency of existing lines and adding new lower-cost, larger lines. It is a big plus—but only one of several that pipelines can point to with pride.

Another and a very major plus is safety. No other form of transportation comes even remotely close to pipelines when it comes to safe operation.

There were more than 60,000 transportation fatalities last year. Pipelines carry almost one fourth of all this country's intercity traffic, but they accounted for only 1/10 of 1% of all the fatalities.

Still another plus for the pipelines is the respect they have shown for the environment. Long before there was an EPA, pipelines covered their traces by replanting rights-of-way and performing otherwise as responsible parties should.

Probably the most convincing evidence of their failure to offend is the public's almost complete unawareness of their existence.

When you look at the economic, efficient, safe, and unobtrusive service pipelines perform and then look at the agonies Alyeska is going through, you have to wonder, "Why?"

EUROPEANS TRAVEL CHEAPER THAN AMERICANS DUE TO NON-CAB STRAITJACKET

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have witnessed the astonishing growth of an increasingly important segment of the air transport industry—the supplemental carriers or, as they are more commonly known, charter airlines. This growth is primarily due to their devotion to the idea that a major percentage of the traveling public is seeking a fast, safe, comfortable, and most important, inexpensive way to travel. And in the tradition of the better mousetrap, budget-minded American consumers in record numbers are discovering the economics of low-cost charter airline service as a means of stretching their vacation travel dollar.

Americans now in the process of voting with their dollars are pointing to charters as the wave of the future in vacation travel. There are some things that need to be done, however, to smooth the path of the growth of this valuable service.

The practice of affinity charters by large groups must be allowed by the CAB to continue. Far and away the most widely used means of charter travel, it has been responsible for opening the doors of the world to millions of Americans. Inclusive tour charter regulations must be relaxed in order to meet foreign competition. The current 7-day minimum requirement for such tours does not exist in Europe, where ITC traffic has increased 15 percent or more in every year since 1963. And finally, steps must be taken to improve the marketability of travel group charters. American travelers are understandably reluctant to sign a contract at an uncertain price with no assurance that the flight will actually operate.

Mr. Speaker, the valuable service rendered by supplemental air carriers has earned them a prominent place in the air travel industry. Using the time-honored principle of providing the best service for the least money, they have literally brought the world within the reach of many Americans who otherwise would have been unable to travel in such a style. The supplementals are clearly deserving of our efforts to assist them in this globe-shrinking effort.

A recent press release from the National Air Carriers Association points up the current posture of the industry as follows:

CHARTER FLIGHTS GAIN POPULARITY

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 29.—Budget-minded American consumers in record numbers are discovering the economies of low-cost charter airline service as a means of stretching their vacation travel dollar.

A report just published by the National Air Carrier Association (NACA) shows that in 1972 nearly 25 percent of the 10.8 million transatlantic airline passengers took charter flights, an increase of one half million people from a year earlier.

The U.S. supplemental airlines, certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board to operate charter flights exclusively, accounted for more than one million transatlantic passengers and 44 percent of the charter business in this market. Dramatic gains were also posted in the mainland-Hawaii market, which increased nearly 40 percent during 1972.

"The results of the past year clearly demonstrate a growing consumer demand for low-cost air travel," observed Edward J. Driscoll, president of NACA and spokesman for the supplemental airline industry.

Stating that supplemental airlines flew more than 10 billion passenger miles in 1972, Driscoll said "we have only scratched the surface of a vast, virtually untapped opportunity that could revolutionize U.S. travel and air transportation industries."

Yet despite significant regulatory breakthroughs and increased consumer demand for charter air transportation, Driscoll reported that 1972 proved to be another year of disappointing financial results for the supplemental industry.

"Increased cost of operations and greater charter market competition by scheduled airlines, particularly in the transatlantic, caused a decline in total industry revenues and operating profits," Driscoll stated.

Total revenues of the supplemental industry dropped 7.3 percent to \$358.3 million.

Operating profits were down 2 percent to \$8.7 million.

Passenger miles flown dipped 4.9 percent, while cargo ton miles flown were off 8.9 percent.

A net profit for the industry was realized for the first time since 1968, but totaled only \$49,000, which Driscoll characterized as "an insignificant return on investment for an industry of this size."

Driscoll noted that NACA member airlines carried nearly 2 million passengers in 1972 and accounted for \$274.6 million, or nearly 80 percent, of total industry revenues, an increase of \$32 million from a year earlier. Commercial revenues reached \$169.6 million, an increase of 18 percent, but net profits slipped from \$9.1 million to \$3.9 million. NACA represents the four largest charter airlines: Overseas National Airways, Saturn Airways, Trans International Airlines, and World Airways.

However, Driscoll predicted that 1973 would mark a major improvement in the economic condition and outlook for the U.S. air transport industry "if a number of critically important actions are taken to stimulate economic growth, including an elimina-

tion of below-cost fares by scheduled and supplemental carriers, CAB action to improve the marketability of new Travel Group Charters (TGCs), a continuation of affinity charters, and legislation authorizing European-style one-stop Inclusive Tour Charters (ITCs)."

AN EXAMPLE OF PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH DEDICATED MILITARY SERVICE

HON. ANDREW J. HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in these changing times when we are reevaluating our whole national security posture and the role that our military personnel will have in the future, I think we should be careful not to overlook our Reserve Forces.

There are some who suggest that an all-volunteer force may not be workable because of limited opportunities for advancement. In this regard I would like to recount the experience of a friend of mine, Roger E. Abernathy.

Mr. Abernathy enlisted in the U.S. Navy shortly before the beginning of World War II on July 22, 1941, at age 18. Rising rapidly through the enlisted ranks, Abernathy became a chief petty officer at age 22. I understand this achievement meant that Mr. Abernathy at that time became the youngest chief petty officer in the history of the Navy.

At the end of World War II, Mr. Abernathy left active duty, but remained in the service of his country as a Naval Reservist. In March 1949, Mr. Abernathy was promoted out of the enlisted ranks and was elevated to rank of ensign.

Continuing the pattern he set during his active duty Mr. Abernathy rapidly rose through the various officer levels to the rank of captain, U.S. Naval Reserve.

Capt. Roger E. Abernathy's latest achievement is best explained by the following letter which today I sent to Rear Adm. Thomas B. Russell, Jr., U.S. Navy, Commander, Naval Air Reserve:

DEAR ADMIRAL RUSSELL: On June 23, 1973 I had occasion to visit the Naval Air Reserve Unit at NAS, Point Mugu, California when my personal friend and military advisor, Captain Roger E. Abernathy assumed command of the Naval Air Reserve Staff Uniform One from Captain Boyd R. Dixon. I had not been on a Naval Air Station since my own Navy service during WWII and could not help but be impressed and to share in the sense of pride the Command personnel displayed about their unit.

During this Change of Command visit, I had the opportunity to make a quick tour of the facility and to enjoy the courtesies and hospitality extended me by Commanding Officer Captain David S. Ailes and also met and chatted with Captain Richard G. Martin, the Chief Staff Officer of NARS U 1.

I believe everyone is pleased when their friends' abilities and achievements are recognized and your selection of Captain Abernathy as Staff Commander is especially rewarding because it confirms my reliance on him as my Military Advisor for recommendations in formulating views on legislative matters involving military affairs.

I have long felt that our military reserve personnel strength is a vital component of

our overall national security—you are to be commended on the posture and smartness evidenced by the personnel at Point Mugu.

Mr. Speaker, this example clearly shows that dedicated and deserving personnel can, not only advance in rank and thereby obtain a sense of personal achievement, but also contribute in a significant way to the good of this country and all of its citizens.

FBI LAW ENFORCEMENT BULLETIN

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years now, the hazards facing policemen in many of our big cities and even in some smaller towns and rural communities have been increasing, as self-described revolutionaries have employed the techniques of urban guerrilla warfare.

In the past decade many law enforcement officers have been killed or wounded by sniper fire, shootouts, and other violence perpetrated by elements who's remedy for their grievances is the assassin's bullet.

There is no question that the seed for these crimes was many times planted by Communist organizations throughout the world, especially those in Cuba and Latin America. Specific instructions in guerrilla warfare, with the police as a primary target, are readily available in any of our large cities.

An extremely interesting and timely article on the subject, entitled "Trends in Urban Guerrilla Tactics" has just appeared in the July 1973 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

As chairman of the Committee on Internal Security, I am recommending this article to my colleagues in the House and all Americans and insert it at this point in the RECORD.

TRENDS IN URBAN GUERRILLA TACTICS

New tactics and techniques have been developed in the United States by a small number of criminals who style themselves urban guerrillas. "... we have to try something new like armed revolutionary violence ... (Urban Guerrilla Units). Ripping off money from banks and being Revolutionary Executioners of the gestapo pigs [police] mainly to capture weapons from the enemy ..." announced the newspaper of the Eldridge Cleaver faction of the Black Panther Party.¹

Here the Panthers were echoing Pan-Africanism advocate Stokely Carmichael ("... when the guerrilla kills a member of the occupying army, he not only takes the gun that's around his waist, he opens up the door and he takes a 12-gauge shotgun.") and the Brazilian theoretician of urban guerrilla warfare, Carlos Marighella ("The principal object of the ambush tactic is to capture enemy arms and punish him with death."²). But recently developed information indicates a change in this tactic.

EVIDENTIARY LINK

A new writer on urban guerrilla warfare realized that weapons taken from murdered

Footnotes at end of article.

police officers—and a number of police killings have been marked by the theft of the victims' weapons—becomes an evidentiary link tying the guerrilla to a police killing in the event of capture while armed with a stolen gun. A notebook of guerrilla techniques, found in the possession of persons involved in purchasing a considerable arsenal, advised the would-be guerrilla: "We do not need to take weapons from iced [killed] pigs, specially those that have been righteously baconized. There are better places to rip-off weapons—not where they can be linked to butchered hogs."

Attacks on police are still the main tactic of these "revolutionary executioners." In 1972, 11 police officers were killed and 23 were wounded in attacks where responsibility was claimed by revolutionary or urban guerrilla-type groups or individuals, or where there were strong indications members of these types of groups were involved. In 1971, 19 officers died and 48 were wounded in similar attacks.

The 9 mm. pistol ("I recommend the Browning 9 mm. automatic. It comes with a 13 shot magazine," notes the writer of a booklet on guerrilla tactics⁴) and the 9 mm. submachinegun are becoming favorite guerrilla weapons in this country, along with the AR-15 and AR-180, civilian counterparts of the M-16 military assault rifle. Other weapons, including foreign military weapons stolen in this country, have also been used, however.

Revolutionary-inspired attacks on police in this country have included ambushes, snipings, and apparently spontaneous shooting confrontations. Perpetrators have made false requests for police assistance to have officers into ambushes and have committed deliberate traffic violations to cause patrolmen to leave their police cars and expose themselves to a fusillade. Cold weather has been suggested as the best time of the year for these attacks as the wearing of heavy clothing permits better concealment of weapons.

EXPROPRIATIONS

"The police have the guns and the banks have the money. So this brings us to the act of expropriation. . . . the rip-off of arms, goods or money for revolutionary purposes. . . ." according to the Black Liberation Army.⁵ Robberies to gain funds for the "revolution" have been claimed by this group. Communiqué No. 1 from the Attica Brigade of the Afro-American Liberation Army (the name Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver gave his urban guerrilla followers—it is synonymous with Black Liberation Army) claimed those who threw a hand grenade under a New York City police car on December 20, 1971, were on a mission to "rip off funds for the Afro-American liberation struggle."⁶

This boasting about expropriations was later criticized by other advocates of urban guerrilla activity who subscribe to the advice of "giving expropriations the appearance of bandit attacks"⁷ in order to gain time to build a revolutionary movement. Also criticized were Black Liberation Army robberies of "after hours" clubs as not being worth the risk. "If U.G.'s (urban guerrillas) are going to risk life and freedom doing armed expros (expropriations)—for the big money," advises the writer who warned against taking slain police officers' weapons. Recommended targets for expropriations, by this writer and others, include banks, check-cashing establishments, and large chain stores, especially the last two categories on the 1st and 16th of the month when assistance checks are to be cashed.

Recent urban guerrilla writings have also detailed techniques and equipment useful in expropriations. Reconnaissance of the target (determining the amount of police patrol

traffic and whether a bank guard is armed) is stressed, along with planning the getaway. Hand grenades are described as having been effective in the past in deterring pursuers. Panel trucks are a favorite guerrilla vehicle because a large amount of equipment can be carried in a concealed manner. The use of rented panel trucks (rented with false identification) as homemade armored cars in escapes has been suggested. The armor would consist of sandbags or sheets of steel or bulletproof plastic.

The lack of a police radio prevented a guerrilla unit watching a bank from knowing police were checking the license number of the guerrilla vehicle, according to an article on techniques by the Black Liberation Army.⁸ (The use of stolen cars is suggested if the car is repainted or the license plates are switched.) Guerrillas have also been advised to attack any police coming on the scene of an operation before the officers can radio for assistance. Suggestions for bank robbery techniques have included warnings about "bait" money, use of disguises, wigs, hoods, and ski masks, plus the destruction or removal of bank robbery cameras.

Followers of the Cleaver Panther faction in Louisville, Ky., described the Black Liberation Army as "a small urban guerrilla unit waging armed struggle against . . . the United States government. . . ." The "army" is "entirely autonomous and decentralized. . . ."; its leadership is a collective. Thus, according to this version, there is no dependence on orders from a "high command" to collect "a compulsory revolutionary tax" from a bank (a thought adopted from Carlos Marighella). . . . "or to carry out other guerrilla operations, such as 'punishing a pig by death. . . .'"⁹

Expropriations by various types of revolutionaries are not always violent. Fraudulent use of traveler's checks has been reported. Followers of the Weatherman (the extremist group later renamed the Weather Underground to avoid implications of "male chauvinism") philosophy have doubled their funds by buying these checks and falsely reporting them lost or stolen, thus receiving a second set of checks to cash. False or stolen identification is usually used in this and other fund-raising schemes, often consisting of credit cards and identification stolen on campuses from college students. Reports have also been received of revolutionaries obtaining birth certificates of persons who died in infancy. The name of a deceased infant can be obtained by reviewing death notices for the appropriate year of birth. This procedure is a well-known espionage technique.

TERRORISM AND URBAN GUERRILLA WARFARE

Expropriations by urban guerrillas to support the "revolution" are seldom needed by today's political terrorist. This is one of several important differences between the terrorist and the guerrilla in today's world. Urban guerrilla warfare can be defined as criminal conduct for revolutionary purposes. Terrorism, on the other hand, is violent criminal activity designed to intimidate for political purposes. The distinction is in goals sought and sometimes in methods used. The guerrilla is working toward revolution. The terrorist acts to focus attention on a particular grievance.

"The terrorist has a political tool; the urban guerrilla has a strategy of revolution. . . ." Today, the usually indigenous urban guerrilla relies on expropriation to finance his activities, while the political terrorist often operates in countries foreign to him and is many times financed by countries sympathetic to his aims. Thus, the fanatical terrorist can create the hostage-type situation (which exposes the terrorist to capture) in order to gain the maximum publicity, but the urban guerrilla must "never expose himself unnecessarily. All possible

precautions ought to be taken to avoid a defeat or annihilation."¹¹

Urban guerrillas can, and do, use indiscriminate terror as a tactic at times. Bombings are the most common instrument, as the unsuspected bomb, used against civilians, is well calculated to instill fear. This tactic, for example, might be similar to the worldwide letter bomb campaign against Israeli officials and sympathizers that followed the Arab terrorist attack at the XX Olympiad. Letter bombs can weigh less than an ounce and be only an eighth of an inch thick. Most have been hand addressed and have been sent from overseas addresses by airmail. Plastic explosive in thin strips and TNT in a powdered form have been utilized; detonators have included tiny springs and percussion caps.

BOMBINGS AND THE WEATHERMAN

In this country, the bomb has been the primary weapon of the Weatherman group. "Tonight [June 9, 1970], at 7 p.m., we blew up the N.Y.C. police headquarters," boasted the Weatherman.¹² The March 1, 1971, bombing of the Capitol building in Washington, D.C., was claimed by the Weather Underground in Communiqué No. 8. In 1972, the Weather Underground took credit for the May 19 bombing of the Pentagon. Other bombings directed against the "establishment" have been claimed by urban guerrilla revolutionary groups with such exotic names as the Smiling Fox Tribe, the Proud Eagle Tribe, and The Perfect Park Home Grown Society.

Often these bombings were preceded by warning calls, though this did not prevent loss of life in at least one case. The nature of the target—military, government, or other "establishment" symbol—and the warning call claiming the bombing have become the trademarks of Weatherman and other revolutionary-type groups.

The Weatherman was among the first revolutionary organizations in the United States to adopt Fidel Castro's "foco" theory—that it is not necessary to organize the population as a whole to accomplish armed revolution—" . . . a small group of armed insurgents . . . can act as a focus for the various discontented elements . . . [to] channel all the latent energy available into action for the defeat of the government."¹³

Bombing by revolutionary groups inspired a Ku Klux Klan group to publish "Revolutionary Notes" late in 1972 "to provide the patriot with the same information which is already in the hands of our leftist enemies."¹⁴ Instructions for making time bombs from dynamite, capable of being concealed in a thermos bottle or attache case, are set out, complete with diagrams. According to the Klan, this type of bomb can wreck an elevator, rupture a gas or water main, disable a power transformer, damage the service core of a skyscraper, or, if left in a subway car over an axle, derail the train. Two months after the Klan claimed in this article that "a well-planned campaign of bombing can wreak utter havoc," a member of the group was arrested and found to have dynamite, blasting caps, a clock, a battery, and other necessary equipment for a time bomb as described in the Klan publication.

While linked most often to ambushes and other shooting confrontations with police, the Afro-American Liberation Army has also used explosives, especially on the west coast. Early this year, components for making time bombs were seized by police from members of this group. In May 1972, a bomb was discovered at the Portuguese Consulate in San Francisco. The Afro-American Liberation Army claimed credit for placing the bomb in a letter directed to the news media. The device in this case consisted of 14 sticks of dynamite, a blasting cap, and a fuse, all contained in a brown paper sack. A dirt-filled cloth sack was placed over the bomb to direct

Footnotes at end of article.

the force of the blast, but the bomb failed to detonate when the fuse went out.

After a police car was bombed in Los Angeles on October 7, 1972, an anonymous caller claimed credit for the bombing in the name of the Afro-American Liberation Army. Although this group has used explosives more on the west coast, a house used as a training base in the South was boobytrapped with a heavy explosive charge when the guerrillas moved out. The "army" has also considered the use of light bulbs filled with explosives and straight pins as antipersonnel booby traps.

LEXICON OF VIOLENCE

Many of the techniques used by extremists of all types in this country can be found in a number of books and pamphlets on urban guerrilla warfare. The volume of this material circulating today amounts to a lexicon of violence. The paramilitary, "anticommunist" Minuteman organization, for example, reprinted two booklets in this category last year: "We Shall Fight in the Streets"¹ and "Special Forces Demolition Techniques." The first title has also been found in the possession of Black Liberation Army members; it was prepared to educate England on guerrilla warfare in the event of a Nazi invasion during World War II. The pamphlet on demolition techniques includes recipes for various explosives, instructions for delayed detonation, and methods of placing charges.

Some books and pamphlets of this genre seen in the hands of extremists in the United States include the well-known "Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla" by Carlos Marighella and "Underground Manual Number 3" by "Nick Parados." The "minimanual" is one of the most complete expositions of urban guerrilla tactics, while the latter booklet is a "how to" manual on explosives and incendiaries. One of the earliest guerrilla manuals circulated in this country, and one used by both Panthers and Weatherman-type revolutionaries, "Underground Manual Number 3" includes materials on homemade and improvised explosives and detonators.

A commercial venture aimed at the would-be guerrilla is "The Anarchist Cookbook" by William Powell (New York, 1971). The "cookbook" part of the title is based on the chapter of recipes for foods incorporating marijuana or hashish. Sabotage, weaponry, guerrilla organization, and explosives are all covered in detail in this book. Another copyrighted volume with both tactics and techniques is General Alberto Bayo's "150 Questions for a Guerrilla" (Havana, 1959; translated edition, 1963). The editor's notes for the translated edition caution the reader against experiments with some of the author's explosive formulas; indeed, the explosives and incendiaries described in all of these books can be extremely dangerous. Many of the instructions lack even elementary safety precautions.

Another instance of publication of material on urban guerrilla warfare by a group at the opposite end of the extremist spectrum from the Weatherman or the Panthers is the series of "Revolutionary Notes" printed by the National Youth Alliance. To overcome a claimed Marxist "monopoly" in this area, the Alliance published detailed instructions for guerrilla activity. In July 1972, for example, an article on sniping was printed which included instructions on telescopic sights and night firing.

This small organization, which opposes "Zionism" and "race-defiling . . . through school integration," accurately sums up the aim of urban guerrilla warfare in this series: "to undermine the confidence of the masses in the existing regime . . . when the authorities lack either sufficient will or strength to restore order—the public will begin withdrawing its support of those authorities."²

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Right On!* (Vol. 1, No. 12, Feb. 15, 1972), p. 10.

² Stokely Carmichael, *Stokely Speaks* (New York, 1971), p. 213.

³ Carlos Marighella, *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla* (New World Liberation Front, 1970), p. 26.

⁴ *On Organizing Urban Guerrilla Units* (Afro-American Liberation Army, 1970), p. 32.

⁵ "Message from the Black Liberation Army," *Right On!* (Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr. 5, 1972), p. C.

⁶ *Right On!* (Vol. 1, No. 10, Dec. 19–31, 1971), p. 17.

⁷ Carlos Marighella, *Guerrilla Tactics and Operations* (n.d.), p. 10.

⁸ "Message from the Black Liberation Army," *Right On!* (Vol. 2, No. 2, Apr. 5, 1972), p. C.

⁹ *Voice of the People* (Vol. 1, No. 1, February 1973), p. 9.

¹⁰ Robert Moss, *Urban Guerrilla Warfare* (The International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1971), p. 3.

¹¹ Che Guevara, *Guerrilla Warfare* (New York, 1969), p. 36.

¹² *Outlaws of Amerika, Communiques from the Weather Underground* (New York, 1971), p. 7.

¹³ Frank Kitson, *Low Intensity Operations* (London, 1971), p. 33.

¹⁴ *The Fiery Cross* (Vol. 7, Edition 10, Tuscaloosa, Ala.), p. 1.

¹⁵ Captain S. J. Cuthbert, *Scots Guards* (First U.S. edition, 1965, Boulder, Colo.).

¹⁶ *Attack!* (Washington, D.C., 1972).

FLIGHTS INTO SPACE PROVIDE IMPORTANT MEDICAL DISCOVERIES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert the following article which appeared in *Today's Health* in April 1973, reporting some of the medical discoveries that have come out of the Moon program:

[From *Today's Health*, April 1973]

SOME DOWN-TO-EARTH MEDICINE WE'VE LEARNED FROM OUR FLIGHTS INTO SPACE

(By Lawrence K. Altman)

Over the last 12 years 35 Americans have been hurled into space from Cape Kennedy launch pads. Each of the men in the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs was backed up by the most elaborate and sophisticated machinery ever devised and built. As you might expect, the same thoroughness that designed the hardware to put an American on the moon by the end of the Sixties also governed the selection of the healthiest, most stable, and fearless band of astronauts the country could produce. Most of them were ex-test pilots, who sought out and were accustomed to danger and risk.

Although the primary purpose of the space program was to put a man on the moon, not to carry out medical or psychological experiments, scientists two years ago made an important and still mysterious discovery about potassium losses in astronauts during space flight that has already helped develop life-saving techniques used in post-operative care, and for treatment of heart disease, diabetes, and serious traumatic injuries.

In the psychological realm, at least three of the astronauts came back from the moon to find their sense of themselves drastically changed. One found it difficult to accomplish even the most ordinary daily acts like choosing what to wear. Two others found new meaning in religious and spiritual concerns.

One of the most important medical discoveries coming out of the moon program was the fact of significant potassium loss during space flight. Potassium, a naturally occurring and vital body chemical, plays a key role in speeding nerve impulses through the body. Among other functions, it helps muscles contract and is required to make the heart beat in a forceful, rhythmic cadence.

Potassium deficiency, on the other hand, can produce a variety of subtle symptoms: tingling sensations in the skin, muscle weakness, and apathy. If the patient suffers small losses of potassium over a long period of time, his kidneys, heart, and bowel can be permanently damaged. If the loss is severe at any one time, paralysis and death can result.

Potassium losses—which doctors often call K losses, after the chemical symbol for potassium—during Apollo flights were not discovered until after the Apollo 15 astronauts splashed down in the Pacific in August of 1971. During the flight two of the astronauts—David R. Scott and James B. Irwin—had several abnormal heartbeats while working on the moon and afterwards on the return flight to earth. The astronauts themselves were unaware of the momentary irregularities, called atrial bigeminy, but they were picked up in Houston on electrocardiograms relayed by telemetry.

After-splashdown tests on Scott and Irwin showed that they had lost large amounts of potassium—at least 15 percent of the K normally present in their bodies. Only then could space agency physicians link the K losses with the irregular heartbeats.

No one yet knows precisely why space flight causes this potassium loss. Charles A. Berry, M.D., director for life sciences at NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center near Houston, and his colleagues, have put forward a complicated theory that involves the increase in blood flow caused by conditions of weightlessness, and the effect of that increased flow on a series of hormonal reactions ending in a loss of body electrolytes, including potassium and sodium. (Electrolytes, in biochemistry, is the name given to substances that separate into ions when in solution, thus making them electrically conducting. This process of separation, which occurs in the bloodstream with necessary electrolytes such as potassium, sodium, and magnesium, plays an important part in body functioning. Thus, any impairment of electrolyte balance, which is maintained by the kidneys, can be damaging to health in a wide variety of ways.)

Since the end of World War II, so much complex knowledge has been gained about electrolyte balance that many medical centers and hospitals now have doctors who specialize in maintaining electrolyte balance.

This knowledge has helped doctors add decades of useful life to many kinds of patients, including those suffering from such complications as congestive heart failure resulting from arteriosclerosis; diabetics recovering from a condition known as acidosis, which results from a severe loss of insulin; those undergoing bowel surgery for cancer or nonmalignant diseases like ulcerative colitis and regional enteritis, which are chronic diseases of unknown cause that inflame the intestines and produce diarrhea; and victims of automobile accidents and other serious injuries.

The impact has perhaps been greatest in the medical and surgical care of the very young and very old—because pediatric and geriatric patients are especially sensitive to small changes in electrolytes like potassium. Electrolyte balance is especially important in the drug therapy of older Americans. For those who take digitals, for example, losses of potassium can interact with the drug to bring on digitalis toxicity, which can be instantly fatal.

The new knowledge about chemical balances in fluids of the body is just as im-

portant in post-operative care. It is not just the techniques of the surgeon that has made modern surgery so successful. Perhaps even more important to recent surgical advances has been the post-operative fluid and electrolyte care that is essential to the recovery of patients from operations that seriously disturb the body's physiology. Often the success of the surgery depends largely on the doctor's ability to apply the results of automated electrolyte tests and to juggle the potassium levels so that the body's biochemistry is kept in its delicate state of balance.

Such surgical patients have benefited greatly from bedside application of basic metabolic research findings made from test tube and animal experiments, and NASA's Dr. Berry contends they could benefit further from space medicine research.

The Apollo flights also provided new evidence that the human body is one of the most adaptable of all organisms. Twenty-seven American spacecraft have blazed off the Cape Kennedy pads, launching men for more than 3521 hours of space flight. These 27 manned flights have carried 35 astronauts, some of whom have flown two or more times. Of the 59 American and Russian astronauts who have spent a total of more than a year and a half in space, none has suffered medical difficulties serious enough to prevent him from functioning.

Fifteen years ago, when man knew little about physiology in space, some scientists were predicting an almost endless list of medical catastrophes that might beset astronauts. Perhaps, it was speculated, their hearts would beat so fast on liftoff that the rapid rhythm would prove fatal. Or serious anemia would result from loss of too many red blood cells. Or weightlessness would cause kidney stones to form as calcium was leached from the bones, turning the skeleton to jelly. Or muscles might atrophy, or wither away.

None of these dire consequences resulted. Astronauts' hearts responded to the physiologic demands—the heartbeat of astronauts ranging from a high of 180 during liftoff to a remarkable low of only 28 beats a minute while they slept in space, compared to a "normal" heartbeat on earth in the 60s or 70s.

Cardiologists were also surprised to learn that astronauts' hearts shrank in space. The doctors still do not know if the smaller size results from loss of muscle fibers and cells, or loss of body fluids, chiefly water and potassium, which seems to be an inevitable consequence of space flight.

Needless to say, their bones did not break. Though they lost some calcium from their bones, kidney stones did not form. Some astronauts did suffer brief episodes of nausea and vomiting. Others had head colds, which are worse in space than on earth because in zero gravity mucus cannot drain, and an astronaut can damage his ears by blowing his nose too hard.

Just as the problem of potassium loss did not become apparent until after splashdown, so too the psychological problems faced by a few of the astronauts did not show up until after their missions were completed.

Remarkably, there seem to have been no psychological problems at all during the missions themselves. "We've been fortunate," Dr. Berry says, "because we have seen no serious psychological problems in anybody as a result of our actual flight experience—even including long periods of time when an astronaut was alone in the command module and spent a fair amount of time behind the moon, totally out of contact with anybody."

He attributes this result to the fact that "we started with a select group of people who had gone through all the stresses and strains of having been selected as a test pilot and who thereafter had been exposed to a lot of life-threatening situations as test pilots."

"Astronauts are human beings," Dr. Berry

says. "Everyone tends to think of them as supermen and they are not. They're just plain old common human beings subject to the same foibles the rest of us are."

Most astronauts appear to have adjusted to the sudden renown, the plaudits, the demands for public appearances that followed their flights.

But for some of them, none of the moon flight training prepared them for the post-splashdown psychological effects of becoming America's newest heroes. The most important of these seems to be a space-age version of the famous malaise that came over Alexander the Great, who, at the height of his conquests at age 29, complained—inaccurately, as it turned out—that he "had no more worlds to conquer."

Coming back from the moon precipitated such a downward psychological spiral for (then) Colonel Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin, Jr., who, with Neil Armstrong, was one of the first two human beings to set foot on another world. (Astronaut Aldrin is now Dr. Aldrin, having recently earned a Sc.D. degree in astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.) As recently as three years after his epic flight on Apollo II, in fact, Aldrin actually feared for his sanity.

In his Apollo days, Aldrin saw himself as others generally saw him: as a supremely self-confident super-achiever, an intense, disciplined harddriver who had almost never failed at anything important he tried to do.

By Aldrin's own account, that self-confidence evaporated in the post-flight letdown that is said to have afflicted several American astronauts. It is a phenomenon that some of the nation's 22 moon-venturers apparently were not prepared to confront.

Faced for the first time with a loss of purpose in life, plagued by fear of the risks he might face in any new and unaccustomed lifework, and suffering from an unexpected culture shock that made crowds and personal appearances an agony, Aldrin himself admits that he virtually ceased to function at times. He couldn't get organized and had to let others almost lead him through day-to-day tasks.

"It got to a point where deciding what suit to wear became an overwhelming decision," Aldrin, now a 42-year-old retired Air Force colonel who wears a lush, graying beard that fringes his rugged face like that of a 19th-century New England sea captain, said in a recent interview.

As he spoke, he slipped sangria at lunch in an intimate cafe on the outskirts of Los Angeles not far from Hidden Hills in the San Fernando Valley, where he now lives with his wife, three teenaged children and a menagerie of dogs, cats, chickens, a goat, and an Appaloosa mare. At Hidden Hills, Aldrin is attempting to put together a new life—and a new personality.

He has had to do it with the help of two periods of intensive psychotherapy, including a month in a military hospital, and he still sees a psychiatrist every two or three weeks or so.

A more relaxed Buzz Aldrin now says he is "back on the track, but still not with great confidence."

Aldrin describes his post-flight experiences as "an unanticipated, abrupt change in life style." Before Apollo II, his days had been governed by concise, precise, concrete objectives and his personal life was still under his own control. After Apollo II, there was no objective ahead, and Mr. Aldrin began to lose his grip on both his professional and personal life.

For a year or two, in between the personal appearances he found so burdensome, he looked around "for some little job in NASA I'd be happy with." But mostly, he sat in his office in Houston, answering mail, occasionally attending meetings, and wondering, in his words, "Gee, what'll I do today?"

"You get so dissatisfied that you get in

your car and drive down to Galveston and walk on the beach," he said, "but that doesn't help."

Eventually Aldrin was made commandant of the Air Force Test Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, California. There his downward spiral into anxious depression accelerated.

"I had been away from the Air Force for 10 years," he said, "and every job has its element of risk. Plus, I was extremely self-critical." This combination of insecurity and self-demand for perfection "started bringing on the problem that eventually put me in the hospital," Aldrin explained.

The problem was diagnosed as "moderate depression" by doctors at Wilford Hall, an Air Force hospital in San Antonio, where Aldrin, beginning in October 1971, underwent a one-month course of drug-aided psychotherapy. But he believes that the very act of seeking help on his own "went a long way" toward helping solve his emotional difficulties.

As part of his treatment, Mr. Aldrin had to examine his life as never before and ask of his Air Force career, "Is this what I want to do?" His answer was no. So he decided to retire from the Air Force, seek a life of less pressure, and explain his story so other Americans might benefit and learn from his experience.

But facing civilian life last July for the first time in 23 years brought on yet another, even more frightening, siege of depression. This time Mr. Aldrin feared that he might be in such a state for the rest of his life. But after two or three visits to a psychiatrist at the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Clinic, the depression lifted again.

Now, Mr. Aldrin believes, he has come through the worst and will be the better for it. He is his own boss. He can control the nature and level of his activities, can dabble in "little projects" here and there. He is gradually relaxing and writing a book *Return to Earth*, which is finished and is scheduled to be published this fall.

However, the nature of an Apollo astronaut's work has given these men a unique view of the world, altering their very consciousness, providing them with perceptions and perspectives that no other American will have—not for many years at the earliest. Dr. Berry comments:

"The total psychological impact of having gone through that experience is great. I don't think you can look at our world in the way that all these crewmen have—and we've been privileged to do that vicariously, too—and not have seen the world in an entirely different context than we do as we sit on earth's surface. That can't help but have some kind of psychological effect."

Two astronauts who reacted to the mystical nature of their flights are Captain Edgar D. Mitchell and Colonel James B. Irwin.

Mitchell said he is trying "to broaden the consciousness of people so that they can see planet earth from the perspective" he had of space. So he has moved toward the exploration of "inner space" by forming a Houston-based private company to promote scientific investigation of such psychic phenomena as extrasensory perception and mental telepathy.

Mitchell hopes that his enterprise ultimately will help unlock the secrets of "psychic energy" so that humans may communicate with one another in richer, more precise ways.

Irwin's experience was quite different. In his words, he went to the moon a practicing but not especially religious Baptist. The effects of moon flight turned him into an energetic Christian and inspired him to form the High Flight Foundation based in Colorado Springs, Colorado, under whose auspices he travels almost constantly, both in the United States and abroad, carrying two messages—that of science and that of the Gospel.

"I consider that it's God's plan that I had an opportunity to come back and tell people what a beautiful thing we have here on earth; to take care of it; and to try to live in brotherhood, the way Jesus Christ would want us to," Mr. Irwin said.

"Before the flight I was a very quiet, reserved guy," Irwin said. "Now I've changed. You can't shut me up. Now I have something to say."

Irwin believes that he and Mitchell are essentially on the same track. "Ed's going the scientific route," he said, "and when we meet, it'll be interesting." But he added: "I think that Ed's getting in deeper than man was meant to go. He's delving into powers that are really of Satan."

Religious interpretations aside, Colonel Irwin sums up the common experience of several astronauts: "We went to the moon as technicians—nuts and bolts men—and we returned as humanitarians."

After the moon voyagers returned, they were constantly put in the public eye so that their weaknesses, strengths, obsessions and

general humanity have emerged as never before. Their differing personalities have grappled in different ways with the transcendent experience of flying to the moon and its earthbound aftermath.

Brigadier General Thomas P. Stafford, who commanded the moon-orbital flight of Apollo 10 in May 1969 and is now deputy director of flight-crew operations at the Manned Spacecraft Center, described to a reporter one of the problems facing the returning astronauts this way:

"You can't let it go to your head. Today's headlines are tomorrow's fish wrappers. Unfortunately, some astronauts have not understood this. Because of one great incident in their lives, they think that anything they say takes on extra meaning."

"There is a tendency to get carried away with yourself," says Colonel David R. Scott, commander of the Apollo 15 lunar-landing mission in July 1971. "You've just got to try to keep your balance."

After their return to earth, Scott and his

crewmates (Colonel James Irwin and Major Alfred M. Worden) developed a trick for use when one of the three would "go off on a tangent" while speaking and start talking too long.

"One of us would pass an ashtray or glass of water over in front of the guy," Scott recalled with a chuckle. "That was the signal to shut up."

Perhaps it is this type of common sense that explains why Dr. Berry concludes:

"It's amazing that there haven't been even more psychological effects than have become evident."

But taken on balance, the experience of the space program has been more encouraging than otherwise in what it tells us about the flexibility and resourcefulness of man. That astronauts have been able to adjust so well to the almost completely alien environment of outer space surely ought to give us at least some hope that future explorations of both inner and outer space will give us more reason to rejoice than to despair.

SENATE—Thursday, July 12, 1973

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

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

Eternal Father, the source of all wisdom and goodness, we bow in Thy presence with the calm confidence that Thou dost never leave us nor forsake us. In a world so uncertain about many things, amid all outer commotions and collision of forces, keep us sure of Thee. Help us to live in obedience to the laws of Mount Sinai and Mount Calvary, assured that in faithfulness to the truth Thou hast revealed we will be led step by step to the completion of Thy kingdom on earth. Give us courage to seek the truth honestly and humbly to follow the divine light until the shadows of doubt and despair disappear and all men live in the light of Thy truth.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 11, 1973, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

CONGRESSIONAL AND SUPREME COURT PAGE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn

to the consideration of Calendar No. 288, S. 2067.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2067) relating to congressional and Supreme Court pages, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, at the top of page 3, strike out:

"(f) Subsection (b) of this section, as amended by section 2 of the Congressional and Supreme Court Page Act, is effective upon enactment of this Act. However, clause (1) of such subsection (b) shall not apply to any page appointed prior to the date of enactment of such Act as long as that page continues to serve as a page."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"(f) Subsection (b) of this section, as amended by section 2 of the Congressional and Supreme Court Page Act, is effective upon the date of enactment of such Act. However, clause (1) of such subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to the reappointment, on or after such date, of an individual serving as a page prior to such date."

On page 4, line 3, after the word "arrangement," insert "No such arrangement shall be entered into providing for the education of such pages with respect to any period commencing after June 30, 1975."; and, on page 5, line 20, after the word "upon," strike out "enactment," and insert "the date of enactment of this Act,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional and Supreme Court Page Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Part 9 of title IV of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C. 88b-1; 40 U.S.C. 184a) is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out the heading of such part and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"PART 9—CONGRESSIONAL AND SUPREME COURT PAGES".

(2) Section 491 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 is amended as follows:

(A) Strike out the section caption and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CONGRESSIONAL AND SUPREME COURT PAGES".

(B) Strike out subsections (a) and (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) An individual shall not be appointed as a page of the Senate or House of Repre-

sentatives unless he agrees that, in the absence of unforeseen circumstances preventing his service as a page after his appointment, he will continue to serve as a page for a period of not less than two months.

"(b) An individual shall not serve as a page of the Senate, the House of Representatives, or the Supreme Court of the United States—

"(1) before he has attained the age of eighteen years; or

"(2) except in the case of a chief page, telephone page, or riding page, during any session of Congress or October term of the Supreme Court, as the case may be, which begins after he has attained the age of twenty-one years."

(3) Strike subsection (f) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) Subsection (b) of this section, as amended by section 2 of the Congressional and Supreme Court Page Act, is effective upon the date of enactment of such Act. However, clause (1) of such subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to the reappointment, on or after such date, of an individual serving as a page prior to such date."

(4) Strike out section 492 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"EDUCATION OF PAGES PREVIOUSLY APPOINTED

"SEC. 492. (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, shall enter into an arrangement with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the education, in the public school system of the District, of pages of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Supreme Court of the United States continuing to serve as pages by reason of the second sentence of subsection (f) of section 491 of this Act, as amended by section 2 of the Congressional and Supreme Court Page Act. Such arrangement shall include provision for reimbursement to the District of Columbia for any additional expenses incurred by the public school system of the District in carrying out such arrangement. No such arrangement shall be entered into providing for the education of such pages with respect to any period commencing after June 30, 1975.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the District of Columbia in accordance with the arrangement referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section any such page may continue to elect to attend a private or parochial school of his own choice, except that such private or parochial