1 percent in the 6 months following the effective date of those increases.

We are all aware of the recession which occurred during 1969–71. As the chart shows, unemployment for both adults and teenagers increased during that period, as one would expect. There is no justification whatsoever for attributing this increase to the increases in minimum wages which went into effect for a very limited number of workers during this period. On the contrary, the record in the years prior to 1969 demonstrates that the minimum wage, by itself, has had no demonstrable adverse effect on either adult or youth unemployment.

Mr. DOMINICK. All I can say is that we do have the chart in the RECORD and the chart speaks for itself.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I wish to observe in connection with the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Ohio in discussing certification, that I believe certification is indeed a discouragement for those seeking employment. Certification generally tends to discourage people from engaging in certain activities. We have an example in connection with the guaranteed loan program in higher education where last year we required certification from the college to the bank that people are qualified for loans. It is reported by the banks that it caused a 40-percent reduction in the number of applications. So certification tends to discourage people rather than to encourage them to a particular activity. Certification in youth employment is an important factor that should be considered when we discuss this matter.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) tomorrow there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 a.m., with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 10 a.m.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

There will then be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m., with statements therein limited to 3 minutes each.

At 10:30 a.m. debate will resume on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT).

A rollcall vote will occur on the Dominick-Taft amendment at 12:30 p.m.

Other amendments will be called up during the afternoon. Rollcall votes can be expected to occur thereon.

If a slack period should occur during which no amendments are being offered to the minimum wage bill, the Senate may turn temporarily to the consideration of S. 440, the so-called war powers bill, for opening statements tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 6:27 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, July 18, 1973, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 17, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

David Olan Meeker, Jr., of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Floyd H. Hyde.

IN THE ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve Commissioned Officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593a and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. William McGilvery Buck, SSN, xxx-xx-xxxx.

Brig. Gen. Evan Albert Turnage, SSN xxx-... xxx-xx-x....

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ONE HUNDRED SCIENTIFIC-MINDED YOUTH STUDY IN NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP IN WEST VIRGINIA—VISIT CAPITOL AND HEAR JOHN NASSIKAS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during these summer months there are many groups of young people visiting the historic monuments and governmental centers of the Nation's Capital. I call attention to one such group which is both unique and representative of the Nation as a whole. Last week 100 young high school seniors at the National Youth Science Camp visited the Capitol, and attended a luncheon in the Senate Dirksen Building at which I was privileged to serve as host, as I have for 10 years.

This year the National Youth Science Camp is in its 11th year of operations in the hills of West Virginia. The camp originated in 1963 as part of the West Virginia centennial celebration, and was so enthusiastically received that the State has continued to support it. After 10 years of operation, the NYSC program of varied scientific and human relationships continues to challenge the 100 delegates. These delegates—two from each State selected on the basis of their scientific abilities and achievements—live for 3 weeks in a wilderness environment while probing life's marvels and mysteries through seminars with top scientific personnel.

The camp was founded with the idea of recognizing promising high school graduates in a distinct way. At the same time, the outdoor experience provides them with a greater awareness of their world and its dimensions. Problems that face the scientific community demand the attention of young minds. The NYSC is one means by which these developing minds can be exposed to some of the realities facing scientific disciplines, while at the same time providing them with a broad view of the opportunities which daily life provides.

These 100 young campers are housed at Camp Pocahontas, a former 4–H camp located near Durbin, in the beautiful Monongahela National Forest. Nearby is the National Radio Astronomy Center at Greenbank, where leading scientists are probing the secrets of the universe.

I said these 100 young men—unfortunately the available facilities cannot accommodate their female counterparts—are unique. Perhaps this is not wholly accurate, for in their wide range of activities, they mirror the intellectual and athletic interests of all American youth. Certainly their academic and leadership credentials—determined by school selection committees in each State—would impress any college recruiter.

Twenty-three of the students were finalists in National Merit Scholarship competition. Seventeen received commendations in the Westinghouse Science Talent Search. Seven are bound for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and five are headed for Harvard University.

They are a multitalented group, including an all-American quarterback who flies his own plane, a track star who builds lasers in his spare time, and a mathematical wizard who has developed a method of picking locks using modular arithmetic. Another placed first in the National Mathematics Tournament sponsored by the Mathematical Association of America 2 consecutive years, and won first place in the U.S.A. Mathematical Olympiad this year—a feat never before accomplished.

An example of the talents among these youths was the organization of an 18-member choir during the first 2 weeks of camping. Led by counselor Haywood D. McCallum, Jr., president of the 1969 NYSC class and a music major at Virginia State College, the choir entertained the luncheon audience with two near-professional selections, "America the Beautiful," and "Keep America Singing."

At last Wednesday's luncheon, 35 Senators came in person to meet or dine with their State delegates; many others with conflicting schedules conveyed personal messages or sent their aides. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, in a brief address to the NYSC delegates, challenged them to expand their technological interest—ranging from agronomy to zoology—to better serve mankind.

Federal Power Commission Chairman John N. Nassikas, the principal speaker, told the youths:

The challenge which the energy crisis poses for the nation's scientific community is awesome. Failure to meet it could result in a total, and in my view, regressive alteration of our national way of life.

Honored guests for the 10th annual NYSC luncheon included:

Dr. Sydney P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for Education; Dr. Edward P. Todd, Acting Assistant Director for Research of the National Science Foundation; Robert W. Fri, Acting Administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency; former U.S. Senator John Sherman Cooper; and national newspaper columnist Holmes Alexander. Prof. Joseph M. Hutchison, Jr., director of NYSC, and Roderick Wilson, assistant director, represented the delegates at the head table. The Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, Senate Chaplain, gave the benediction.

Mr. President, in order that each Senator may know the two outstanding young men who represent their State at the National Youth Science Camp, I am listing their names and home States, in alphabetical order. I also will ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD excerpts from the prepared remarks by FPC Chairman Nassikas, who reminded the young people that there must be a trade-off between the Nation's economy and ecology. But, he concluded, in the long view, any economic penalties we must pay today will provide much greater benefits to future generations.

The NYSC delegates are:

William Cotter, Alabama; Stuart F. Bockman and Reed Copsey, Alaska; Richard Crowell and Stanley Reynolds, Arizona; William T. Pennington and Terald Edwin Smith, Arkansas; Shawn Lee Morgan and Kurt Arthur Wood, California; Gregory Scott Bell and William N. Shaffner, Colorado; Martin Louis Marchese and Ronald A. Soltz, Connecticut; James Bernard Huffman and William Leo Holstein, Delaware; William Shannon Patton and Mark C. Schendel, Florida; Gilbert Louis Mobley and Jack B. Straus, Georgia; Wayne Mitsuo Fukunaga and John Carl Hamilton, Hawaii; Craig Conrad Alford and Edwin D. Dykes, Idaho; Joel Marc Weinfeld and Daniel Hayes, Illinois; Larry Dale Gatewood and Jeffrey Kent Marchal, Indiana; Donald Kirchner and Gordon Waite, Iowa;

James Joseph Hamilton, Jr., and Carl Richard Anderson, Kansas; David M. Maddy and Charles O. Lewis, Kentucky; Christopher Albert Fields and Lester Ernst Hurrelbrink III, Louisiana; Peter C. Bals and Alexey Vladimir Orlovsky, Maine; William James Adkins III and William Henry Nicholson, Maryland; Stephen Robert Cloutier and Todd M. Stolzbert, Massachusetts; George A. Rozanski and Peter M. Schemm, Michigan; Leroy A. Andresen and Steven Theodore Engen, Minnesota; Michael Harry Brown and Jerome A. Gilbert, Mississippi; Jeffrey B. Rubins and Douglas Bryan Schwartz, Missouri; Kip Anthony Kramer and John Mallan Lynn, Montana; Stephen Seberger and Matthew Travers, Nebraska; Michael Charles Lasage and Jim Snyder, Nevada;

Jonathan Wayne Fraser and David Martin Wilterdink, New Hampshire; Kurt Reynolds Johmann and Anthony V. Roubik, New Jersey; George Melvin Foglesong, Jr., and David Doyle Welter, New Mexico; Sanford Rose Climan and Sheldon H. Katz, New York; John Donald Hiatt, Jr., and Raleigh Bradford Perry, Jr., North Carolina; Reginald Walter Geck and Frederick Mitzel, North Dakota; Clifford Lau and William Steers, Ohio; Vernon Leroy Gowdy III and Kevin Mitchell Vaughn, Oklahoma; Roderick Wells Lewis and George Martin Sampson, Oregon; Anthony Grace and Joseph Charles Kaczmarek, Pennsylvania; Michael I. Grant and Michael Jeffrey Kornstein, Rhode Island; William Joseph Hollins II and Patrick Graham Jobe, South Carolina; Mark James Hildman and Samuel J. Simons, South Dakota; William Thomas Mueller and Ricky Lynn Smith, Tennessee; Richard Louis Johnson and Keith Sebastian Pickens, Texas; Mark A. Martin and Kraig Patterson, Utah; George Safford Putnam and Norman Charles Smith, Vermont; William Henry Graybeal and Warren Boyd Jessee, Jr., Virginia; Gordon H. Cougdon and George T. Hashisaki, Washington; David R. Blum and Eugene Kitts, West Virginia; Gary B. Beecham and John Kenneth Riege, Wisconsin; and James Scott McNiven, Jr., and Norman R. Schaible, Wyoming.

These names are added to the 1,000 young men—20 from each State, who form this unique fraternity of interests and scientific talents. From this list, in the years ahead, will come highly capable scientists and engineers who will form the front ranks of our technological society. Accompanying these young men to Washington for visits to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were 34 members of the NYSC staff, including many former campers who return year after year to assist in the project.

In addition to Director Hutchison, Rod Wilson and Haywood McCallum, they are:

William J. Hilton, Jr.; Charles R. Carlson; Don Strader; James C. Shuman; Sidney Barker; Stacy L. Groscup; Richard Lemuth; Jerry Johnson; Cecil Pauley; David Brookman; Kip Dopp; James Michael Crum; Samuel D. Hensley; Michael Gregory Luke; David F. Smith; James O'Boyle; Cliff Petterson; Norman S. Strouse; H. Gehrig Coleman; Larry Hill; Don Ristroph; Jill Cochran; Michael Maxon; Larry Eugene Morse; John Stewart; Victoria Keith; Linda Jones Acord; Susan Jo McClinchie; and Pauline Shaver. West Virginia archeologist Bette J. Boyles and Prof. Violet Phillips, resident botanist, accompanied the staff.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech by FPC Chairman Nassikas be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO COPE WITH THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By John N. Nassikas)

I welcome this opportunity to explore with you today some of the realities of our developing energy crisis, since the paths that many of you will follow may be specifically directed toward its resolution. It is now quite evident that only through scientific research and development can our future needs for adequate energy resources be provided. I will not attempt a technical presentation of energy research requirements, as unlike yourselves, I am not a scientist but a lawyer. Rather, I should like to examine the broader aspects of the energy problem, both in terms of its immediacy and its impact.

The achievement of our national economic, social and environmental objectives require an ever increasing supply of energy.

Our goals of full employment and a high material standard of living for all Americans depend for their realization upon the continued growth and health of our industrialized economy. Such economic dynamism in turn is dependent upon secure, abundant and economical sources of energy. At the same time, our national interest requires a simultaneous growth in pollution control technology to insure that an increase in material benefits for our people is not accompanied by degradation of the natural environment.

However, the technology for recycling, secondary and tertiary treatment of water wastes, maintenance of air quality standards, and advance techniques of land restoration will likewise require substantial energy inputs. By way of illustration, it is estimated that with present technology, 18 percent more energy will be needed to meet 1975 automobile emission standards. In order to control thermal pollution and remove particulates and sulphur oxides, it is estimated that power plants will require 7 percent more energy.

Absent radical and fundamental societal changes, past trends indicate even higher levels of energy consumption than is presently the case. It is therefore critical that we identify and correct the conditions which have resulted in the present energy supply shortages.

The dimensions of the energy crisis may be better appreciated by reference to current estimates of the extent of our remaining domestic energy resources:

Potentially recoverable petroleum resources would be adequate to meet future demand growing at the rate of 3 percent yearly for 44 years;

Recoverable shale oil reserves at present demand levels to implement oil supplies for about 35 years after depletion of present potentially recoverable oil reserves;

Potentially recoverable gas resources would be adequate to meet future demand growing at the rate of 1.4 percent yearly for 65 years;

Identified coal resources would be equivalent to 300 years' supply at a growth rate of demand of 2.4 percent yearly;

Recoverable uranium resources at $30 per pound would be adequate to meet the projected levels of nuclear generation under present technology (without the breeder reactor) growing at the rate of 18 percent yearly for 32 years.

From these estimates, it would appear that substantial energy reserves remain. In absolute terms this is true, but in practical terms of energy that is actually deliverable to consumers, very real domestic shortages exist with respect to natural gas, petroleum, and possibly uranium.

As only partial recovery of these resources may be possible because of economic and environmental limitations, the supply of deliverable, usable, energy may be significantly less than the order of magnitude represented by these estimates.

* * * * *

At this point, I would like to turn to some suggested initiatives for resolving the energy crisis and the issues raised if those initiatives are in fact pursued.

If there may be said to be one guiding policy objective which has near unanimous support among those trying to alleviate the energy crisis, it is the need for energy self-sufficiency. Continued and increasing reliance on foreign energy resources is wholly unsatisfactory, whether in terms of supply dependability, national security or balance of payments disequilibrium, although for the short-term such reliance on imports appears unavoidable.

The President's Energy Message of April 18, 1973, outlines proposals ultimately directed at the restoration of a self-supporting national energy resource base. Among these are a deregulation of the price of natural gas at the wellhead, immediate construction of the Alaska pipeline, an expanded offshore leasing program, a restructuring of the Oil Import Program, deepwater port construction to facilitate the handling of petroleum supertankers, and a program to expedite site selection and construction of electric power facilities. The President's Energy Message of June 29, 1973, urged a commitment by all sectors of society to an energy conservation ethic and called for a major reorganization and expanding of our energy research and development efforts.

In my view, these proposals require immediate implementation. Voluntary action by industry and private individuals to conserve energy is particularly important, for dramatic results can be achieved with only minimal alterations in our everyday energy consumption patterns. For example, as noted by the President, a potential 2 percent fuel savings nationwide is possible from a 10 mph highway speed reduction by all drivers. By raising thermostat settings on air conditioners by four degrees, the amount of energy now consumed for air conditioning purposes could be reduced by 15 to 20 percent. Likewise, home heating energy requirements could be reduced by up to 10 percent with a lowering of home heating temperatures by five degrees.

The President has also ordered a government-wide review of energy consumption by Federal departments and agencies in an effort to achieve an anticipated 7 percent government energy consumption reduction over the next 12 months, and has urged State and local governments to undertake similar programs. In addition, the Secretary of Transportation is asking the air transport industry to consider immediate reductions in flight frequencies and aircraft cruising speeds. An aircraft speed reduction of 3 percent adds 12 minutes to a transcontinental flight, but could save 200 million gallons of jet fuel yearly. Likewise, reducing flight frequencies to raise national average aircraft load factors from 52 percent to 60 percent could save as much as 1.3 billion gallons of jet fuel yearly.

The announcement of a greatly expanded energy research and development program in the June 29 Energy Message, as recommended by Senator Randolph and Senator Jackson, is a recognition by the President that solution of our energy problems requires a massive scientific effort. In raising his sights to accord with Senator Randolph's view, the President has proposed an additional $100 million for priority energy R&D projects over and above the $25 million already requested in the fiscal 1975 budget, in addition to an overall proposal of $10 billion for energy R&D for the next five years beginning in 1975.

Corresponding to this funding increase, the President has also proposed to consolidate current Federal energy research and development efforts in a single body, the Energy Research and Development Administration. The ERDA would build upon the scientific and technical base of the Atomic Energy Commission, using the AEC's technical management and laboratory resources, while adding the fossil-fuel research and development operations of the Department of Interior.

Approval of these proposals by Congress will contribute immeasurably to the attainment of the following basic objectives of our energy research and development activity.

An initial goal of our energy R&D program should be to improve our technological capacity for full development of our domestic resource base, consistent with the preservation of environmental integrity. For example, we need to expand and accelerate the projects now underway for utilization of our abundant coal resources. These include, among others, gasification of coal to produce natural gas, refinement of coal to produce low sulfur content derivative fuels, coal liquefaction, strip mining reclamation technology, and improved stack gas desulfurization and cleaning techniques associated with coal consumption.

The accessibility problems created by the search for oil and gas in deep water and arctic environments must be addressed, in addition to the development of an adequate pipeline technology for delivering the oil and gas produced in these remote areas. Likewise, an environmentally acceptable extraction method must be devised to take advantage of our potentially enormous shale oil reserves.

A second major R&D goal should be to improve the conversion efficiency of our primary energy resources, essentially a problem of energy conservation. The nuclear breeder reactor program now underway will result in a 40-fold increase in the energy output of uranium. Further, research is needed in the area of superconducting power transmission, a process for moving large blocks of electrical power at near absolute zero temperatures and resulting in a virtual elimination of resistance to the flow of electricity. Generating technology demands immediate attention to reduce the present 70 percent loss in energy efficiency through conversion to electricity by fossil-fuel steam electric plants.

Above all, there must be a concerted R&D effort to provide new sources of energy for the use of future generations. A breakthrough at least equivalent to the discovery of nuclear energy is essential. The potential of exotic energy sources should be fully explored, in line with the work now being done to harness solar and geothermal energy.

In addition, expanded research in fuel cell technology, fusion, and magnetohydrodynamics may afford the basis for the power systems of the 21st century.

The challenge which the energy crisis poses for the nation's scientific community is awesome. Failure to meet it could result in a total, and in my view, regressive alteration in our national way of life.

I would hope today to impress upon you, as the most able young scientists in America, the need for the commitment of your talents to this critical enterprise.

LONG ISLAND'S FIRST LADY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention the unceasing efforts expended by Gertrude Merinoff in behalf of the Association for the Help of Retarded Children. Mrs. Merinoff was recently chosen as the recipient of the 13th annual Humanitarian Award of the Nassau County chapter of AHRC.

Mrs. Merinoff and her late husband, Charles, gave generously of themselves to enable AHRC to reach ever-increasing numbers of young children who might otherwise be forced to live their lives in uncaring and inadequate institutions.

The Charles and Gertrude Merinoff Center will be built in Brookville to commemorate their contributions. It is designed to enable retarded children to transfer from specialized educational facilities into classroom situations with normal children. The center will offer classroom services for young, preschool, retarded youngsters. A description of the center and its plans follows these remarks.

Mrs. Merinoff was honored for her dedicated service and oustanding generosity on behalf of retarded children at the 20th annual Rose Ball for the Benefit of Retarded Children on June 16 at the New York Hilton. She was presented with a statue entitled, "Love," bearing this inscription:

She reached out to our children and encircled them with the warmth of her heart. With love and gratitude, Nassau County Chapter, New York State Association for Retarded Children.

Further praise is due Helen Kaplan, executive director of the Nassau County chapter. Mrs. Kaplan, a Baldwin resident, was one of the founders of the AHRC, and has been with the Nassau County chapter for almost 25 years, spending over 10 years as executive director. Without her continuing efforts and enthusiasm, the AHRC in Nassau would not be the vital organization it is today.

My congratulations to AHRC for a well-chosen honoree, to Helen Kaplan, and to Ruth Drucker and Herman Merinoff, Gertrude and Charles Merinoff's children.

The description follows:

THE CHARLES AND GERTRUDE MERINOFF CENTER

Situated on the 18 acres of the Educational Center of the Association for the Help of Retarded Children in Brookville, Long Island, the Charles and Gertrude Merinoff Center will offer classroom services primarily for young, pre-school retarded children. After about two years at the Center, most of the children will then be ready to transfer to special classes in the public schools.

The professionally staffed, well equipped building will contain eight classrooms accommodating 75 children on a regular 5 day basis throughout the school year. At other times it will be available to enhance and supplement other AHRC programs already in operation such as the summer camp program now providing recreation and training to 400 youngsters each summer.

In addition, the Center will include a well-equipped dental clinic . . . a satellite of the Dentistry Department of Long Island Jewish Hospital. All dental services which can be performed without general anesthesia will be available to any retarded child, or adult, in need of clinic services in Nassau County. Whereas some of the dental personnel will be employed by AHRC, there will be additional voluntary dental service through the hospital.

Included in the plans of the approximately 15 thousand square foot building is a speech and hearing center. It will be the first of its kind in Nassau County since it will be designed to focus only on the speech and hearing needs of the marginal to profoundly mentally retarded population. The extended space will give us the opportunity to design a language environment more conducive to speech as well as audiological assessment. Our current affiliations with local universities may also be extended as a result of the new center which will result in our ability to service still more children.

An all-purpose playroom, with specially designed equipment for the pre-school age group is a feature of the new building. In addition to school offices, a conference room/lecture hall will serve the dual purpose of a lecture room for the great number of visitors who come to AHRC to learn the content of our program, as well as a conference room for staff.

TAKING STOCK

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., published an editorial on Wednesday, July 4, 1973, which is worthy of note.

This editorial, entitled "Taking Stock," presents some serious thoughts we all should consider. It calls upon the Members of Congress and all Americans to restore the spirit of 1776 to this great Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extension of Remarks at the conclusion of my comments.

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

TAKING STOCK

No time is more appropriate for a Nation to take stock of itself than on its birthday—in the case of the United States, July 4.

On this Independence Day, few Americans can fail to be disturbed, as they take stock of our strengths and weaknesses, by the multiplicity of the latter.

We are, as a Nation, fascinated by a performance in the Senate which centers around a parade of unsupported statements, insinuations and hearsay testimony that would never be admitted as evidence in a court of law, and we are in the process of forming our attitudes on the basis of this Roman holiday. Every bit of real evidence, down to the final crossed "t" and dotted "i," ought to be elicited—but in accordance with sound judicial procedure.

We are degraded by the fact that, in some manner, a President of the United States could have become surrounded by a group of assistants to whom honor apparently was an unknown word. The urgent question is, "Why? And how can such a situation be prevented from happening again in either a Republican or Democratic administration?"

We are shamed by Senate action which has forced the President of the United States to agree to remove, within less than two months, any possibility that we might reinforce the ceasefire which so many thousands of our men died to achieve. If this is followed by rapid conquest of the anti-Communist peoples of Southeast Asia, the blood of Americans and Asians alike will be on the hands of elected senators and representatives who are not worthy successors of George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and all the others who put liberty above personal security.

We are tormented by an unnatural economy which has had to be twisted into a socialistic type of control, and—even with that—is malfunctioning to the extent that food shortages threaten. Freedom, forced to retreat in many parts of the world, has disappeared from our economy for the time being when poultry growers as a result of inept government action feel impelled to slaughter hundreds of thousands of baby chicks in the face of meat shortages.

Our school funds are eaten up by expensive, time-consuming, dangerous and frustrating busing while our children do without needed teachers who could remedy shortcomings in learning.

We spend ever-larger amounts of money for poverty projects, only to see the relief rolls steadily expand.

Moral standards are thrown in the trash can as millions wallow in pornography—literary and cinematic—and in the sort of life that such filth reflects, and then wonder sadly why their every action seems to lead to frustration and despair.

Is this the sort of society that the men of 1776 died to establish?

Isn't it about time the Spirit of 1776 was restored again by latter-day Patrick Henrys, Thomas Paines and John Peter Zengers?

If, as historian Arnold Toynbee has said, history is the record of challenge and response, isn't it high time that the challenge of what we see in a frank and candid stock-taking today is followed by the kind of response that brought us the Declaration of Independence on this day in 1776?

REINTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL OIL RECYCLING ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with 30 of my colleagues in reintroducing the National Oil Recycling Act of 1973. In this period of energy shortages and environmental concern, the problem of waste oil stands as an area where positive Federal action is not only possible but also vitally needed.

The extent of the waste oil problem is staggering. Industry produced roughly 330 million gallons of waste oil in 1971. The automobile contributed close to another 700 million gallons. All of this used oil—over 1 billion gallons—can be recycled to produce a useful resource for our Nation's economy. Unfortunately, only a fraction of our total oil waste is now reused. Most of our used oil is disposed of in ways which threaten the quality of our environment—it is spread on roads to control dust, burned, or simply dumped into land fills, waterways, or sewers.

Used oils pose a significant environmental threat because of their chemical characteristics. Additive packages, introduced into new oil by producers interested in improving the performance of their product, increase the chemical stability of the oil. When this oil is finally discarded, these synthetic compounds retard the natural processes which work to decompose the oil.

Additionally, waste oil contains toxic materials which makes the careless disposal of waste oil even more worrisome. Zinc, lead, barium, phosphorus, boron, and copper are among the elements which find their way into our air and water through the vehicle of used oil.

Beyond the tremendous pollution threat that the improper disposal of waste oil poses, we are also unnecessarily wasting an available energy source in a time of acute energy shortage. The technology exists to refine this oil into a satisfactory fuel. In fact, a corporation under contract with EPA has demonstrated that a "clean" fuel oil can be produced from waste oil.

In view of the potential resource of waste oil and the hazardous alternative of careless disposal, it is distressing that until very recently the Federal Government has done little to promote the recycling of used oil. Instead, an ill-conceived patchwork of tax provisions and uninformed rulings by the Federal Trade Commission have created a series of unnecessary barriers to a vigorous program of waste oil recovery. The legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today removes some of these inequities and makes a positive first step to the development of a national strategy for using our tremendous volumes of waste oil.

In section 4 of the bill, a coherent tax policy to recycled and new oil is formulated. Under present law undue tax discriminations are placed on the rerefiner. These discriminations are directly responsible for the drop in domestic rerefiners from 150 in 1965 to 48 today.

The second key feature of this bill mandates that all rerefined oil be labeled "recycled oil." In addition, all automotive and industrial oil, whether new or recycled, must be sold in containers which bear the inscription:

It is in the national interest to recycle this product after use.

Under present rulings of the Federal Trade Commission, all recycled oil must be labeled, "previously used." This requirement represents another unnecessary discrimination for the rerefiner trying to market his product.

Beyond these two provisions, the National Oil Recycling Act makes a positive step toward an activist waste oil recovery policy. The problem of recycling oil is essentially twofold. First, there is the need to establish an effective program for collecting, storing, and reprocessing used oil. Second, there is the problem of the growing number of individuals who handle waste oil—the "do-it-yourself" oil changer. Recent data indicates that as much as 30 percent of automotive waste oil is disposed of directly by individuals.

An effective national policy must balance incentive with regulation. This legislation confronts the twofold problem with a comprehensive response:

All automobile oil sold to the consumer for self-service shall be sold in resealable containers to facilitate recycling. A 10-cent deposit will be offered on each container.

Any person selling automobile oil shall maintain collection facilities for waste oil.

Users of more than 100 gallons of industrial oil will be required to keep complete records of the fate of the oil they use.

In addition, this legislation authorizes $25 million to be available to the States to encourage the recovery of waste oil. It is on the State level—in Massachusetts, Maryland, Wisconsin, and Hawaii—that the most innovative work has been done to promote recycling practices. In addition, a number of local governments—such as Schenectady, N.Y.—have taken significant steps in this area.

This legislation also authorizes moneys for the improvement of technologies of recycling. More extensive research is needed to insure that the full resource potential of waste oil can be exploited.

Mr. Speaker, the National Oil Recycling Act makes a significant contribution to the solution of the problem of waste oil. It is my hope that this legislation will help mold a new national ethic of economy and thrift in the use of our country's irreplaceable resources.

WESTERN EUROPE'S DRIFT TOWARD NEUTRALISM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the soft words which are being heard from the Soviet Union at the present time should not blind us to the reality of the real goals inherent in their current approach.

The Soviet Union seeks to disarm the West, and particularly Western Europe, and it has decided that the best way to implement such a policy is to cause the leadership and people of Western Europe and the United States to believe that communism is no longer a threat, and no longer is pursuing a policy of world domination.

Writing in The World Today, Malcolm Mackintosh points out that:

The Soviet leaders hope that, by skillful and patient tactics over a long period, they and their successors could influence West European politics. Even in the short term an atmosphere might be fostered in which NATO found it difficult to maintain its military strength; differences within the Western alliance might be exploited; and an attempt made to inhibit the enlarged EEC from moving forward toward political integration.

Mr. Mackintosh cautions that:

However remote it may seem, one should not lose sight of the kind of Europe which the present Soviet leaders would like to see: an Eastern Europe firmly under Soviet domination, its political systems and frontiers unchallenged by the West; a Western Europe divided both politically and economically, without binding military ties or defense links to the United States; each country with minimum forces deployed only on its own territory, and, hopefully persuaded of the need to make its own bilateral deal with the Soviet Union on foreign policy issues.

The signs of European lack of willingness to defend against Soviet incursions are mounting. A report drawn up by a team of crisis-studies specialists at Munich University claims that secondary and high school students in West Germany are increasingly rejecting the idea of compulsory military service and that the teachers' union is waging a campaign against military service. The report indicated that educated youth in general does not feel threatened by any outside power, ignores the power of potential enemies, and even rejects information dealing with the necessity of protecting peace. Similar reports have come from France, Belgium, Holland, and other NATO countries.

Recently, NATO released an intelligence study of Soviet military strength in Eastern Europe, showing that Warsaw Pact armies had deployed 6,000 additional tanks—to increase their advantage 4 to 1—and the number of Russian aircraft poised against Western Europe is up 50 percent.

Discussing this news, Arnaud de Borchgrave, writing in Newsweek, notes that—

On the Belgium Radio news . . . these sensational disclosures were buried after a long story about a truck spilling a load of milk . . . when NATO Foreign Ministers gathered in Copenhagen . . . they faced a twofold threat: a Soviet buildup that cannot be ignored, and a public that increasingly doesn't give a damn.

Mr. De Borchgrave writes that—

Western Europe is sliding toward neutralism. And in off-the-record talks in six capitals, I was told by key foreign and defense policy planners that they are powerless to reverse the drift . . . the West European inclination to let down its guard has been encouraged by the mistaken notion . . . that detente-minded doves in the U.S.S.R. have won a Kremlin showdown.

The situation facing us is one in which the Western nations are doing precisely the things the Communist leadership wants them to do, and in the process are endangering the freedom of their peoples and the security of their countries. I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "Western Europe's Drift Toward Neutralism," by Arnaud de Borchgrave in the June 25, 1973 issue of Newsweek, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

WESTERN EUROPE'S DRIFT TOWARD NEUTRALISM

(By Arnaud de Borchgrave)

Two weeks ago, NATO released an intelligence study of Soviet military strength in Eastern Europe—and the details were startling. In the past five years, Warsaw Pact armies have deployed 6,000 additional tanks (to increase their advantage to 4 to 1), and the number of Russian aircraft poised against Western Europe is up 50 per cent. But on the Belgium Radio news that night, these sensational disclosures were buried after a long story about a truck spilling a load of milk. Then, when NATO Foreign Ministers gathered in Copenhagen last week for their spring meeting, they faced a twofold threat: a Soviet buildup that cannot be ignored, and a public that increasingly doesn't give a damn.

Indeed, Western Europe's attitude toward the Soviet Union can be paraphrased as: "Don't bother us with news that disturbs our vision of a new era in which defense is obsolete." Under the magic spell of "pan-European vistas," Western Europe is sliding toward neutralism. And in off-the-record talks in six capitals, I was told by key foreign and defense policy planners that they are powerless to reverse the drift. The press recently hailed as a Western "victory" at Helsinki the Russians' agreement on a European-security-conference agenda that included some noncommittal verbiage about "freer circulation of people, ideas and information." But much more significant than this victory was the deadlock in Vienna, where the Russians have dragged their feet on agreeing to a date for the start of talks on mutual and balanced force reductions. By procrastinating in Vienna but appearing reasonable in Helsinki, Moscow made sure that Western Europe would continue what amounts to unilateral withdrawal.

The West European inclination to let down its guard has been encouraged by the mistaken notion—spread by Soviet diplomats on the cocktail circuit—that detente-minded doves in the U.S.S.R. have won a Kremlin showdown against expansion-minded hawks. Only a few experts realize or care that Soviet party chief Leonid Brezhnev won his arguments for a "new look" foreign policy by convincing his colleagues that it would be the most effective way to break up NATO and neutralize Western Europe. While Moscow has made an important shift in tactics, policy planners say the goals the Kremlin has pursued since the early 1950s are unchanged.

HIT PARADE

For practical purposes, Moscow has achieved two of its four main geopolitical objectives: conventional military superiority in Europe over the U.S. and its allies, and recognition of Moscow's hold on Eastern Europe. Next on the Kremlin hit parade is the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Europe and the collapse of NATO. This, in the Kremlin scenario, is to come about as a result of internal pressures in the United States and growing European doubts about American reliability. Despite Secretary of State William Rogers' effort to reassure America's allies last week, many openly voiced fears of a "new Yalta"—a Nixon-Brezhnev deal behind NATO's back on troop cuts— which would leave Europe in the lurch. The fourth Kremlin goal—to put the productive capacity of the West to work for the Soviet Union—is also very much on track. An analysis of Brezhnev's recent visist to West Germany shows that the Russians certainly got the better of the economic bargain.

West German Chancellor Willy Brandt's preoccupation with Ostpolitik and the strengthening of Germany's economic ties with Russia, moreover, will delay and hinder the consolidation of the West European community. But the biggest obstacle to real European union remains France—whose concept of a united Europe is Paris thumbing its nose at the United States. What other European officials are saying about the French isn't fit to print in a family magazine. So in studied disunity, West European nations go on spending $28 billion a year on independent conventional forces that have little if any credibility. Budget and personnel problems grow more serious by the month. Denmark cuts back its armed forces and postpones modernization. Belgium further reduces compulsory military service, and West Germany's Second Army Corps drops to 42 per cent of combat strength.

The real problem for Mr. Nixon and the Europeans is that as long as Western Europe does not exist as a strong entity that can stand up to the Soviet Union, there is no substitute for American power. U.S. disengagement from Europe would be an open invitation to Russia to become the military supervisory power on the Continent—an intolerable shift in the world balance of power. But for the United States to continue playing its defensive role, the Europeans—with monetary reserves twice the size of America's—will have to contribute more. Despite vehement disclaimers from Paris, international monetary reform, the Nixon round of trade negotiations and the U.S. presence in Europe are inextricably linked.

Two months ago, the Nixon Administration asked Europe what sort of relationship it wanted with the United States over the next decade. Not only has there been no concerted European answer; unreconstructed Gaullists even objected to any discussion of the question. But in Copenhagen last week, France agreed to let NATO at least think about a new "conceptual framework" for the alliance. The one they come up with had better be good. For unless the Atlantic concept is revived and strengthened—based on today's realities and with the understanding and support of the people—protectionist, isolationist and neutralist forces will scuttle what's left of the partnership.

CONTINUATION OF A GOOD ALLIANCE WITHIN NATO

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "NATO a Good Alliance, Must Be Kept Intact," appeared in the Friday, July 6, 1973, issue of the Aiken Standard newspaper in Aiken, S.C.

This editorial drives home the importance of maintaining a credible deterrence in NATO and the need for solidarity among all the NATO partners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks at the conclusion of my comments.

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

NATO A GOOD ALLIANCE, MUST BE KEPT INTACT

Foreign Minister Michel Jobert of France, whose country is often the maverick among the 15 nations making up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, managed to give an upbeat tone to his parting remarks at the recent NATO ministers conference in Copenhagen. "We have a good alliance—let's keep it!" he declared.

NATO indeed is a good alliance and it must be kept. The French depend on it as much as any Europeans. The question Mr. Jobert left dangling was whether France and other Western European nations are prepared to make the changes in their policies toward NATO—and in some cases toward each other—which are necessary to keep the alliance strong.

Mr. Jobert remained aloof when other ministers at Copenhagen acknowledged that their nations may have to dig deeper into their own pockets to help defray the $1.5 billion annual cost of maintaining 300,000 U.S. troops in Europe—the backbone of NATO. Secretary of State William Rogers apparently convinced most if not all of the ministers that our troop commitment is in trouble in Congress, both as an item in a tight defense budget and as a drain of dollars overseas.

That issue is an old one, however, and our NATO partners are simply tardy in attending to it. What should concern the ministers as much are strains which current political and economic problems are placing on the Atlantic Alliance, and the abiding need for review of its underlying principles in a "new Atlantic Charter."

Most countries of Western Europe are wrestling with inflation problems worse than our own. Both Italy and Denmark are in the midst of governmental crises. Greece has been wrenched by the dethronement of its exiled king and the beginning of what could be a perilous transition back toward democratic government. Great Britain and Iceland are locked in a "cod war" over fishing rights, and Iceland is threatening to expel NATO from the Keflavik base used to monitor Soviet maritime traffic in the North Atlantic.

Meanwhile, a new status quo is emerging in Central Europe. The new pacts between West and East Germany, and their forthcoming admission to the United Nations as separate states, cannot be ignored for their impact on the Atlantic Community. Like it or not, NATO faces the fact that much of the diplomatic script in Europe is being written by the independent-minded West German Chancellor Willy Brandt.

Secretary of State William Rogers has assured our NATO partners that the summit meeting between President Nixon and Soviet Chairman Leonid Brezhnev will bring them no unpleasant surprises about America's commitment to European defense. The NATO ministers have assured Mr. Rogers they understand the need for solidarity in the Western approach to the European Security Conference in Helsinki and the force reduction talks between NATO and the Warsaw Pact in Vienna.

These assurances would be far more comforting if the nations which must back them up were exhibiting more of the community of interest and dedication to common goals that brought NATO into being in the first place.

"DELTA QUEEN"

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5649, the bill to extend until November 1, 1978, the existing exemption of the steamboat *Delta Queen*, is scheduled for consideration today, Tuesday, July 17. Recently I ran across an article in the Christian Science Monitor which should be of interest to my colleagues.

The article points to an important aspect of the *Delta Queen* not mentioned in the bill—its educational aspect. The floating seminars for young people are certainly "an intimation of the boat's potential as an on-moving educational resource," bringing young people together to exchange ideas. The *Delta Queen* stands for much more than nostalgia. I support H.R. 5649 so that the last paddlewheeler can continue to be a source of education as well as history for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following for the review of my colleagues:

SAVING THE LAST PADDLEWHEELER

(By William Marlin)

Somewhere up the darkened Mississippi from the New Orleans levee, paddlewheeler boatmen would drop a line and shout, "Mark Twain!" Hearing it, a captain would adjust course toward more dependable depths. A hand named Samuel Clemens would adjust his toward literary greatness. And an expansive era of American history would take soundings of its own.

Plying out of that period, and into our own, only one paddlewheeler remains—the 285-ft. Delta Queen. To the chagrin of many who relish a revival of leisure-time river traffic, she may be scuttled if the National Trust for Historic Preservation and allied groups do not get their way in Congress.

The Mississippi is federal water, which means the Delta Queen comes under the safety at sea law—the measures of which her owners, the Greene Line steamers, have successfully met.

But even with safety improvements, the existing congressional exemption from the law will run out on Nov. 1, and the boat's backers are seeking a five-year extension.

Fortunately, the extension may "float," so to speak. But the question of an extension, however much it is to be prized, may be detracting attention from the central issue. This is the Delta Queen's long-term survival as a roving ambassador of American history, tying up at various cities and towns along the nation's major river system.

Last spring, for example, members of the national trust used the Delta Queen for a week-long cruise which included educational programs for 25 young people between 9 and 16. Just as important as the floating seminars and discussions, however, were the meetings which occurred on the levees, or on visits to various landlocked landmarks enroute. That kind of elbow-rubbing between people, and between the present and past, came through as cheerfully as the Delta Queen's calliope—an intimation of the boat's potential as an on-moving educational resource.

There are a number of pending bills which would prevent her hitting bottom next November. H.R. 5649 was introduced last March by Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (D) of Missouri, who is chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Mrs. Sullivan's measure would exempt the Delta Queen until Nov. 1, 1978—five years to bide time, finish building a second, spanking new Delta Queen (now in construction), and find a way to keep the original for good.

A bill introduced by Sen. Robert Taft (R) of Ohio, in April, is similar to the Sullivan measure; his S. 1625 awaits hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee. During testimony late last May before Representative Sullivan's committee, Coast Guard officials insisted that the Delta Queen is unsafe, even though later testimony confirmed that she is regularly inspected. Evidence of crew competence (75 hands) and safety precautions was presented.

So was evidence of ardent public support for the boat's new lease on life. In light of this, the Coast Guard might do well to scrub its decks of some of the legal barnacles of the safety at sea law. Modern-day techniques allow a boat like the Delta Queen to be perfectly safe—despite the law. Properly maintained and inspected, and equipped with up-to-date navigational devices, there is no reason why this venerable vessel should have to bow out of the American scene.

It is not for nostalgia that the Congress should pass favorably on the pending measures. The preservation and operation of the Delta Queen pertain to a very real need—that of education, the exchange of ideas in a setting which is both physical and symbolic. It is to be hoped that the Delta Queen would help us landlubbers gain a greater sense of history, of each other. Those are lights on her bridge might just illuminate more than the shore.

IRA L. GREENHUT TO RETIRE FROM 82D DIVISION ASSOCIATION

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the 82d Division Association was formed to serve as a means of communication among veterans who served in one of our most outstanding military units during World Wars I and II.

These men distinguished themselves in times of great national need. Often when a person leaves the armed services, he loses touch with many close friends, but because of the association, the 82d Division remains unified and in contact.

One man in particular has worked long and hard, for 20 years, at maintaining a bond of friendship among the division's veterans. Ira I. Greenhut has given voice to their postservice activities as editor of the association's All American News, and is now retiring from those duties.

Mr. Greenhut has done an excellent job, working without salary and promoting the finest ideals of Americanism. A man of distinguished background, he attended New York Law School and graduated in the class of 1918. For 54 years, he has been a member of the Lexington, Ky., McKee Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He also is a member of the Order of Lafayette. Now he has completed two decades of outstanding work for the 82d Division Association, and his presence there will be sorely missed by all members and readers. I pay tribute to his diligent, good work and I wish him well in whatever he next undertakes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my comments be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

SAINT EARL'S EPISTLES TO THE CONSUMERS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz has blamed consumers for the administraton's recent price freeze. Speaking before young civic leaders at Kenansville, N.C., he contended that consumers with more spending money are causing soaring food costs, which in turn mandated the freeze.

According to him, even though consumers are to blame, they do not realize the enormity of their deeds. It seems we dare to blame the administration and bankrupt farm polices for the present catastrophic state of affairs. He places the blame where it belongs; on the American consumer.

How dare we insist on eating meat, thereby hiking ground beef prices to $1.27 per pound? How could America's shoppers be so dense as to drive the price of lettuce to 70 cents per head by insisting on green salads? For shame. A massive act of public contrition is in order.

The Secretary should be singled out for praise for calling attention to this outrageous situation. Nor is this the first time he has spoken out in such a manner. Remember when meat boycotts started, and he claimed consumers were to blame for meat prices?

Such wisdom, courage, and perspicacity must be recognized and rewarded. Butz should be accorded a place in history alongside other government immortals, such as Calvin Coolidge, who said:

> The business of America—is business.

If thumping non sequiturs do not move you, then perhaps we might refer to Commodore Vanderbilt's immortal words, akin to Butz' latest:

> The public? The public be damned.

Let us not forget Marie Antoinette, of revered memory, who, in the same spirit, when informed that her subjects were hungry and lacked bread, piped up:

> Then let them eat cake.

However, insofar as Butz is concerned, it may best be summed up by a memorable cartoon of Anthony Comstock standing before a scowling judge, holding a terrified young woman by the scruff of her neck. He is saying, in high dudgeon:

> Your honor, this shameless woman dared to give birth to a naked child.

They all fit like the proverbial glove. So let us be thankful for his fleeting presence, to remind us of how unworthy we are of him.

ACLU BRINGS FORCED STERILIZATION SUIT IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in the shadow of the highly publicized Relf sterilization case are countless anonymous instances whereby poor black women became helpless victims of forced sterilization procedures. Horrified by such unlawful brutality, I joined several groups across the Nation in demanding a prohibition against the sterilization of minors. In addition, I voiced the need for more stringent regulations governing the sterilization of retarded persons. I hope that within the next 2 days, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Caspar Weinberger will present the safe and equitable guidelines which he promised upon temporarily suspending sterilization funds recently.

The flagrant abuse of current sterilization law is graphically demonstrated by the case of Nial Ruth Cox of North Carolina. The American Civil Liberties Union has recently brought a class action suit challenging a State statute providing for sterilization of mentally defective persons. ACLU lawyers seek a declaratory judgment that the statute is unconstitutional as well as $1 million in damages for the physical and emotional injury suffered by Nial Ruth Cox as a result of the sterilization operation.

Following is an ACLU statement describing Ms. Cox' case:

Nial Ruth Cox, a black woman, was 18 at the time of the operation, a minor under North Carolina law. Neither she nor her mother understood the nature of the operation performed on her. She is not, and never has been, mentally defective, despite an assertion by the doctor who performed the operation that she was an "18 year old mentally deficient Negro girl." Nial Ruth's mother, Devora Cox, under threat of removal from the welfare rolls of her entire family, "consented" to what she was told was a *temporary* tying of her daughter's tubes. There are no procedural safeguards in North Carolina to prevent the sterilization of minors if a parent or guardian gives consent. "Consent" in this case was to a temporary procedure—

under coercion—which was not explained to, or understood by, either Nial Ruth Cox or her mother. Neither plaintiff nor her mother was accorded at any other time an opportunity to question the proceedings. ACLU lawyer, Brenda Feigen Fasteau, Coordinator of the Women's Rights Project, contends that plaintiff Nial Ruth Cox has been "deprived of substantive and procedural due process and equal protection of the laws, that her privacy has been invaded, that the statute providing for the sterilization of 'persons mentally defective' is impermissibly vague and that Nial Ruth Cox has been the victim of cruel and unusual punishment. This sterilization operation undoubtedly occurred because the plaintiff is a black woman, who at the time of the operation was a minor and a member of a welfare family," Ms. Fasteau observes.

Plaintiff Nial Ruth Cox describes what happened to her as follows: "I was living with my mother and eight sisters and brothers. My father, who was married to my mother until I was six, is dead. My family was on welfare, but payments had stopped for me because I was eighteen. We had no hot or cold running water, only pump water. No stove. No refrigerator, no electric lights. It got cold down there in the winter. I got pregnant when I was 17. I didn't know anything about birth control or abortion. When the welfare caseworker found out I was pregnant, she told my mother that if we wanted to keep getting welfare, I'd have to have my tubes tied—temporarily. Nobody explained anything to me before the operation. Later on, after the operation, I saw the doctor and I asked him if I could have another baby. He said that I had nothing to worry about, that, of course, I could have more kids. I know now that I was sterilized because I was from a welfare family."

PRESIDENTIAL AIDE ILLEGALLY HOLDS TWO JOBS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, although it is illegal to serve as an active duty general and a White House aide at the same time, Presidential assistant, Alexander Haig is staying in the Army until August 1 in order to boost his retirement pay by more than $3,300 per year.

August 1 is the first day that General Haig can retire and receive a full general's retirement pay of $24,403.

Mr. Speaker, Haig's decision to stay on illegally until August 1 to boost his annual retirement pay by more than $3,300 is one of the chintziest deals I have ever heard of.

The General Accounting Office has already ruled that Haig is illegally serving in a civilian office while continuing on active duty. But, for General Haig an extra $3,300 of booty in his own pocket is more important than obeying the law. General Haig is obviously willing to break the law rather than lose a little retirement pay.

Mr. Speaker, Haig's insistence on staying in the service until August 1 is a sleazy deal designed to lap up a few extra monetary goodies.

As my colleagues know, Haig was appointed as a replacement for H. R. (Bob) Haldeman by the President on May 4, 1973. On June 6, 1973 the White House announced that Haig would retire from the Army on August 1.

Mr. Speaker, General Haig should have resigned his commission immediately after his appointment as a White House aide even if he would lose a little retirement pay.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the unwillingness of Attorney General Elliot Richardson to enforce the GAO's ruling that Haig was illegally serving at the White House.

It is incredible that this administration continues to condone flagrant lawbreaking by White House officials. Mr. Richardson should put a halt to this illegal money grabbing scheme immediately by enforcing Comptroller General Elmer Staats' ruling which held that Haig could not hold both jobs.

We have in this Nation a strong tradition of civilian control over the military. General Haig's continued service as an active duty officer while occupying the position of Assistant to the President undermines and erodes that basic principle that the military is subject to civilian control. We are setting a very bad precedent that may be repeated in the future to the detriment of civilian control over the milita:.· and ultimately affect the vigor of our democratic institutions.

FRINGE BENEFIT ADOPTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years adoptions have increased in number to the point where there is now a long wait before one can adopt a child. This has been true in spite of the fact that private industry and government have refused to grant to adoptive parents the same fringe benefits it gives natural parents. I certainly believe that the adoptive parents should be given these benefits so that they too, can have the time to adjust to the new situation and bring their child up in a natural atmosphere.

On July 9 and 10, WRC-TV editorialized on this issue and I would like to share that editorial with my colleagues:

FRINGE BENEFIT ADOPTION

An innovative, equitable and eminently fair approach to the high cost of adoption has come to our attention. We'd like to pass it along.

For years, industry and government have subsidized biological, natural parenthood. This has been done by many health insurance plans paying for almost all pre and post natal costs and hospital expenses. In addition the natural mother, in most cases, is given a leave of absence from her job for anywhere from several weeks to six months to recover and get to know her child.

In our opinion the family who chooses to adopt a child should receive some of these same benefits.

Adoption costs are high, oftentimes too high for the low to middle income family, and surely an adoptive family needs the same amount of time as a natural family to get to know their new child.

What makes this idea all the more alluring is that there are many hundreds of children waiting to be adopted, especially the older, handicapped or minority child, who might be placed in a loving permanent home more easily if the inital costs were paid.

We also favor subsidized adoption by the states for low income families who are willing to take into their homes hard to place children.

Company insurance plans are set up to serve employee disabilities of one form or another. The great majority of families who choose to adopt cannot have children of their own. That is certainly a major disability.

Industry, and in Washington, government, could aid both its employees and the community by granting to adoptive parents the same fringe benefits it gives natural parents.

INFLATION: A WORLDWIDE DISASTER

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, everywhere in the United States, inflation has become the No. 1 economic and social problem. All sections of our people are being hurt, but the deepest hurts are felt by the tens of millions who are least able to defend themselves—our senior citizens, minorities, unemployed, sick, the young, the majority of industrial workers, managers, and so forth. Only the speculators and sharpsters profit at the expense of others, while our entire society and its Government reel under the strong blows of inflation. Leaders in public and private life at every level are rightfully deeply worried.

For this reason, I am particularly pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new, highly original and most timely book, "Inflation: A World-Wide Disaster." It is written by the eminent economist of international repute, Dr. Irving S. Friedman. I have just read this book with great interest and profit. It is lucidly written and, in addition, is the most readable economics book that I know of.

The author draws on many years of firsthand experience in dealing with the economic problems of countries throughout the world as a senior official of the U.S. Treasury, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. His careful examination of our present-day inflation has led him to conclude that it is not merely a U.S. problem but it is rather a worldwide epidemic generating economic and social dislocations on a global scale. Every day we read accounts of events which repeatedly confirm the accuracy and wisdom of the analyses and prognostications set forth in "Inflation: A World-Wide Disaster."

The author explains that in the past the experiences of inflation were generally local and temporary. He analyzes why the policies followed by governments since World War II have resulted in continuing inflation which has had much more destructive consequences than temporary inflation and further why the elimination of persistent inflation requires different solutions from those traditionally used to eliminate temporary inflation. Friedman stresses that many of our political and social problems such as the public's weakening confidence in government, urban decay, and increasing crime are intensified by the effects of persistent global inflation. He discusses the deep social and political roots of inflation and urges that these social and political roots and the pervasive and harmful effects of inflation be realistically appraised in order to find successful solutions to the overcoming of persistent inflation.

Dr. Friedman explains how modern objectives to which our country is deeply committed can be reconciled with the achievement of noninflationary conditions if nations will undertake some hard-headed changes in their priorities and practices. Indeed, he argues convincingly that the achievement of desirable modern objectives are gravely endangered as well as made more difficult by our failure to eliminate persistent inflation and the expectations of continuing inflation which have now become worldwide. Thus, the author is not a doomsday prophet but is deeply convinced that we have no alternative but to face up to the problem of persistent inflation and take the decisions needed to create an environment in which we can hope to do that which we agree is necessary and desirable. I commend this book to all concerned with the all-important problems of inflation.

SEWAGE TREATMENT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the water department of the city of Philadelphia continues to be a leader in the development of new methods for sewage treatment.

A new technique for the removal of pollution from our waters is under study by the water department.

At this time I enter into the RECORD an article released by the city of Philadelphia on its new method of water pollution control:

SEWAGE TREATMENT

A new type of rotating disc offers hope of cleaner streams, Water Commissioner Carmen F. Guarino said today.

Guarino said that 80 visiting engineers will watch a set of polyethylene discs in action at the Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant on Wednesday evening. The long roller-like discs, which revolve in sewage, have been under study by the Water Department for four months.

The visiting engineers, representing the Philadelphia section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, will see a film and slides and then visit the site of the pilot study. Michael D. Nelson, acting chief of water pollution control, will speak to the group.

Although the pilot study is on a small scale, Guarino said that the discs were being evaluated for possible incorporation on a large scale in new sewage plants which the Water Department will build in the next three years. The pilot study shows that the discs can remove more than 90% of biochemical oxygen demand (a rough measure of pollution) from sewage. At present the city's plants remove a combined average of 55%.

As the discs rotate, they pick up a film of sewage on which aerobic bacteria grow. These bacteria break down the wastes in the tank, converting them to carbon dioxide and water. They also convert sewage ammonia to nitrate.

Guarino said that the discs, technically called "bio-surf", represent the latest in a series of experiments by the Water Dept. with new methods for treating sewage. He said that his department is looking for the most effective methods for incorporation into its future sewage plant.

NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP WEEK

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster said that:

> Labor is one of the great elements of society—the great substantial interest on which we all stand.

I would add that time has only increased the validity of Mr. Webster's sentiment; and along with this, the increased need for skilled tradesmen has proven a thousand times over the need for recognition, continuation, and expansion of the vital apprenticeship programs throughout the Nation.

I am today introducing legislation as a tribute to apprentice training and to the essential role which that training plays in our society and economy. This legislation calls for the establishment of a National Apprenticeship Week to be designated on the first week to begin on the first Sunday of September of each year. This legislation is, however, more than a tribute. By establishing a permanent National Apprenticeship Week we would establish a permanent reminder of over 300 apprenticeable occupations which touch our lives and serve our communities each day.

Apprenticeship has evolved from indentureship existing in the early days of our country to play a vital role in replenishing and expanding our increasingly sophisticated production force today. Those skilled craftsmen and women emerging from the competitive and rigorous work involved in completing a 2- to 4-year training program become our small independent businessmen, our public employees, our industrial workers, and our labor leaders. Their role is central in keeping our country moving and deserves our recognition and encouragement.

I ask you to review the following partial list of specialized occupations made available through apprenticeship programs conducted by cooperation between labor, management, schools, and the Government—and accordingly, urge your support of National Apprenticeship Week:

FAMILIAR APPRENTICEABLE OCCUPATIONS

Aircraft fabricator.
Airplane mechanic.
Arborist.
Asbestos worker.
Automotive body repairman.
Automotive mechanic.
Baker.
Barber.
Blacksmith.
Boilermaker.
Bookbinder.
Brewer.
Bricklayer.
Butcher-meat cutter.
Cabinetmaker-millman.
Candy maker.
Canvas worker.
Carman.
Carpenter.
Cement mason.
Cook.
Cosmetician.
Dairy products maker.
Draftsman-designer.
Electrical worker.
Electroplater.
Electrotyper.
Engraver.
Fabric cutter.
Farm-equipment mechanic.
Floor coverer.
Foundryman.
Furrier.
Glazier-glass worker.
Heat treater.
Ironworker.
Jeweler.
Lather.
Leadburner.
Leatherworker.
Lithographer.
Machinist.
Mailer.
Maintenance mechanic repairman.
Metal polisher and buffer.
Millwright.
Model maker.
Musical instrument mechanic.
Operating engineer.
Optical technician.
Orthopedic prosthetic technician.
Painter-decorator.
Patternmaker.
Photoengraver.
Photographer.
Plasterer.
Plate printer.
Plumber-pipe fitter.
Printer.
Printing pressman.
Rigger.
Roofer.
Rotogravure engraver.
Sheetmetal worker.
Sign, scene, and pictorial artist.
Silversmith.
Stationary engineer.
Stereotyper.
Stoneworker.
Stonemason.
Tailor.
Telephone worker.
Textile technician.
Tile setter.
Tool and die maker.
Upholsterer.
Wallpaper craftsman.
Wire weaver.

JAMES V. SMITH

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing my sympathy to the family and friends of James V. Smith, who died in a tragic accident on June 23 in Oklahoma. Many of us became familiar with Jim's dedication and leadership when he served in the 90th Congress as Representative from the Sixth District of Oklahoma. Jim continued to use his talents in public service as Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, a position which he held until January of this year.

I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that Jim Smith was an outstanding public servant who will be greatly missed by those whose admiration and respect he so justly earned.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD HAVE DONE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I believe the phase 3½ controls which have caused such havoc in the marketplace are a tragic mistake and I have strongly urged that the President immediately put an end to the present freeze.

Controls treat the symptoms rather than the causes of inflation, and, as we are already seeing, controls create shortages of goods. Supermarket owners are expressing concern over the unavailability of foods such as tomatoes, celery, potatoes, apples, vegetable oil, and eggs; virtually all the same supermarket chains are finding poultry and pork suppliers limiting them from 75 to 20 percent of the amounts ordered. Clarence G. Adamy, president of the National Association of Food Chains, reported last Friday that—

> We have received a number of wires from . . . members warning of serious shortages of fresh and processed pork products such as bacon, along with poultry, in most parts of the country . . .

As I have continually stressed, only one thing causes inflation, high prices and the spiraling cost of food and that is unsound fiscal and monetary policy. Government's own policy of running huge budgetary deficits and continuously increasing the supply of credit and paper money has brought about the inflation which is plaguing us today.

History shows that controls only conceal rather than solve inflation. Controls are unfair in their application and are difficult to administer. They play havoc with our economy and bring shortages, rationing, and eventually a black market. Inflation can be cured and prices brought under control only if the fiscal fat is cut out of the Federal budget and the increase in the supply of paper money and credit is restrained.

Mr. Speaker, the brilliant economist, Milton Friedman, has included in his Newsweek column of July 16, an abbreviated draft of the speech which he suggests that President Nixon should have given on June 13 concerning the price freeze. I wish to associate myself with Milton Friedman's remarks and I strongly recommend his column to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD HAVE DONE

(By Milton Friedman)

(As a severe critic of the new price freeze, I have repeatedly been asked, "What should the President have done instead?" Herewith is an abbreviated draft of the talk that I wish he had given instead of the one that he did give on June 13. The quoted passages are from his actual talk.)

"In August 1971, I announced the New Economic Policy," in which, against my better judgment, I imposed a 90-day freeze on prices and wages to be followed by more flexible controls.

Ever since my Inauguration, I had been trying to avoid such controls. Again and again, I had warned the American people that controls threaten our freedom and our prosperity. But when inflation proved unexpectedly stubborn, a consensus developed among legislators in both parties, among businessmen, and among citizens at large, in favor of controls. Reluctantly, I yielded to this consensus.

Twenty-two months later, it is clear that controls have been an utter failure. Prices are now rising more than twice as fast as in early 1971. We can now see that controls only concealed inflation; they did not eliminate inflation. As soon as phase two was eased, controlled prices bounded forward, joining the rapidly rising prices of uncontrolled foods.

What should we do now? One thing we are not going to do: "put the American economy in a straitjacket. We are not going to follow the advice of those who have proposed actions that would lead eventually to a permanent system of price and wage controls. Such actions would bring good headlines tomorrow and bad headaches six months from now for every American family."

We must tackle the basic causes of inflation: ever-rising government spending financed by the erection of money. These are the flames that have caused the economic pot to boil. We must turn them down, not simply put a heavier brick on top of the pot.

Accordingly, I am today asking Congress to enact an emergency across-the-board reduction of 5 per cent in every item of government spending that is not mandated by contractual arrangements already entered into. I am today requesting the independent Federal Reserve System to hold the growth in the quantity of money to not more than 5 per cent a year for the next two years. I am today abolishing all controls over prices, wages, interest rates, dividends and rents that were imposed under phase three and its predecessors.

These measures will simultaneously turn down the heat and remove the brick from the pot. They will set free the unrivaled energies of our citizens cooperating through a free market.

Once inflation has gotten the start it has here, there is simply no way to stop it without some hardship, without at least a temporary slowdown in the economy while prices and wages are adapting to the new realities. To make certain that the burden does not fall on those least able to bear it, I am today asking Secretaries Weinberger and Brennan to survey our unemployment-insurance and welfare programs to assure that no family suffers acute distress because of the necessary economic adjustment. The adjustment will be far less painful if we take these measures today than if we let the inflationary virus grow by what it feeds on, or seek to suppress it by more rigid controls.

"Let there be no mistake: if our economy is to remain dynamic, we must never slip into the temptation of imagining that in the long run controls can substitute for a free economy or permit us to escape the need for discipline in fiscal and monetary policy. We must not let controls become a narcotic—and we must not become addicted . . .

"Today, in America, we have a magnificent opportunity. We hold the future—our future—in our own hands. By standing together, by working together, by joining in bold yet sensible policies to meet our temporary problems without sacrificing our lasting strength, we can achieve what America has not had since President Eisenhower was in this office: full prosperity without war and without inflation. This is a great goal, and a goal that together we can reach."

This hypothetical talk reflects President Nixon's basic principles far better than the talk he did give. More tragically, it also responds far better to the nation's true need.

We shall come to this policy in the end, but only after much needless travail, only after the narcotic of controls has permanently weakened the foundations of this great nation.

PROTECTION OF POLAR BEARS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the State Department a reply to an inquiry I made about action being taken to protect the polar bear.

The letter informs me that plans are moving forward for the circumpolar nations to sign an interim agreement providing for a moratorium on the killing of polar bears on the high seas. The U.S. negotiating position originally included a provision calling for a convention protecting polar bears both on the high seas and in national territories; however the draft interim agreement accepted by the circumpolar nations did not include this provision.

The United States is now seeking the incorporation of a provision in the interim agreement which would call for the negotiation of a full treaty at some future date to protect the polar bear both on the high seas and within national territories.

I have asked the State Department to report to me again after the interim agreement has been signed. I am placing in the RECORD at this point the recent exchange of letters I have had with the State Department on this subject:

JUNE 5, 1973.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: An international moratorium on the killing of polar bears on the high seas was the subject of House Joint Resolution 1268, passed by the House last September. The Senate passed the resolution, in modified form, in October. I am writing today to request a report from the Department on the action taken since then on this subject in our government and in the international community.

I am interested in a general account of what progress has been made through negotiations for an international agreement pursuant to the provisions of House Joint Resolution 1268. Specifically, the following questions come to mind: 1. Has the United States expressed support for a ban on killing on landed territory in our communications with the other four circumpolar nations? 2. What are the attitudes of other countries toward a ban on killing on landed territory as well as on pack ice? 3. What exceptions from the moratorium on killing are now included in the draft Interim Agreement and what is the estimated total kill per year under these exceptions? 4. After the Interim Agreement has been signed, what plans are there for negotiation of a full treaty later and what additional provisions will the United States seek which differ from those in the Interim Agreement?

Could you also explain why the polar bear was not included in Appendix I of the Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species?

I understand that the present negotiating schedule aims for a conference sometime this fall at which the Interim Agreement would be signed. I would be most grateful if at the conclusion of that conference the Department would furnish me with a report on its outcome. I will appreciate any assistance you can give me in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. FRASER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1973.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of June 5, 1973, in regard to an international moratorium on the killing of polar bears on the high seas.

As you know, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (I.U.C.N.) in September, 1972, circulated to the United States and the other four circumpolar nations a draft interim agreement providing for a moratorium on the killing of polar bears on the high seas, including the area of the circumpolar pack ice, except in accordance with the traditional rights of local people who depend on that resource. The U.S. took the lead in responding and proposed a few modifications. The I.U.C.N. in turn recirculated the agreement as modified by the U.S. proposals. Norway and Canada have responded with their comments on the modified draft. The Canadian comments are tentative since they have not yet received the clearance from the provinces which are required under the Canadian constitution.

Norway on June 13 invited the U.S. and the other three concerned nations to attend a meeting of technical experts to conclude the agreement. Our formal reply, which will be affirmative, is being held temporarily while the Norwegians clarify whether they wish to have the agreement signed by the experts at the meeting or by diplomatic representatives shortly thereafter.

Regarding your specific questions: Question 1: The United States in its proposed changes to the I.U.C.N. draft suggested the inclusion of a section calling for the negotiation of a convention protecting polar bear populations both on the high seas and in national territories. Question 2: The Soviet Union banned polar bear hunting in 1956, but no other nation has taken a similar position. Question 3: The exceptions allowed under the draft interim agreement, as currently amended by the U.S., Canadian and Norwegian suggestions, would allow the hunting, killing and capture of polar bears for a) scientific purposes, b) as a continuation of the traditional hunting rights of local people, c) and for the protection of human life or property.

The necessary scientific data is not available for estimating what the total kill would be under these exceptions. However, the agreement would almost completely stop sport hunting of polar bears in the U.S. where virtually all the bears are on the pack ice, severely curtail it in Greenland and Norway where most of the bears are on the pack ice, but have little effect in Canada where the bear hunting is largely conducted on the land. Of course, hunting by natives, which is probably responsible for killing the most bears, would not be affected by the agreement.

Question 4: As stated above, the U.S. wishes the interim agreement to incorporate a provision which would call for the negotiation of a treaty to lend protection to the polar bear both on the high seas and within national territories.

The Department of Interior specialists believed that the polar bear only qualified for protection under Appendix II on which it was finally placed. Some countries believed it did not qualify for inclusion on that appendix.

I trust this information has been responsive to your inquiry. However, if you have any further questions please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

TRIBUTE TO MERVYN LEROY

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian I have on several past occasions, with great pride, saluted various persons who have contributed to the greatness of our motion picture industry—an industry which has provided enjoyment for countless billions of people throughout the world.

Recently I found myself again viewing, and again enjoying, the motion picture "The Wizard of Oz," which was produced by a neighbor of mine in California, Mr. Mervyn LeRoy. I would like to spend a few minutes today calling to your attention the achievements of this remarkable man, who can truly be termed one of the giants of his industry.

Mr. LeRoy—as a director and as a producer—has given the screen some of its most unforgettable masterpieces—such films as "Little Caesar," "I Am a Fugitive From a Chain Gang," "Tugboat Annie," "Gold Diggers of 1933," "Anthony Adverse," "Five Star Final," "Quo Vadis," "The Wizard of Oz," "Madame Curie," "Little Women," "Mister Roberts," "Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo," "The Bad Seed," and "Gypsy," to name but a few of his 75 motion pictures.

His talent and his good taste have enriched all of our lives. Many of his films are considered among the greatest ever made.

Mervyn LeRoy is, however, much more than an accomplished director and producer. He is a bold and courageous innovator; a humanitarian who has sought to inform as he also entertains; to illumine even as he has explored some of the social ills of the turbulent decades in which he has worked.

Mr. LeRoy is a starmaker, having discovered, nurtured, and brought to full bloom such talents as Edward G. Robinson, Paul Muni, Robert Taylor, Judy Garland, Lana Turner, Greer Garson, and many more.

In a career that has spanned more than 40 years, this gentleman has been a credit to his industry, his Nation, and to the city in which he works and lives. His efforts have earned many awards from his peers and from other persons and nations. He has been honored with the Star of Italy from the Italian Government, the Victoire du Cinema Francais Award from France, the Christopher Award, the Foreign Press Association's Cecil B. DeMille Award, the World Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the B'nai B'rith's Man of the Year Award, several Academy Award nominations, and a special Oscar for "The House I Live In," as well as innumerable other citations for work well done.

Mervyn LeRoy directed his first film in 1928. During his early years in Hollywood it was not at all unusual for him to direct as many as seven pictures in a year. His passion for Hollywood and for hard work were paramount in his rise to prominence.

He is a native Californian, born in San Francisco, who has worked in Hollywood most of his adult life. His father died when Mervyn was 10 years old, and the youngster soon thereafter got his first job in the theater. He toured in vaudeville, then acted in silent films. Finally, he was given the opportunity to direct a picture, "No Place To Go," and the die was cast. Directing and producing became his life.

If Mervyn LeRoy had never produced any other film except "The Wizard of Oz," his name would still be assured of a unique place in screen history. A film that appeals to the child in all of us, that picture will be playing to audiences longer than any of us will remain on Earth. Mr. LeRoy has said that it was necessary to have the heart and mind of a youngster to make that film. He has them—in all their beautiful purity and idealism.

Jack L. Warner, himself a titan in the motion picture industry and a man for whom Mervyn directed some of his big hits, has said that LeRoy, more than any other director who worked for Warner Bros., helped shape the history of that company.

Mervyn LeRoy has long been a champion of social reform, evidenced by such early pictures as "I Am a Fugitive From a Chain Gang," which was an attack against the maltreatment of prison inmates; "They Won't Forget," the film that introduced Lana Turner to the screen, but which is also memorable for its attack on the principle of the lynch law; "Blossoms in the Dust," a treatise against the labeling of children as illegitimate; and "The House I Live In," a documentary film which pleads for brotherhood.

Mr. LeRoy is, in addition to all else, a humanitarian, known for his personal philanthropies and his constant readiness to aid a worthy cause. His intimates are also aware of his numerous unpublicized acts of kindness and help to his fellowman.

He is also a sportsman, in the finest tradition of that word. As president of Hollywood Park he labors tirelessly to bring added prestige to the sport of kings, and enjoyment to those who love horses.

Mervyn LeRoy has filled his life with achievement and with honor, and it is my pleasure to salute him today.

NATIONAL TAY-SACHS DISEASE CONTROL ACT

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the National Tay-Sachs Disease Control Act in an effort to reduce the numbers of Jewish children who die each year with Tay-Sachs disease.

This disease strikes 25 percent of the offspring of Jewish parents who carry the abnormal gene responsible for the disease.

The death is a horrible one.

Often not detected until the fourth or fifth month of life, the disease attacks the infant's coordination and mental capacity and the infant begins to waste away.

Three or 4 years later, the retarded and blind child, unable to eat, smile, turn over, or show any other signs of emotion, dies.

While there is no known cure for Tay-Sachs, often referred to as the "Jewish disease," there have been sufficient breakthroughs in research which enable us to detect carriers of the gene.

I propose, through my amendment to the Public Health Service Act, that Congress act promptly in appropriating $3 million for research, detection, and screening. The legislation also authorizes counseling of those found to carry the genes responsible for Tay-Sachs.

Tay-Sachs is an inherited disorder caused by an absence of a vital enzyme in the body and resulting in the destruction of the nervous system. The disease is transmitted as an autosomal recessive trait and is invariably fatal.

It is estimated that there are between 175 and 250 cases of Tay-Sachs disease each year in this country.

The disorder occurs 100 times more often in Ashkenazi Jews than in non-Jews, and in this group—which constitutes 90 percent of the U.S. Jewish population—it is believed that one out of every 30 persons is a Tay-Sachs carrier.

Current interest in Tay-Sachs stems from the fact that although the disease is incurable, recent advances in research have made the disorder detectable before birth.

There are three main reasons why Tay-Sachs disease is very conducive to mass screening programs:

First, it affects a definite population group;

Second, its carriers can be identified by a simple blood test which measures the presence or absence of a crucial enzyme; and

Third, an affected fetus can be detected in the uterus, through a process by which a small amount of fluid around the unborn child is removed.

The idea in the screening programs is to detect the hidden gene which is responsible for the disease. The normal gene produces an enzyme called hexosaminidase A, or hex A, which breaks down fatty material in nerve cells. When this enzyme is absent, fatty material begins to accumulate in the nerve cells, eventually destroying them and leading to the progressive deterioration of the nervous system.

There is no treatment for the disease.

The only hope lies in screening programs to identify carriers of the disease.

The first pilot program for screening Tay-Sachs carriers was carried out by the John F. Kennedy Institute of the Johns Hopkins University under the direction of Dr. Michael Kaback.

It was designed not only to do large-scale blood sampling, but also to offer genetic counseling to those couples who were identified as Tay-Sachs carriers. The total cost of the Baltimore-Washington pilot program was estimated around $100,000.

According to the National Tay-Sachs and Allied Diseases Association there are currently only 14 screening programs being conducted in major cities in this country and these are privately funded.

If the screening programs for Tay-Sachs are successful, they will hopefully serve as prototypes for the detection and prevention of other genetic disorders, including sickle cell anemia—an inherited disorder specific to the black population which attacks one chlid in every 400 black births—and cystic fibrosis—a genetic disease carried by about one in 20 Americans of northern European ancestry.

According to the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, there is now no specific funding level provided for Tay-Sachs disease through the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to give consideration to enactment of this bill, a very necessary step in the direction of detecting, and perhaps ultimately eliminating, this dread disease which preys on the Jewish population.

TROOPS ARE BARGAINING CHIP

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) recently chaired joint hearings of the full Foreign Affairs Committee on the question of unilateral withdrawal of American troops from Europe. During the course of those hearings, Mr. ZABLOCKI made his opposition to such a unilateral withdrawal abundantly clear. I concur with his views and would commend his rationale to other Members of the Congress.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal editorially took note of the gentlemen's position and endorsed it. Considering the general editorial policy of the Journal, I believe the newspaper's comments of July 13 are particularly pertinent.

The newspaper article follows:

TROOPS ARE BARGAINING CHIP

Wisconsin Rep. Zablocki's House subcommittee is holding hearings on the question whether to unilaterally withdraw American troops from Europe. Zablocki has made it clear that he opposes such a move. It is hoped that the subcommittee will reach the same collective decision.

Zablocki believes that this is not an auspicious time to bring US forces home. He is correct. Formal negotiations with the Soviet bloc on mutual reduction of forces are scheduled to begin this fall in Vienna. Why should the Russians negotiate if the US unilaterally undertakes what the Kremlin would like to see—a lessening of American military strength in Europe?

In the opening of the closely related Helsinki negotiations on European security, the Soviet Union let it be known that it had no intention of giving anything away in Eastern Europe. Moscow acknowledged the Western aim of more East-West contact, but stated its priorities in terms of "institutions, organizations and people." Such a listing indicates that contacts would be closely controlled, with individual contacts receiving little more than lip service approval. Nor did the Russians rule out repeating of the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia. Under such circumstances the West needs every tool it has to bargain. The presence of US troops in Europe is an essential one.

H.R. 8949 AND H.R. 9048

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, generally bills which come to the floor under suspension of the rules are noncontroversial pieces of legislation of little import. Today, however, we will consider two bills, H.R. 8949 and H.R. 9048, which are extremely important to our Nation's veterans and which I feel deserve some comments.

The elimination of the interest rate ceiling on VA guaranteed or insured loans through the enactment of H.R. 8949 is a matter of pressing urgency. The expiration of June 30 of the Secretary of HUD authority to adjust interest rates above the permanent ceiling of 6 percent has effectively halted VA activities in the mortgage market. The net result is that no VA loans have been made since July 1 of this year.

My office has received numerous calls from constituents who have had their plans totally disrupted by this event. They have proceeded as far as final settlement, their belongings are packed, their present home sold, yet they find that they cannot complete the transaction because of congressional inaction.

The enactment of H.R. 8949 will provide a simple solution to this problem and prevent its recurrence in the future. The flexible authority to adjust interest rates will also allow veterans to better compete for funds in tight money periods and, by minimizing loan discounts, increase the number of properties which can be sold through VA financing.

The Veteran's Health Care Expansion Act of 1973, H.R. 9048, is of equal, if not more, importance to those who have served in our Nation's Armed Forces. The House and Senate Veteran's Affairs Committee's oversight hearings on medical care conducted during 1970 and 1971 clearly revealed that an increasing strain would be placed on the VA hospital and medical system due to the influx of Vietnam era and aging World War II veterans.

The major objective of H.R. 9048 is to improve the ability of the VA to meet this increased demand for its services and allow it to provide quality medical care to its beneficiaries. The expansion of eligibility, benefits, and VA facilities as specified in this bill will go a long way toward achieving this objective.

I have every hope that both of these important pieces of legislation will pass the House today and receive prompt action by the other body. They represent minor rewards for those who served their country so valiantly.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE SYSTEMS ACT OF 1973

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased that the House voted 305 to 111 to support the conference report on the Emergency Medical Service Systems Act of 1973. I hope this indicates that the Congress supports the program of emergency medical services and the continuation of the Public Health Service hospital system. I am aware the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on July 16, 1973, on page 24075 indicating the opposition of the administration to the emergency medical services and their opposition to the Public Health Service hospitals. Since the House was aware of administration opposition and passed the bill by this number of votes, I would hope that the administration does not veto this bill.

I believe that the Federal Government should be expending funds on necessary local hospital facilities as one of the Nation's top priorities. When one considers the small amount involved in maintaining the Public Health Service hospital facilities as compared to the amounts we are spending on military operations, the argument of the administration that this is costly or not administratively sound seems very foolish.

Let us hope that this bill will be signed by the President and we will continue to provide some measure of medical services for our people rather than going to a system where we are closing hospitals and thus denying services which are needed.

TVA PAYMENTS TO U.S. TREASURY TOTAL $74 MILLION THIS YEAR

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority under the TVA Act is required to pay into the U.S. Treasury annually a return on the appropriations investment in the agency.

In this connection TVA has just issued a press release announcing that the agency this week will pay $46,892,225 to the Treasury from the agency's electric power revenues—making a total of nearly $75 million paid into the U.S. Treasury this fiscal year.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this important matter, I place the release from TVA in the RECORD herewith. The release follows:

TVA PAYMENTS TO U.S. TREASURY TOTAL $74 MILLION THIS YEAR

On Friday the Tennessee Valley Authority will pay $46,892,225 to the U.S. Treasury out of the agency's electric power revenues, making a total of nearly $74 million paid in the fiscal year that ends this week.

The TVA electric power system is not operated for profit, but it is required by law to pay its own way, including these specified payments to the Treasury on account of government funds used in the past to build the power system.

When TVA was established 40 years ago, hydroelectric power plants were financed with appropriations from Congress as part of the agency's system of multipurpose dams and reservoirs. As the years passed and the power operation proved financially sound, earnings were plowed back into the system to help offset the need for Federal funds.

After World War II the region's power requirements began to outgrow the waterpower available at dams, and TVA began building coal-burning power plants to meet the increasing need. By the late 1950's these plants provided the major share of TVA's power supply, and the financing of the power system was revised to reflect this change.

In 1959 legislation, TVA was authorized to issue bonds and notes to provide—along with earnings—the capital for additional facilities needed to keep up with the continuing growth in the region's use of electricity.

At the same time TVA was required to make two kinds of payments on the appropriations previously invested in the system. One is an annual repayment—currently $20 million—until the agency has repaid a billion dollars of the $1.2 billion appropriation investment at the time of the 1959 legislation.

The other is an annual dividend to the Treasury on the remaining appropriation investment, at a rate based on the average interest rate payable on the Treasury's marketable public obligations at the start of the fiscal year. In simpler terms, the dividend paid by TVA offsets the Treasury's own interest costs for an amount of money equal to the remaining appropriation investment in the TVA power system.

This year's dividend of $53.8 million was based on a Treasury interest rate of 5.1 percent at the start of the fiscal year, applied to an appropriation investment of $1,055 million. Next year's dividend will be over $60 million because the average interest rate on Treasury securities has now increased to about 6 percent.

When TVA began selling power bonds in 1961, investment in the power system totaled about $1.8 billion—including the $1.2 billion from appropriations and roughly $600 million from reinvested earnings.

That picture has changed sharply. More new generating capacity must be built each year to keep up with power demands, and construction costs nationally have zoomed in the past 12 years. As a result TVA power construction now requires some $500 million in capital funds a year, compared with about $150 million in 1961. Reinvested earnings provide some of these funds, but most of them must come from the sale of bonds and notes.

More than half the $4 billion net investment in the power system now is from these borrowings:

Appropriation investment:	
June 30, 1961	$1,193
March 31, 1973	1,055
Reinvested earnings:	
June 31, 1961	581
March 31, 1973	836
Bonds and notes:	
June 30, 1961	50
March 31, 1973	2,235
Total:	
June 30, 1961	1,824
March 31, 1973	4,126

The interest rate on TVA power bonds, established by competitive bidding, was less than 4½ percent on the first bond issue in 1961. Recent issues have sold at interest rates between 7 and 7½ percent.

With this rise in interest rates, and the large-scale borrowings that have been necessary to finance new facilities, interest expense and payments to the Treasury this year will total more than $200 million. That is four times as much as in fiscal year 1961, when capital costs included $51 million in payments to the Treasury and $1.5 million in interest on the first bond issue.

The power program is financially separate from other TVA programs such as flood control and navigation development. Since 1961 TVA has paid more into the U.S. Treasury under the power financing law than it has received in Federal appropriations for its other resource development activities.

TVA now has paid more than a billion dollars to the Treasury from proceeds of the power program, including $623 million in dividends and $185 million in repayments under the 1959 legislation, plus $250 million repaid previously. An additional $42 million has been paid to the Treasury from proceeds of other TVA programs.

PORT WASHINGTON NEWS: 70 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this week the community of Port Washington, within my Sixth Congressional District salutes one of its finest institutions. The Port Washington News, as it heralds 70 years of continuous publication.

The Port Washington News, an exceptional weekly newspaper, pursues a vigorous course to chronicle local events and to keep tabs on the community's growth and development. It not only acts to promote the general welfare of the community and to provide a sounding board for local opinion, but it reacts through its editorial columns to speak out on matters of concern to all segments of the populace.

The Port Washington News truly is a community newspaper and its dedication to high journalistic standards merits our recognition and praise. Its reputation as a pillar of the free press is widely known.

Mr. Speaker, it is my district privilege and pleasure to join in this community tribute and I heartily commend the Port Washington News to my colleagues.

CONTINUING NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN GREAT LAKES WATER LEVEL MANAGEMENT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this time to remind my colleagues of the still unresolved problems encountered by residents and property owners along the shores of our Great Lakes. The unprecedented rainfall in the Midwest last spring and the columns and columns of news accounts of the disasters it brought have largely faded from our minds.

Unfortunately, we have also forgotten the terrible misfortunes still being felt by Great Lakes residents. Millions of dollars of land and personal property have already found a grave in one lake or another, with more homes still threatened or crumbling.

It appears that the levels of all the Great Lakes will equal or exceed their historical records this summer. Some of the lower lakes are almost 3 feet above normal levels, with each additional inch of water exacerbating storm or wind damages.

On the 16th of July, the International Joint Commission—IJC—held a meeting to brief House Members on recommendations by the IJC to help minimize damage from high water levels around the lakes downstream from Lake Superior.

The IJC offered a continuing careful scrutiny and control of the amount of water released from Lake Superior at the St. Mary's River. This reduction can mean the lakes downstream, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario can expect their levels to go down more than would otherwise be possible—given a stability of the other factors of climate, etc. But, we cannot expect the levels to go down much, nor can we expect the reductions to be immediately observable.

Although its water level will rise with the additional impounded waters, Lake Superior can most afford an increase since its level is only 0.6 foot above normal, while lakes downstream have up to 2.6 feet more water than normal levels.

But Mr. Speaker, despite the IJC's recent action, I am disappointed with the general lack of action by the Commission. Since its inception in 1914, the IJC has remained low-key to say the least. In the first decade or two, when leadership and initiatory action was needed, it appears the IJC has usually been forced into action only by prodding from legislators, shoreline residents or executive agencies.

In 1964, the Commission started a comprehensive study of Great Lakes water level fluctuations in order to present courses of action that would benefit all the many areas and interests affected. That study has taken almost 9 years and will not be completed until this October. At the July 16 IJC meeting. Mr. Christian Herter, Jr., Chairman of the United States section of the Commission, could not say assuredly that the report would indeed by complete by October.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be entirely fair to the IJC. It appears that no amount of foresight and preparation could have prevented all of last spring's lakeshore erosion damages—we could not predict the long term heavy rainfall of the last year, but we could have done more to reduce the long term high water levels that softened us up for the big punch. Every inch of water above normal levels means more damage—so every step must be taken to reduce lake levels those inches.

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know of the concern felt for this issue by bodies other than our own. For that reason, I am including in the RECORD at this point a resolution introduced and recently passed in the State of Ohio General Assembly.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Requesting the President to enter into negotiations with Canada to take measures to maintain navigation and protect shorelines on the Great Lakes

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio,

Whereas, The Great Lakes comprise the largest system of fresh water lakes in the world, and these lakes form a vital element in the economic health of the United States as well as an invaluable source of recreation for the people of the United States; and

Whereas, The public ability to use and benefit from the lakes is curtailed during periods of excessive high- and low-water levels; and

Whereas, The water levels of the Great Lakes are now reaching unprecedented high levels, which will cause flooding, enormous property loss, and accelerated erosion of the shorelines impose a threat to human life; and

Whereas, These high-water levels follow a period of extremely low-water levels only ten years ago, which caused serious economic loss to shipping, industry, and recreational interests along the lakes; and

Whereas, It has been demonstrated on Lake Superior and Lake Ontario that the water levels of those lakes can be controlled within a range of maximum and minimum levels; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ohio House of Representatives hereby requests the President of the United States, acting through the Secretary of State, to enter into negotiations with the Government of Canada (one) for the purpose of establishing for each of the Great Lakes a maximum and minimum range of water levels in order to maintain navigation and protect shorelines against erosion and flooding, and (two) for the purpose of entering into suitable agreements on the construction of necessary public works to maintain such water levels within such ranges; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives cause this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States, and that copies be forwarded to both Ohio Senators and to all Ohio members of the United States House of Representatives.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS NEEDED FOR MASS TRANSIT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, an assistant administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency recently addressed a group of citizens at Pace College in New York City regarding the need to allow States and localities to use a portion of their highway trust fund appropriations for mass transit purposes. I will include a report on his remarks in the RECORD at the end of mine.

In his talk, he points out once again, that the automobile is receiving large amounts of subsidies from general revenues, while mass transit is receiving very little.

I urge my colleagues on the Conference Committee, Congressmen JAMES WRIGHT, JOHN BLATNIK, JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, HAROLD JOHNSON, WILLIAM STANTON, WILLIAM HARSHA, GENE SNYDER, JAMES CLEVELAND, and DON CLAUSEN, who are trying to resolve differences between the House and Senate versions of the highway bill to accept the Senate language permitting use of the trust funds for mass transit purposes. If we are to save the air in our cities and provide better transportation for all citizens, this is a necessary step in our overall efforts.

EPA OFFICIAL URGES MORE SUBSIDIES FOR RAPID TRANSIT TO CURB AIR POLLUTION

Mass transit deserves subsidies at least as great as those provided unknowingly to private vehicles, a top official of the Environmental Protection Agency said today.

Robert L. Sansom, EPA Assistant Administrator for Air and Water Programs, noted that cities like Philadelphia now subsidize private cars out of general revenues at $50 per car per year. In a recent year, highway-related spending in 43 major cities cost $676 million while highway revenues were only $305 million.

To achieve the goal of healthy air, Sansom declared, "reason dictates we must allow cities to use their share of the highway trust fund for mass transit, if they see fit." He emphasized that all governments, particularly local governments, "provide massive subsidies to the private automobile."

The Assistant Administrtor made his remarks at a citizens briefing at Pace College in New York City today, in a speech titled "Rethinking Your Automobile—No. 2."

Transportation control plans for 38 cities to meet clean air staindards show that in many cases auto emissions must be reduced 70 to 90 percent, Sansom noted.

Among the most important measures proposed are restrictions on auto traffic and improved mass transit.

"It seems clear," Sansom declared, "that under appropriate conditions very high levels of transit usage can be achieved, for example, in New York City which has a substantial, unified transit system."

In New York, he said, 27 percent of all trips and 83 percent of downtown trips take place by transit, compared to Los Angeles where only 3 percent of trips are by transit. If Los Angeles could achieve the ridership of New York, in fact, its auto use might be reduced by 25 percent, he added.

Sansom suggested that the best way to achieve clean transport is "to look at the most successful cities and use them as measuring rods for what others can do." Citing a number of municipalities where transit experiments have attracted new riders, Sansom said, "The first key to a realistic transportation control policy is to set high mass transit goals that can be demonstrated achievable by the exemplary cities."

The speaker pointed out that already some cities are subsidizing mass transit as a matter of course. "Communities such as New York, Philadelphia, Boston, San Francisco, and others use general revenue funds. Some enlightened officials consider such subsidies as legitimate as police and fire fighting."

Sansom said some cities with critical air problems must also use land use planning to assure that enough future trips can be handled by mass transit. "This means focusing growth along corridors and leaving open spaces in between. Instead of devoting one-third of our cities to roads and parking lots, we need to devote one-third to parks and open spaces," he explained.

In the final analysis, such actions will make our cities more livable, Sansom said.

CHANCE TO CLEAN HOUSE

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, Station WSOC–TV and its radio counterparts in Charlotte, N.C., recently presented a thoughtful editorial on the subject of the Supreme Court's decision concerning pornography.

The vice president and general manager of this excellent broadcasting company is a longtime friend of mine, Freeman R. Jones.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues this fine editorial, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WSOC-TV EDITORIAL

In its latest decision on pornography, the Supreme Court offered every community in America a chance to clean its own house. So, now the burden of what to do about "X" rated movies, live stage acts and printed material is yours. And that's the way it ought to be. The Supreme Court has finally turned something . . . and a very important something at that . . . over to local folks to decide. How far we go with smut is up to the people on the other side of this picture. If you want the type of trash they seem to go for in some cities, then it's yours . . . if the old fashioned waltz is as far as you want to go in entertainment, then waltz on, Carolina. And, anything in between is simply a matter of your judgement. We appreciate that. It should have been done long ago.

STILL IN THE SUCKER ROLE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the two Germanys, the Associated Press has learned, will be asked to pay about 8 percent of the annual costs of the United Nations when they are admitted to membership in the world organization.

This amount, the AP reports, has been determined by the 13-member Committee on U.N. Contributions as part of a new scale of assessments for the coming 3 years. The People's Republic of China reportedly is on the list for a 1½ percent increase to 5½ percent; the U.S. assessment is to be dropped from the current 31.25 to 25 percent. Obviously, the U.N. Committee has heard the complaints made across the country that this Nation is paying far too much.

In my judgment, the new 25 percent rate is still too much when we compare it with those paid by the world's new financial giants. The two Germanys are enjoying periods of vast prosperity. Indeed, the dollar's plight in Europe is caused in large part by the preference over there for the supposedly stronger West German mark.

Under what formula, therefore, should we with our weakened dollar and our immense debt and our multibillion deficits pay only 8 percent? The same question is raised by matching our assessment with that of the Soviet Union whose total, including those of Ukrainia and Byelorussia, amounts to only 16.55 percent.

In recent days we have heard the leaders of both our Nation and Russia equate their countries as the world's greatest and most powerful. If there is this similarity in globale stature, why should we pay so much more to the U.N.?

We have seen Japan rise in recent years to a position in which its industry challenges us in our own market and around the globe—this Oriental power of unprecedented economic achievement. And still Japan, spared what would be its normal defense costs while living securely under the U.S. military umbrella, continues to enjoy a U.N. break also. Its assessment is only 5.40 percent, or about a sixth of ours.

Why, too, should Great Britain be assessed only 5.90 percent and France, that demanding European power, only 6 percent? Certainly, in view of present economic circumstances, these are modest charges and patently unfair to the American people who are paying 31.52 percent now and, on the new scale, still will be shouldering one-fourth of the entire load.

My concern with this is based mostly on my resentment over the way this country has been played for the patsy for far too long a time, not only in the instance of U.N. costs, but in every other international arrangement which finds money involved. It may have been reasonable, in the immediate wake of World War II, for undamaged America to take on the lion's shares. But I insist that times have changed—that this country no longer is the lone rich boy in the global block and that others have made their fortunes and should now be paying their full share.

A protest against the U.N.'s lop-sided way of assessing us is nothing new. Even back in 1945 when the assessment committee first set to work, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, one of the U.N.'s most influential sponsors, objected strongly to a proposal that we pay 49.89 percent. He insisted that it was not wise to make the U.N. dependent on one member for so much of its expenses and suggested that no country be assessed for more than a third of the total. We won only part of his argument. Our first charge was set at 39.89 percent "temporarily" and, after 28 years, it currently is down to only 31.52.

Now, so the AP informs us, the rate may be cut to 25 percent which, in my opinion, would still be too high when we realize that others would pay.

One of the big jobs begging for attention today is that of getting the world functioning on an equitable basis with an end to the habitual overdependency on the U.S. on matters of cost. The U.N. assessment on us needs to be fully justified against those of the other big nations and this has to be done before the 20 percent rate is fixed and accepted for the next 3 years. My plea is to get Uncle Sam out of that sucker position in which he has been trapped and badgered for a generation.

CONCERN OVER LORTON REFORMATORY

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the Manassas, Va., Journal Messenger which comments on the growing concern in northern Virginia about the Lorton Reformatory, a facility which although located in Fairfax County, Va., is operated by the District of Columbia Department of Corrections.

Although the Journal Messenger's solution to the problem of Lorton may be somewhat unrealistic in view of the tremendous capital outlay already invested in the Lorton facility, I think it is a clear indication of the increasing concern over this problem and heightens the need for action on H.R. 3844 which I have introduced before this House and which would transfer the control of this facility from the D.C. Department of Corrections to the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

LORTON MUST GO

The Lorton prison complex has long been a festering sore on the Northern Virginia countryside. Even though there have been fewer reports of escapes than there were a few months ago, this institution stands as a threat to the safety of the citizenry in Prince William and Fairfax Counties.

We had previously raised the question of why this Commonwealth is saddled with someone else's penal problems. We realize that any such question is purely academic at this point in time and that there is little likelihood that Lorton Prison will pick itself up and go back across the Potomac where it belongs.

Several recent developments could hold forth a ray of hope for Virginians that this complex be removed from our midst. These are the objective of the District's new corrections chief to replace the current prison with a new modern structure, the strong possibility of home rule for the District, and the phasing out of Bolling AFB from military use.

Home rule in the District should strengthen our contention that the District of Columbia is analogous to a state and should therefore solve its own penal problems within its own borders. Can you conceive a situation in which the State of New Jersey would permit a prison within its borders to house felons convicted by the courts of New York City? Why should Virginia house D.C. felons?

If a new prison complex is to be built, it should be built at a different location than Lorton or any other spot in Virginia. Even if the administration and management of the prison should achieve a Utopian excellence—which it won't—the time is long past for this situation to be terminated. The prison belongs elsewhere.

Finding new prison sites in a congested metropolitan area is not an easy thing, but the apparent availability of land on the site of Bolling AFB should provide a solution to this problem. With a new modern facility within easy reach, D.C. residents would be better served as would the people of Virginia with the excision of the festering sore of Lorton.

We call on our Eighth District Representative, Sanford Parris, and on Virginia's U.S. Senators, William L. Scott and Harry F. Byrd Jr., to explore the possibilities of such a course.

We believe that mere transfer of the current Lorton complex to Federal control is not an adequate solution to the continuing presence of alien felons in our midst. District of Columbia prisoners must be moved out of the State of Virginia. If Virginians speak out loudly enough, this can become a reality.

IMPROVED MEDICAL CARE TO VETERANS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today the House has approved H.R. 9048, the Veterans Health Care Expansion Act of 1973. I was pleased to vote for this bill to provide improved medical care to veterans, to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans, and to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

On April 2 of this year, I sponsored H.R. 6426, a bill to make certain totally disabled World War II servicemen and their dependents eligible for CHAMPUS benefits. Therefore, I am delighted that section 103(b) of H.R. 9048 does authorize the Administrator of VA to provide hospital and medical care to survivors and dependents of totally and permanently disabled service-connected veterans under contract with CHAMPUS or a private insurance plan. In addition, care may be provided for these individuals in VA facilities in those cases where there are specialized facilities which are not being used for care of eligible veterans.

Survivors and dependents of totally disabled veterans now residing in the Sixth District of Florida will appreciate this action by the House to meet their health care needs.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1973, the Dispatch, a leading newspaper in northern New Jersey, turned its editorial spotlight on the problem faced by parents of juvenile campers interested in insuring that their offspring will be safe.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been fighting for a youth camp safety bill only to have my bill sidetracked at the behest of interest groups more concerned with making a buck than the safety of thousands of young people. Two years ago a study was authorized. Of course, a study was not needed, but in a sensitive area such as this, it is a most effective way to oppose needed legislation. Few Members of this House want to go on record as being opposed to a bill which deals with the safety and, yes, the very lives of young campers. Voting for a study indicates a sense of concern without actually doing anything about the situation.

The Dispatch has very clearly and factually labeled the opposition as being very likely motivated by the fact that safety will cost money—a fact which may motivate the opposition to this bill. No reputable camp owner, and this includes the vast majority, is against this measure. Only the fast buck minority—who ought to be put out of business anyway—oppose this bill. Soon all Members will have a chance to go on record about youth camp safety. I urge all Members to look into the facts, lest they be misled.

The issue is too serious for anyone to be taken into "camp" a second time. The press across the Nation is now aware of the real equities involved, and an aroused Nation wants action now.

Mr. Speaker, the Dispatch editorial follows:

HE IS AIMING AT SAFETY

There have occasionally been snide remarks in Trenton and Washington that officials from Hudson County are solely interested in what they can do for their county. By the very nature of politics this, to an extent, is so. But, let's not make a too-general rule of thumb.

Rep. Dominick V. Daniels of the 14th District has once again proposed in the house strong legislation calling for national standards on the operation of the country's 10,600 summer camps. He's primarily concerned with the safety of all the young people involved.

It's estimated that each year 250,000 children are injured in camping accidents. This is a high toll and some of the accidents unquestionably must have resulted from a lack of certain safety facilities. Too many camps skimp on safety when cutting budgets.

Mr. Daniels would have national standards to be administered by the states but he has opposition to this most commendable proposal. It comes from camp owners who point to too much federal interference, but more probably involves dollars and cents.

It's about time that someone, somewhere, thought about the children involved and not in the camps making money. This is the point that concerns Rep. Daniels and he is correct. It's good that he has brought up his bid for safety again.

NEW POLICY ON PRESENTATION OF VIEWS RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, CBS Television and Radio Network disclosed that news analysis of Presidential speeches would no longer immediately follow the Presidential addresses, but rather be incorporated into the next regularly scheduled newscast.

I feel CBS deserves much recognition and commendation for their new policy which should add more balanced coverage to issues. The network is not abandoning analysis of Presidential speeches nor is it eliminating the opportunity of direct replies to the President by those who oppose his views. They are merely rescheduling the time for news analysis. time which may be utilized toward more thoughtful preparation of the analysis. As Eric Sevareid stated—New York Times, Thursday, June 7, page 83:

Instant analysis works okay when you get an advance text of a speech, or a briefing on its content, but if you don't have those advantages, what comes out on the air is poor journalism. We're not being fair to ourselves or our audiences.

I am inserting a copy of the June 6 CBS press release announcing their new policy:

CBS CHAIRMAN WILLIAM S. PALEY ANNOUNCES NEW POLICY ON PRESENTATION OF VIEWS RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

CBS has adopted a new policy providing for presentation of views contrasting to those expressed in Presidential broadcasts "on matters of major policy concerning which there is significant national disagreement," CBS Chairman William S. Paley announced today.

Mr. Paley said that such broadcasts will be scheduled as soon after the President speaks as practicable but generally in no later than a week's time. They will be presented on the CBS Television and Radio Networks, with which some 500 stations throughout the country are affiliated.

"Fundamentally," Mr. Paley said, "this decision is an application of a long-standing CBS policy—a cardinal principle of our news operation since its inception—of providing fair and balanced coverage of public issues. Traditionally as times have changed CBS has sought new approaches to serving the public interest through expanding the public dialogue on national issues.

"Recent Presidents," Mr. Paley noted, "have conceived as one of the main functions of the Executive the focusing of national attention on public issues. To accomplish this, they have turned more and more to broadcasting as a means of direct access to the people. This in turn has increased the need for broadcasting to develop new avenues to provide a broad spectrum of significant views and a multiplicity of representative voices on public issues.

"Fulfilling our journalistic responsibilities to present issues objectively and fairly, generally speaking CBS has followed two basic approaches. First, in our regularly scheduled news broadcasts we provide continuous opportunity not only for the views of the Administration whose actions make news, but also for significant differing views. Second, CBS News presents coverage of points at issue on such broadcasts as Face the Nation, Spectrum, 60 Minutes and on documentary and special broadcasts. The new policy, by providing an additional dimension to the coverage of public issues, institutes a third approach."

The main elements of the new CBS policy, which is effective immediately, follow:

1. Whenever the President speaks to the Nation on radio or television on matters of major policy concernnig which there is significant national disagreement, CBS will present a broadcast of other viewpoints related to those matters of major policy.

2. The length, format and persons appearing on such broadcast will be determined by CBS News in light of the relevant facts of the Presidential appearance. The broadcast will be scheduled as soon as practicable, but generally no later than one week after the President speaks.

Simultaneously, CBS announced that henceforth CBS News will not provide news analyses immediately after Presidential appearances, nor after broadcasts presenting views contrasting to those expressed in Presidential broadcasts. Such analyses will be scheduled by CBS News during the normal CBS News broadcast schedule.

WATERGATE

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I am anxious to bring the so-called Watergate affair to a speedy conclusion so that we can concentrate our thoughts and attention on some of the many problems facing this country and devote more of our time and thinking toward those things which we were elected to do.

We have both an energy and a food crisis on our hands. We are facing both inflation and unemployment. We are spending more money than we make and we are buying more than we sell. It is difficult enough to seek solutions to these mammoth problems under normal conditions, but almost impossible now when the thoughts of all America, including both those who must seek out legislative solutions as well as those who must administer them, are turned to the Watergate matter.

This week, startling revelations were made by Alexander Butterfield, assistant to former White House Chief of Staff H. R. Haldeman. In his testimony before the Watergate hearings and before the whole world, Mr. Butterfield has given us hope that the Watergate hearings can be brought to a speedy conclusion so that we can once again turn our attention to some of the other problems facing the people of this great Nation.

We have learned to our surprise that tape recordings of the very conversations in the Oval Room of the White House, as well as those on the telephone which have been the subject of such debate, rumor, and conflicting statements, do exist. By making these tapes available to the Senate committee immediately the President can, by this one act, help to bring a speedy conclusion to the Watergate hearings, erase questions that might exist throughout history, and permit us to once again turn our thoughts to some of the other important matters facing this country.

Many Members of Congress are stunned and outraged that the President, all along, has been in a position to take a more judicious course of action than he has taken in the Watergate affair. To many it is incredible that he has withheld such a mighty storehouse of relevant information from the committee—not to mention the American people who have been demoralized by the events depicted in the televised Senate hearings.

Perhaps the President seeks to protect some of his closest associates who it would appear have not acted in the best interest of the President: In so doing, the President is only causing greater suspicion with regard to his only possible involvement in Watergate as is shown by a recent poll which indicated that 71 percent of the American people believe he was involved in either the planning of or the cover-up of the Watergate affair, both Federal crimes.

For months now, the tedious probing for the truth has continued. The affairs of the Nation have been delayed and disrupted. The prosecutors, the Senate committee, the Congress, the American people and suspecting neighbors abroad have been reaching for the truth.

The budget to conduct such investigations which must be borne by the American taxpayers, not counting additional costs caused by either the disruption or the failure to act by a Congress and administration bogged down by the Watergate affair, will continue to be diverted from constructive purposes to benefit Americans unless the situation is reversed. Now we find these proceedings can be quickly concluded if only the President will turn over the tapes in question to the investigating committee.

Why should the people of this country be demoralized by further delay? Why should this Nation remain the object of pity and scorn in the face of other nations? Why should the office of the Presidency be dragged through further hearings and innuendos if we can answer many of the most pertinent questions by one set of tapes?

Now we face further accusations by foreign heads of state who have just learned that their most private conversations with the President, both in the Oval Room of the White House and on the telephone, were not so private. In view of these revelations one must wonder how the President can expect candid advice from advisors, associates, and Government leaders in the future, knowing that neither the President's "hot line" nor the Oval Room of the White House offers the sanctity of privacy one would expect.

Some have said that for the President to appear personally before the Senate committee would be a breakdown of the balance of powers in our checks and balance system. It has further been pointed out that executive privilege is imperative in matters connected with the President's performance of the duties of his office. However, since the conversations in question do not deal with the President's carrying out the constitutional duties of his office, but instead deal with discussions of Watergate and the reelection campaign, the turning over of these tapes to the Senate committee would not violate the principle of division of powers.

Let us not prolong the agony and embarrassment and continue the slowdown of our Government by dragging out information piece by piece over the next year or two when we now have actual tape recordings of the very conversations in question. These taped conversations will not provide us with any different conclusion than we will eventually get through months or perhaps years of testimony, hearings, and long drawn-out court proceedings.

We are more interested in getting to the bottom of the truth quickly, making legislative changes to see that any wrongdoings do not recur, and restoring confidence to our Democratic system than we are in "nailing" the guilty. Punishing those who have violated the law is important and should not be overlooked, but of immediate concern is the matter of getting to the truth and restoring faith in our Government at home and abroad.

In my home State of Missouri, Republican Governor Kit Bond has called on the President to make a full disclosure to the American people. I join him and millions of other Americans who are anxious to bring the Watergate hearings to a speedy conclusion so we can turn our attention to some of the other problems facing our Nation.

We now have a way to bring these hearings and the Watergate matter to a conclusion and I urge the President to make these tapes available to the Senate committee before there is further deterioration in the respect and confidence in both our Government and the Office of the Presidency. The fact that 71 percent of the American people, according to a recent poll, feel the President was a party to either the planning or cover-up of the Watergate affair and only 18 percent favor his impeachment, is ample proof of the respect the American people have for the Office of the President. If the President is innocent of any wrongdoing, he owes it to these people to make these tapes available immediately. I pray to God that he will.

A FURTHER INGATHERING OF THE EXILES

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, this has been largely a century of turbulence around the world. Decade after decade, mankind has plunged into a variety of conflicts, which have spread ever outward to engulf virtually every continent. One depressing result of all this has been the uprooting of peoples and their dispersal across the globe. Refugees in all their misery have become an all too common sight to the world.

Americans have been particularly touched by such scenes because we are a nation composed of the descendants of immigrants, who came to these shores largely to avoid persecution of many kinds. In effect, then, we are the descendants of refugees. And our country, concerned and compassionate, has time and again reached out the hand of assistance to such people. Our willingness to help has usually been in evidence, regardless of who those in need are and in spite of any special background they have possessed. Such behavior has become one of the hallmarks of America, and perhaps our special saving grace.

When one speaks of exiles, dispersal, refugees and persecution, however, one must again and again return to the original people to whom these words have a timeworn, unique meaning; the Jews.

For the past 20 centuries, they have written the original script in regard to these unhappy experiences. Every era has witnessed another kind of oppression directed at them. Every harsh regime has, for one reason or another, found it convenient to single them out for persecution. As one boundary was opened to them, another slammed shut. When one ruler allowed them to exist, another instituted calculated policies of violence against them.

In the Middle Ages, cruel discriminations and massacres were their lot, as mankind, its mind beclouded by superstition, took out its hatreds and fears upon these people. Capping centuries of agony was the inquisition, complete with torture, forced conversion and public executions of Jews, known as auto-da-fes. Yet worse awaited them.

As the last century drew to a close, one of the most tolerant, civilized societies in Europe was torn asunder by the Dreyfus Affair, as France exiled an innocent man whose sole crime was to be a Jew.

The memories of Nazi Germany are today still too vivid to be relegated to library shelves. Never before in modern recorded history had a great state mobilized its resources to annihilate a people, small in numbers, from the face of the Earth. Six million Jews, including 1 million small children, were systematically murdered by Germany.

From the ashes of Hitler's crematoriums arose the phoenix we know today as Israel. One of the first acts of that newly born democracy was to proclaim a policy known as the "Ingathering of the Exiles." In effect, it was the fulfillment of an ancient prophecy. From the four corners of the Earth, the Jewish people gathered from the Diaspora, or dispersal, to create a viable, vibrant free society, which today is one of the wonders of the world.

Surrounded on all sides save one by harsh regimes sworn to have her life's blood, this tiny state vigorously holds aloft the light of hope to all of these people who are victims of oppression. Since 1948, whenever Jews anywhere have been confronted by the cruelly familiar face of hate and violence, Israel has offered itself as an alternative, preventing a reoccurrence of what took place in the late thirties, when the Jews of Europe sought escape but found only closed doors and violent death.

Israel has become the door to life where before there was no alternative but surrender, resignation, and oblivion.

Today a new chapter is being written in Jewish history, replete with similarities to old persecutions. In Russia, whose history is replete with anti-Semitism, 3½ million Jews are not allowed to practice their faith. It is assimilate as the regime commands or face the consequences, which are unpleasant in the extreme.

Hundreds of thousands of these Jews, determined to live as they see fit in terms of religion and personal identity, have defied the regime in an unheard of manner.

It is to the everlasting credit of the United States that as a nation we have taken a stand on their behalf, contributing significantly to the grudging agreement of the Soviet regime to allow a trickle of these people to leave and seek new lives elsewhere, notably in Israel.

A new ingathering of the exiles is taking place daily in Israel, as planeloads of immigrants, quivering with hope, arrive in the land of their fathers. In all turth, the dream becomes reality and the words of the prophets come alive before our eyes.

America has done more than just speak up. She has done more than just seek the release of these people. Once released from Russia, their odyssey is just begun. Once in Israel, they must proceed to absorption centers. Housing is a vital necessity. Medical and nursing care must be provided. Training for some and retraining for others is essential if they are to be able to earn livings.

In all these elements of resettlement, the United States is playing a crucial role, mounting a $50 million program to assist these new immigrants. That program had its birth and approval in the Congress, and received strong backing from a wide variety of Members. Last week a number of contracts were let by our Government committing much of that assistance for this year. It could not have come at a more important moment.

Each of these people is in the tradition of the American immigrant. They seek the same things our forebears sought: Freedom, religious liberty and a chance to better themselves. It is altogether fitting for this Nation to extend the hand of assistance at this time in their experience.

There are a few voices raised against this dramatically successful undertaking. To them I must offer a voice from America's past. It belongs to a former Governor of Illinois named John Peter Altgeld, a Czech immigrant who might have been President but for his foreign birth.

When becoming governor, he investigated the trial and sentencing of the Haymarket bombing anarchists, who had been either hanged or sentenced to life terms because of their supposed role in that infamous affair. He discovered, as an attorney, that they had not received any kind of fair trial, and were, in all likelihood, totally innocent; in effect, sacrificial victims of the outcry of vengeance at someone's expense that went up at the time. Upon announcing his intention of pardoning the survivors, who had languished in prison for a number of years, his confidants and staff remonstrated against the move at length and with great passion, indicating that it would end his political career. He responded with a simple sentence, which suffices to explain why we do what we do regarding these refugees.

"I do this because it is right."

Those pardons cost Altgeld his career. But he is remembered today as one of the finest exemplars of what the American immigrant experience produced. It is worth pondering.

U.S. BOMBING OF CAMBODIA IN 1969 AND 1970

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the press reported on allegations made to the Senate Armed Services Committee that limited bombing was conducted in Cambodia in late 1969 and early 1970, before the Cambodian incursion of the spring of 1970 and at a time when the United States officially regarded Cambodia as "neutral."

The question of the wisdom of concealing these military operations from the American public at the time is a complex one, and one which can be hotly debated. I should like, however, to consider whether the bombings themselves—which the Pentagon has admitted took place—were permissible from the point of view of international legality. The press at least implies that they were not.

The issue in this case is now whether Cambodia had formally proclaimed its neutrality under Prince Sihanouk, as it did, or whether the United States claimed to respect that neutrality, at least in principle. The issue is whether the theoretically neutral country of Cambodia was in fact being used as a staging and supply ground for Vietcong and North Vietnamese attacks on South Vietnam.

The Cambodian incursion of late April 1970 showed conclusively to all who would not recognize it earlier, that Cambodian territory was in fact being used for such purposes. It is irrelevant whether Cambodia permitted this use of its territory or was unable to prevent it: the important point is that Cambodia was involved in the Southeast Asian belligerency in fact. Cambodian neutrality at that time was a sham neutrality, a figleaf which, unfortunately, the United States was willing to respect for too long a time.

Given the fact that Cambodia was indeed involved in supporting and supplying Communist troops in their aggression against South Vietnam, there is nothing in international law which would forbid military action against Cambodia, either in the form of carefully limited bombing strikes or the very restricted Cambodian incursion of the spring of 1970, which aroused such misguided indignation in this country. This elementary principle of international law stands in need of restatement. The United States and South Vietnamese military were quite justified in doing what they did in late 1969, in the winter of 1970, in the spring of 1970 and since, from the point of view of military necessity and international law.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 14th anniversary of the national observance of Captive Nations week. Hence, it is particularly appropriate at this time that we understand the frustration and desperation that confronts the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania, who must live under Soviet domination of their economies, political institutions, and private lives.

Need we be reminded of how ruthlessly the Soviets established their control after World War II? Need we be reminded the steps they have taken in recent years to maintain control of these small defenseless countries?

The seed of nationalism remains in the minds of these oppressed people. And although we observe their plight for only 1 week out of the year, we must continually remind ourselves that we, as the arsenal of democracy, are their friends. Even though this week of captive nations comes in the shadow of talks between the United States and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, we must continue to be aware of the denial of these peoples' freedoms.

Some 32 years ago, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt presented to Congress, and to all the oppressed people of the world, four freedoms, freedoms that we, as Americans, cherish. The people of the captive nations cannot enjoy those freedoms. Freedom of expression and speech—their press is censored. Freedom to worship—the Communists' governments do not allow free exercise of religion. Freedom from want—the Communists now rely upon American agricultural products for their existence. Freedom from fear—the people of these captive nations live in everyday fear that the police will imprison them for no reason.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we, as the representatives of the American people, encourage and support the freedom that the people of the captive nations deserve and have a right to expect.

AXEL SPRINGER INTERVIEWED ON BERLIN BY L'EXPRESS—PART I

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the noted West German publisher, Mr. Axel Springer, who has become a symbol of Berlin's determination to remain free, was recently interviewed by the French magazine L'Express on the 20th anniversary of the revolt in Berlin. This interview appeared on pages 70–78 of the June 18 issue of that magazine and this English translation was prepared with the permission of L'Express. His comments are certainly pertinent as the Congress and the President consider our future role in Europe and the best course to follow in negotiations with the Soviet Union. The first part of the interview follows:

AXEL SPRINGER INTERVIEWED ON BERLIN BY L'EXPRESS—PART I

L'EXPRESS. Twenty years ago, on June 17, 1953, Berlin rose against the Soviet troops. How is Berlin now, twenty years later?

Mr. Brezhnev has just visited West Germany for the first time. Chancellor Willy Brandt has—for the first time—paid an official visit to Israel. And when this interview appears. Mr. Nixon and Mr. Brezhnev will be meeting in the United States.

You, who have staked everything on Berlin who live in and for Berlin, who have become a kind of "Monsieur Berlin"—how do you view from here the great changes which have happened in the world.

AXEL SPRINGER. Yesterday I put on a black suit and went to the funeral of a little boy. This five-year-old had fallen into the River Spree, which at that particular point belongs to East Berlin, while the bank on this side is West Berlin territory. Nobody helped him. The West Berlin police had no right to intervene, and those of East Berlin had to consult their superiors first. So this little boy drowned.

It is the second child that this very simple family has lost, for a daughter was killed and the murderer threw the body into the Spree almost at the same spot.

I interested myself in this family and went to the funeral. It was a painful surprise to see that this time I was the only one. Ten years ago one would have seen the mayor of Berlin there as well. That is no longer so.

L'EXPRESS. Will you celebrate the 20th anniversary of the 1953 uprising in Berlin, as you do every year?

AXEL SPRINGER. I will. But our government now prefers to display great discretion with regard to all these things.

When I came to Berlin—called upon by the then mayor, Willy Brandt, who feared that the isolated city would be abandoned—there were huge demonstrations in front of the Reichstag every year on May the first, Labor Day. Like many others, I marched with the workers. All the parties spoke of liberty. Once a black singer was engaged to sing a song about freedom. Those were great times for Berlin.

In the other part of Berlin the German Communist Army marched the goose step in uniforms which recalled for some the old Wehrmacht, for others the Russian Army's. They marched, although their presence was a breach of the Allied agreements on Berlin. Today, they still go on marching. But we on this side of the wall unobstrusively held a meeting of the trade unions in a closed hall of the Radio House on May 1. That is all.

You have to be a dreamer to live in hope in this city.

L'EXPRESS. To dream of what?

AXEL SPRINGER. An Israeli friend, a distinguished scientist, recently sent a book with the following inscription: "It's an old story, but remains for ever true: Only the dreamers of great dreams are the creators of the future." Berlin must survive. Berlin is the heart of Europe—I know no other. That is the constant vision, the obsession, with which one must be filled. It is by Berlin's survival, its elan, that one will be able to measure the value of any policies, whatever they are. To measure, for example, the value for the future of liberty. If it has a future.

L'EXPRESS. In this future the Soviet Union will play a great part, at least for Berlin?

AXEL SPRINGER. I would like to remind you that many years ago, in 1958, I went to Moscow to help create better relations with the Russians. I had consulted about it with leading members of the Bundestag. It is, of course, an urgent necessity to establish good and significant relations with Moscow.

But one must not forget that the present Soviet Ambassador in Bonn has several times in the past stated that the integration of the entire city of Berlin, within the Eastern empire is only a matter of time, that this process is part of the logic of history . . . As a German I have learned to give great attention to statements by totalitarian states. They always say aloud, what their goals really are. Far too many people, however, do not want to believe it.

The "New York Times", a newspaper which closely observes developments in Berlin, recently wrote that the problems of Berlin seen in the framework of a wider politics between East and West, were apparently minimal, but that they were decisive questions on which the survival of a free Europe depended. And that the Chancellor should have insisted on clear guarantees for Berlin when he was dealing with Mr. Brezhnev. I fully agree with the "New York Times" on this point.

L'EXPRESS. Why this Springer House in the heart of Berlin, why this passion and this risk, why did you come to Berlin?

AXEL SPRINGER. I am not a Berliner by birth; I have become one since. When the Berlin situation became dramatic, on the eve of what has been called "the second Berlin crisis", during the so called Khrushchev ultimatum, I came here. I did so against the advice of all my staff. And I did it, totally, without reservation and for ever, and for one reason only:

The independence of this city is vital for the future of the entire West, to the future of every free society in Europe, perhaps in the world. The life of Berlin, that is the sign. And this sign was menaced by death twenty years ago; just as today it runs the risk of being menaced in another way. There must be no illusions.

When in 1961 I had made my decision to go on building despite the wall, Willy Brandt wrote me a letter: "Dear Mr. Springer, I just wanted to say a word in this way of my personal and official joy at your plans in Berlin. You will surely not mind if we describe you as an example of German investment in Berlin." Such was the climate at that time.

I want to say clearly that for many years of my life I have been closer to the Social Democratic Party than to any other.

During the National Socialist Regime I managed not to be called up as a soldier. That was pretty difficult for a "tall blond from the north". I went under cover with my parents in the Lueneburger Heath. My relations to Germany as a young man were deeply disturbed. I aspired to freedom of speech. I dreamed of freedom of expression. But I had to submit like everybody else.

The Swastika flag waved over every city in my country and very soon over Europe, and yet I built in my dreams the publishing house which I hoped one day to found. The letters I wrote to my friends at the time (in a converted stable) were always signed: "Your 'Giant Publisher' Axel Springer".

My parents were a little worried. My father sometimes said to my mother: "I believe our son is mad. But my mother, an absolutely wonderful woman, always answered: "With Axel you never know. Who knows?"

After the Nazi nightmare it was some of the well-known Social Democrats, Ernst Reuter and others, who reconciled me to Germany. Because I had gone through their school I could become a German again. And that is why I went to Berlin later, when "things went badly", although I am not a Berliner. This city is the heart of Germany.

L'EXPRESS. When did the influence of Social Democrats like Ernst Reuter begin to work on you?

AXEL SPRINGER. After the war Ernst Reuter, Wilhelm Kaisen and Max Brauer helped me to find my cordial and emotional contact with my country again. Max Brauer was like my spiritual foster father. Like me, he comes from Altona, near Hamburg.

Before this building in Berlin was inaugurated I visited the Mayor of Jerusalem, my friend Teddy Kollek. He took me to the roof of his office. There he told me that in the event of a future reunification of Jerusalem it was imperative to stay as close as possible to the notorious wall and build. I replied, "What are you telling to whom?"

Incidentally, one of the most impressive moments I ever experienced was directly after the six days' war when I walked at five o'clock in the morning with Teddy Kollek round the Arab Quarter of Jerusalem. Afterwards I was so moved that for two hours I could not speak. After this visit I went to the Vatican at the request of Israeli friends to plead for the cause of the reunification of Jerusalem—quite unusual for a German and a Protestant at that. But for me these two dedicated cities, Berlin and Jerusalem, are bound together by destiny.

Let me say now a few words about France.

The day my family learned of the defeat of France was one of our blackest days. For we could not grasp how a "valet"—Hitler—could become the ruler over Paris, this symbol of liberty. The thought was unbearable.

Now I am sorry I do not know France very well. Born on the outskirts of Hamburg, I am more oriented towards England. But I can promise Mr. Pompidou that he will never need to use the Force de Frappe against Germany. . . . .

Here in Berlin the French troops have always behaved exemplarily. Relations with the local population are excellent. Every year on July 14th there is the Franco-German People's Fete, a brilliant event.

In the other provinces of Germany there is not the same reception on this scale, not the same open spirit. Berlin is the only real metropolis in Germany.

L'EXPRESS. Are you afraid that Chancellor Brandt may go further than you believe would be good for the freedom of Germany? More precisely, what gives you most concern with regard to Germany and of course Berlin in the present state of world history?

AXEL SPRINGER. Willy Brandt certainly does not wish to make any decision which would have negative consequences for Germany. But despite this, it may happen.

I believe that the building of the wall, the inactivity of the protecting powers, particularly of the Americans, gave Willy Brandt a shock. His apprehensions have grown that some day America may leave Europe in the lurch. When the Social Democrat Floor Leader, Herbert Wehner, once spoke about this in the Bundestag, Brandt applauded demonstratively. This present misgiving in regard to the Americans is the germ of the Ostpolitik, this concern which has grown into a conviction that the Soviet Union either is, or soon will be the dominant political and military factor in Europe.

It is obvious—and I said before that we must reach detente with the countries of the East. But a detente policy pushed through in haste, whose result gives the other side far, far more advantages than it gives us, I just cannot support.

When I was with Khrushchev in Moscow in 1958, he revealed the Soviets' long-term plans for Germany quite openly. What was aspired to then has now been laid down in the treaties. What has been lauded everywhere as the new German Ostpolitik is really nothing but a—unfortunately only too successful—Soviet Westpolitik.

In a speech, I once contrasted the "Pax Sovietica" for Europe which Moscow is heading for and the "Pax Americana" I would like to see. A letter writer corrected me: We should aim at a "Pax Europeana", a peace settlement for Europe closely associated with America. I would be glad to subscribe to that.

Detente with the East under conditions which really will lower tensions is something we should talk about. And also about conditions that everybody can accept with all their hearts.

Berlin could be an example, a test case, the key to everything. We will and should talk about that.

I have studied the possibilities for economic cooperation between Germany and the Soviet Union. I have ascertained that in these German-Soviet exchanges we have long been the ones who have given the most in advance. This would, in itself, not be a bad thing if our other engagements did not suffer because of it.

What counts today in the long view—beyond texts, treaties and diplomacy—is economic development. Since the war we Germans and the Japanese have been quick to recognize this. The Americans showed us the way. All the free countries of Europe have taken this path.

The Soviets, too, know that the future lies in the economy. Years ago, Konrad Adenauer told me that one of the Soviet's goals was to tie the West German economic capacity to that of the East. The Soviets would then have won the conflict with the West.

Limited to their own forces they will never manage to outstrip the West. They have not managed to do so in 50 years. That is why they are so extraordinarily interested in economic collaboration with Western countries. Economic questions dominate Brezhnev's visit to Bonn, just as they do the visit to Washington.

I say, conditionally, "Yes" to economic cooperation, one can almost call it economic aid. However the prerequisite is that the economy is not used as a vehicle for domination.

What part can Berlin play in such a framework of economic cooperation? Let us speak about that later.

Today Berlin is a threatened, secondary scene of German and international East-West politics. The Soviets and their allies, particularly East Berlin, try for instance to exclude West Berlin from all agreements which concern West Germany. If we allow that, we have lost the battle. If we were to allow Berlin to decline, the way would actually be free for the Kermlin's expansionist policy. What we in the West need is firmness and perseverance.

For two thousand years the Jews in the world have been saying: "Do not forget Jerusalem". It is this thought which has helped them to survive despite all resistance against them, and all tragedies. For each of us the word for the future must be: "Do not forget Berlin."

From this an extraordinarily vast field can open up. I am personally acquainted with the fate of Pasternak. And of course I know the fate that the persecuted writers and others in the Soviet Union are suffering. As a German, I am particularly sensitive when free men are in captivity. We must do everything to help them, to open up their prisons.

If the "opening to the East" leads to the "opening of the prisons" then we will have the correct Ostpolitik. In this Ostpolitik I could fully agree with Willy Brandt.

It may seem strange to speak of morality in our age, but I like to classify all political ideas according to an ethical scale of values. You can see at the back of my office a portrait of Bismarck. He was without doubt a great man, but naturally he applied the methods of a different century. He tried to realize the dream of German unity. He opposed the German Princes and even his King in order to impose his ideas, and in the euphoria of victory had the German Reich proclaimed in Versailles, not in Berlin.

This Reich has gone. It will only arise again—in a purified form—when the place of power is taken by morality. Then one will again see all of Germany again united for the sake of freedom, and integrated in a free Europe. I am convinced of this. I would gladly live to see this happen, but if not, my son will be there.

I want to stress that I long with all my heart for the reunification of Germany, but I am not a fanatic or reunification. If the Germans on the other side of the wall lived in freedom, I would not be upset at having to show my identity card when I crossed the boundary.

As a result of the Second World War, for which we were responsible, two German states? All right with me, if freedom and human rights are guaranteed in both.

The day when the basic treaty, the Grundvertrag, between the two German states was initialled I was visited by the Ambassador of a great power who seemed to regard the partition of Germany into two states as a natural thing. We had a very lively discussion. I told him it was not so much a matter of Germany; it was a matter of a part of Europe which must live in freedom. This Europe can only be realized in mutual respect and provided that each helps the other. Here in Berlin the idea of such a Europe falls on fruitful ground.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week of July 15–21 has been set aside as Captive Nations Week. Once again, for the 15th time since the observance began in 1959, we honor those European nations whose people reach out for freedom and cannot seem to grasp it.

My colleagues and I all know the contributions made to civilization by citizens of these countries and their descendants. In my own district, those of central and eastern European origin are counted among the most outstanding and patriotic residents and I am sure that this is true in many other areas.

These men and women have brought to their new country all the virtues of the Old World and have joined their neighbors in helping to make the United States the great nation which it is. But at the same time, these people look back into their pasts and see what has become of the lands of their parents and grandparents—shut off from the rest of the world and locked out of the brotherhood of free nations through no fault of their own. And for 1 week each year descendants of the captive nations ask that all Americans join with them in their efforts to make these nations free once more.

Mr. Speaker, scarcely 2 weeks ago we celebrated the independence of our country with fireworks, parades, and picnics. Families came together to enjoy a day devoted to the celebration of freedom. During this coming week let us turn our thoughts to the family of man and work toward that day when we may all join together throughout the world to enjoy the freedom which only a few now know.

IN DEFENSE OF SHORT HAIR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a devote of the American "crewcut", I especially was interested in an article in the Monday, July 16, issue of the Evening Star and News, by Russell Baker. The tremendous effectiveness of the editorial should be recognized.

IN DEFENSE OF SHORT HAIR

(By Russell Baker)

This is in defense of zeal, Madison Avenue, short hair and Southern California. It is not a spirited defense. How could it be? It is no pleasure defending Madison Avenue. One rises in court depressingly aware that it is Madison Avenue that has committed commercial television in the first degree. Southern California which regularly commits grave offenses against taste.

In brief, one rises in court with a heavy heart, but with a nagging sense of a man's obligation not to acquiesce silently in foolishness.

In the facile generalizations about the Watergate affair, they are painted as prime villains. Zeal, for example, is frequently blamed for causing the whole affair.

The Nixon people were the first to try to hang the rap on zeal. When Watergate was still a mere "caper," they explained it as a simple case of zeal gone astray. "'Oh, maybe a few overzealous White House flunkies have overstepped the bounds. Still hardly a federal case.'")

As matters became graver, White House defenders became tougher with zeal. Explaining how such princes as Haldeman and Ehrlichman could have been involved, they found a moral lesson to expound. Too much zeal. Very bad stuff, all that zeal.

Nowadays zeal is commonly spoken of as an offense comparable to the mutilation of small children.

Columnists, bounded by their trade to find universal lessons thrice weekly in meaningless events, have eaten so well off zeal that the more reckless are beginning to say there will be much less zeal in future elections.

Here is a flat prediction that is absolutely certain to prove correct: There will be just as much zeal (maybe more) in the 1976 presidential campaign as there was in the 1972 campaign.

Presidential campaigns run on zeal. Eugene McCarthy, who saw the corruption of it, has been denounced ever since by his young idealists for "not wanting it enough" to emulate the zeal of the Kennedys. Kennedy campaigns were famous for zeal, but when Kennedy zealots did unpleasant things to elect their man they were said to be practicing "pragmatism," a doctrine that is always praised in Washington-type circles.

The generalization about Madison Avenue—the ad-man mentality—being the real root of Watergate is not worth long argument, for truckloads of facts will not stop Americans from ascribing disagreeable political events to Madison Avenue. Briefly then: John Mitchell is not an ad man, but a lawyer; so is Ehrlichman; so is Dean; so is the President.

Ah, but the real root of the business is Southern California, you see. Place breeds this sort of thing; with its birchers, freeway culture, boobs racing off to drive-in, human-sacrifice ceremonies. That's what gave us Watergate-ism, Nixon and all.

In fact, as Carey McWilliams noted recently on the op-ed page of the New York Times, McGovern carried Los Angeles in 1972 and Nixon has never been able to establish a stable political base in California.

Finally, hair. Nobody is actually saying that Nixon-esque short hair caused Watergate, though it may yet come to that. The close barbering of all the characters involved in Watergate has, however, begun to make a neat hairline suspect. Parents begin to report that the hairy son's squelch to the plea to thin his knotted locks is becoming: Do you want me to grow up to be like that Watergate gang?"

This is bad—tonsorial tidiness falling victim to guilt by association. It can also be depressing if young people, who have had to listen to old folks' bigotry about hair for years, are going to take up the line that hair makes the man.

The moral—this being a newspaper column, there must be one—is that we ought to resist Watergate's temptation for us to draw nonsensical morals about man and hair, and about almost everything else that soothes a good old prejudice while making the wits nod.

IN MEMORY OF FRIDGE L. JESTER

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii mourns the loss of a special friend, Mr. Fridge L. Jester, who passed away on the morning of June 6. Mr. Jester originally served with the office of the Doorkeeper from 1955 to 1957. He rejoined the office in 1961 to serve as attendant to the Capitol Prayer Room until his retirement in 1970. It was while he was serving in this capacity that I became acquainted with Mr. Jester.

Since I first came to Congress in 1963, I have been particularly interested in the Prayer Room. As many of my colleagues know, on April 4, 1965, a Buddhist memorial service was held in the Prayer Room for my father. This history-making service was conducted by Rev. Shojo Honda, formerly of Hawaii, now a Washington, D.C. resident.

During Fridge Jester's years as attendant to the Capitol Prayer Room, a close attachment developed between him and the frequent visitors from Hawaii. To these visitors Mr. Jester's personalized greeting, often expressed in the Hawaiian tongue, was a warm reminder of aloha hospitality in their home State.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, and for myself, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of Fridge Jester who served the Congress and the Nation with great dedication. May he rest in peace.

OPEN LETTER TO MOBIL OIL CO.

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Mobil Oil Co. ran ads last week in the hometown newspaper of every Member of Congress setting forth their position on why we have an energy crisis.

I took the liberty of publicly answering their "open letter" and ask that it be printed below together with a copy of the ad as it appeared:

[Mobil Oil Co. Advertisement]

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 tnan 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 every 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 doubteless 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 marketeers have in the past chosen to rely on day-to-day purchases of gasoline from oil companies instead 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.

JULY 11, 1973.

Mr. RAWLEIGH WARNER, Jr.,
Chairman and Executive Officer,
Mobil Oil Corp.,
New, York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WARNER: Today your company ran a newspaper ad in my hometown newspaper, the Wausau Daily Record Herald, to "set the record straight" on the gasoline shortage and to blame the present crisis "on political decisions" over which you "had no control" rather than on shortcomings of the American oil industry.

That "open letter" is evidently part of a national campaign by Mobil which includes the placement of ads in the hometown newspapers of every Member of Congress in the country.

Because I do not have the financial resources available to Mobil Oil Corp., I cannot afford to answer your ad with one of my own. I would like, however, to respond to your company's ad with a few questions of my own regarding the assertions in your open letter.

MOBIL AD CLAIM A

All charges that the gasoline shortage is a manufactured shortage are untrue.

Question: But, is it not true that for years the oil industry has vigorously opposed the one action that could have prevented a shortage of oil and gas in this country, namely the elimination of the oil import quota system which for 13 years has restricted the supply of oil in this country and made your profit-making easier?

Has not the current "shortage", in fact, been a convenient excuse for improving the competitive position of the major oil companies by pushing upwards of 1200 independent dealers out of business in the past five months—competitors who often were selling gas across the street from the major dealers for from 4¢ to 6¢ cheaper than the major prices?

Do you really expect the American public to believe that Mobil and other oil companies regret the elimination of your competition?

How do you respond to New York State's chief anti-trust officer who recently pointed out in hearings in Washington that gas reserves totaled 202.5 million barrels as of June 1, 1973, but that least year—when no "crisis" existed—stocks were 1.6 million to 9.6 million barrels less?

MOBIL AD CLAIM B

The present shortage is not a conspiracy of the major producers and there is, in fact, vigorous competition in the oil industry.

Question: What about the just released Federal Trade Commission staff report which concluded after a two year study that major oil firms do not compete on price, "consistently appear to cooperate rather than compete in all phases of their operation," and have "attempted to increase profits by restricting output"?

Just what competition has there been other than advertising cleaner restrooms and glassware givaway programs?

MOBIL AD CLAIM C

Environmentalists are responsible for the present shortage because of their resistance to the development of U.S. government offshore oil reserves.

Question: Do you deny the facts contained in the just released General Accounting Office report in which that agency is highly critical of the haphazard regulations and inspections governing present offshore oil drilling operations; facts which indicated that the Geological Survey, which is responsible for regulating oil drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf, provided no formal training for those who inspected the offshore drilling operation; that only 4 of 69 oil-producing structures in 1972 were re-inspected within the required 6 month interval; and that those companies who had leased offshore lands from the government were slow to take corrective action where violations of drilling regulations occurred?

Is not the real answer to these problems oil companies support for greatly improved regulations and inspections of offshore operations, and by committing additional research to both prevention and clean-up of future oil spills?

MOBIL AD CLAIM D

Environmentalists have also been responsible for the shortage by their opposition to the Alaskan pipeline.

Question: Is it not true that the President of Atlantic-Richfield oil company himself, on a national television program, publicly credited environmentalists with pressuring the oil companies into substantially improving their proposed construction techniques for the trans-Alaskan pipeline, thereby enabling them to build a much safer line?

Why are the oil companies so opposed to a pipeline through Canada, which I support, which will ship oil to the section of the country which most needs that oil, the Midwest?

Is it not true that if a pipeline is constructed from Proudhoe Bay to Valdez, rather than across Canada to the Midwest, all the Alaskan oil will be shipped to the U.S. west coast which will then have more oil than it can use? And is there not then a much greater likelihood because of the high cost of transporting that oil to the Midwest, that much of the new Alaskan oil could be sold by oil companies to Japan at a good price?

If Congress authorizes the construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline, which will put oil on the west coast, would your company support a prohibition on the export of any of that oil?

MOBIL AD CLAIM:

The government's anti-pollution regulations are helping to cause the gasoline shortage.

Question: Is it not true that President Nixon's own appointee to head the Council on Environmental Quality, Russell Train, remarked just last month that emission controls account for only 7% of increased fuel consumption by automobiles and that added weight and air conditioning have, in fact, had a greater impact on the gas mileage than exhaust emission controls?

Do you disagree with the results of an EPA study which found that a change of only 500 pounds in weight of 1973 vehicles—from 3,000 to 3,500 pounds—can lower the mileage from an average of 16.2 miles per gallon to 14.0 miles per gallon, a decrease in fuel economy of nearly 14%?

Do you not agree that increased fuel consumption traceable to emission control systems could have been partly avoided if Detroit had dropped its stubborn resistance to change, reduced its advertising budgets and increased its research budgets to develop new kinds of automobile engines?

Mr. Warner, I will agree that all of the blame for the energy crisis certainly does not fall on the shoulders of the major oil companies in this country, and that political decisions—or the lack of them—have in fact been one of the root causes of the present energy crunch. It is certainly true that we have not had a President as long as I have been in politics who has shown any basic understanding of the energy problems in this country, and the Congress has not been much better.

I agree with you that legislative action is required, but I suspect that the legislative prescription I would require would be quite different from your own. We could do a great deal to solve the energy crisis by: (1) dramatically increasing the amount of money we spend on research to develop alternate sources of power; (2) refusing to guarantee huge increases in profits to the major oil and gas producers in hopes they will beneficiently do more exploration and development of American oil reserves; (3) by having the government itself develop the offshore oil and gas reserves and oil reserves on federally-owned lands which both, after all, belong to the American people and not the American oil manufacturers; and (4) by prohibiting the complete wellhead-to-gas pump control that major oil companies now have over their products.

Vertical integration, especially in the energy industry, is a dangerous, monopolistic practice which places in the hands of a very few American corporations, including your own, almost life and death control over the American economy. It seems to me that politicians ought to own up to their past mistakes which, as I see it, have been not in their resistance to the suggestions of the oil industry, but rather in their almost total capitulation to its suggestions, demands and its economic interests.

In closing, let me say that I find your company's ad novel in only one respect: you are trying to do publicly what the major oil companies have been doing privately and very successfully over the past 20 years—controlling the Congress and the decisions it makes about your industry.

Finally, since you've taken the liberty to write me, in addition to answering the above questions, I would like to have the answers to three others: first, how much did this entire ad "campaign" cost those who purchase Mobil products; second, how does that expenditure compare with the amount of money Mobil or its executives have previously spent by contributing to Presidential or Congressional campaigns in an effort to affect decisions made in Washington; and third, do you regard this coast-to-coast propaganda campaign as a so-called "ordinary and necessary" business expense to be deducted from the company's taxable income?

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. OBEY,
Member of Congress.

TRINITY CHURCH AT 100

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, the members of Trinity Church, Lime Rock, Conn., along with their friends and neighbors, celebrated the 100th anniversary of the laying of the church's cornerstone.

In the past century Trinity has stood as a center of religious worship and a focal point of community activity. The church was designed by Richard Upjohn, and his son—the same architects who designed the State capitol building in Hartford. One of the founders of the church was William H. Barnum, U.S. Senator from 1876 to 1879.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of this auspicious occasion, I would like to insert the following article in the RECORD. The attached article from the Lakeville Journal, by Faith Campbell recount highlights in the history of this beautiful Connecticut landmark:

TRINITY CHURCH AT 100

(By Faith Campbell)

Trinity Church in Lime Rock launched its Centennial Year Tuesday evening, celebrating the 100th anniversary of the laying of the church cornerstone.

Members of the parish, friends and neighbors turned out for the event, which was the first of several planned for this anniversary year.

After a beautiful concert and cantata by the Boys' and Girls' Choir of St. Michael's Church, who had come from Litchfield to perform "Joseph and His Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat," a visit was paid to the cornerstone.

Sealed inside it are a prayer book, church almanac, copies of "The Churchman" for 1873 and of "The Connecticut Western News," for July 4 of that year. It also contains cards of the Bishop of Connecticut, who presided at the first service on the site of the church, and of other attending churchmen, including the Rev. William Allen Johnson, rector of St. John's, Salisbury, in whose parish the new church was built.

LIME ROCK THEN

At the time when the idea of an Episcopal Church for Lime Rock first took shape, this was an industrial village, its mills powered by a series of falls where the Salmon Kill descended to The Hollow.

Its furnaces were supplied with high-grade ore from Ore Hill, fluxed by limestone from local quarries and fired by heat from charcoal made in the forests of Sharon Mountain.

The two families who ran all this business, the Barnums and the Richardsons, had built up much of the village. It was a model company town with its rows of neat small houses for workers, great houses for the managers, and recreational areas where company teams played baseball and everyone could listen to band concerts on summer evenings.

The post office, general store, barbershop and even the railroad station (two miles east of the carwheel shops) with its long loading platform, were all tied in to the nationally-important manufacturing of the village.

William H. Barnum, one of the owners, was already an important figure in state and national Democratic politics.

There had been a small church on Barnum Avenue (now White Hollow Road) supplied by Methodist ministers. The Barnums and the Richardsons and some other families, however, attended St. John's, driving their stylish carriages over six miles of dusty rutted roads in summer, and icy drifted roads in winter.

HOW THE CHURCH BEGAN

Julia Emmons Goodwin, in her "History of Trinity Church" (1949), wrote that it was Mrs. Barnum's determination that Lime Rock should have its own Episcopal Church that brought Trinity into being.

"She interviewed the heads of the Protestant families and secured so many pledges of support that her husband told her to carry out her idea and he would finance the undertaking."

James and Julia Goodwin Ensign gave a parcel of land from the Goodwin farm, on the main road just opposite the cemetery. Richard Upjohn was asked to design the church.

THE ARCHITECT

Upjohn had been designing great churches modeled on English Gothic revival lines and was a leading architect of the time. Although he had done beautiful Trinity Church in New York at the head of Wall Street, on Broadway, many imposing private residences, and was the founder and first president of the American Institute of Architects, he also loved to design small country churches.

His plans for Trinity, Lime Rock, showed his loving care. For it he chose tan sandstone from a quarry on Sharon Mountain. According to Miss Goodwin, there was great interest all during its building: "when the time came to raise the bell, a large crowd gathered to watch two yokes of oxen pull the rope that lifted it to its place in the belfry."

The church was completed and consecrated Nov. 4, 1874, and in May, 1875, the parish was separated from St. John's. The first rector was the Rev. Millidge P. Walker.

GOOD YEARS AND LEAN

The church has had its full years and its lean. A funeral of national interest was held there in May, 1889, when William H. Barnum died. Attending the funeral was ex-President Grover Cleveland, who gave the eulogy; so many important men in the state and national Democratic parties came that the church couldn't hold the crowds.

During its first 100 years Trinity Church has improved its fabric, built a series of parish houses (the present one was completed in 1962, and later named in honor of A. Scott Walker, senior warden emeritus and son of the first rector); built a rectory, designed to harmonize with the lines of the church; added a rector's office to the parish house wing in 1971, and a new garage in 1972.

AN ACTIVE PARISH

To support itself, the congregation and its active Woman's Auxiliary put on a yearly Christmas pageant in the 1940s. Since then the annual Shrove Tuesday Pancake Lunch and the famous Salisbury Antiques Fair have been important to the community as well as to the church. (The Fair will have its 17th production the first weekend in October).

The goal for the Centennial year is to bring the Endowment Fund to $100,000. Special festivals and events to help achieve that goal are still in the planning stage.

HON. DOLPH BRISCOE, GOVERNOR OF TEXAS, SPEECH TO MIDWESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Dolph Briscoe, Governor of the State of Texas, addressed the Midwestern Governors' Conference on July 9, 1973, at their meeting in Rapid City, S. Dak. His subject was our energy crisis, the critical energy shortage, and his views as to the course of action we should take.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Governor's remarks:

ADDRESS BY GOV. DOLPH BRISCOE

Governor Ray—I am honored to be invited to address this most distinguished group of State leaders on the most critical problem of energy shortages our Nation now faces. It is a subject of vital concern to me, to you and to the welfare of this great Nation. And it is a problem that has been building up for more than twenty years, due largely to a lack of effective national leadership to formulate a comprehensive national energy policy which could have prevented the situation we now face from ever occurring.

We have not done this, so today we are running *out of gas—and oil*—and we have run out of time and the Country is in trouble. We have dealt in stop-gap measures in times of crisis and then quickly abandoned them when the crisis subsided.

In my judgment, most of our problems today have been generated by a series of errors in the past.

The abundant supply of natural gas and the low cost, which is due to Federal Power Commission well head pricing, have served to stimulate the demand for gas, keep the price of oil severely depressed, and have driven coal almost completely out of the domestic market.

Natural gas is today our cleanest and most desirable fuel, and this un-natural restriction of price by governmental control has resulted in lavish and wasteful use which now threatens to exhaust the supply. If the government were to require that cadillacs and chevrolets be sold for the same price, there would, doubtless, be few Chevrolets sold, and they would soon be out of production. In effect, this is what federal price control has done in the use of natural gas as opposed to coal and oil.

Probably, the most serious error of all was the veto of the bill passed by Congress in 1956 that would have freed natural gas from the disastrous effect of the Federal Power Commission's well head pricing. It forced an alien system of economics upon our traditional concept of free enterprise and attempted to place a commodity—natural gas—into a form of utility regulation.

This action changed the energy consuming habits of both industry and the homeowner.

For example, in 1950, fossil fuels supplied some ninety-seven percent of the total energy requirements of this Country. Today, with energy requirements much greater, fossil fuels still provide ninety-eight percent of the Nation's total energy requirements—but in very different proportions.

In 1950, coal, which is today our most abundant source of fuel and energy, contributed thirty-eight percent; now it contributes only twenty percent.

Natural gas contributed twenty percent in 1950, and has risen to thirty-three percent—while during this same period, oil moved from thirty-nine percent to forty-five percent.

The remaining three percent in 1950 was a product of hydro-electric power, which has not significantly increased in more than twenty years, and with the addition of nuclear power, the two combined furnish the remaining two percent at the present time.

If during this period, coal's share in the energy market had risen ten to twelve percentage points—instead of an eighteen percent decline, we would now be in good shape.

Artificially low prices imposed on the petroleum industry and the impact of other regulations at the federal level are largely responsible.

Certainly also, the reduction of the oil depletion allowance and the continuous threat of reducing other tax incentives for investors have acted to slow down exploration for new wells by the oil and gas industry, and to reduce the investment of needed capital by outside investors into high risk drilling programs. Recent considerations before the National Congress—which would provide that intangible drilling costs can no longer be expended for individuals who are not primarily in the oil business—has already discouraged drilling investments, and is further slowing down our already lagging domestic exploration program.

The uncertainty over delivery of crude oil and uncertainty over the type of gasoline that will be permissible under EPA regulations means that for the first time in recent history, no new refineries are presently under construction and haven't been for five years—even though the demand for petroleum products continues to increase. And it now takes about three years to get siting approval on a refinery and about ten years to build a nuclear power plant.

Surely the clash between environmentalists and energy proponents has helped to cause our shortage. Environmental concerns have blocked the way for offshore oil production and construction of the Alaskan pipeline. Also, more and more rules are being enforced to prevent the use of coal because of undesirable effects on the environment—and coal is today our most abundant source of fuel and energy.

Environmental considerations are crucial—but they do not override all other considerations. This Nation must reclaim its land and preserve its environment, and at the same time provide the fuel necessary to meet our needs, and I am convinced that we can do both—safely and effectively.

The fuel needs of all of the states must be met whether we are a producing or solely a consumer state.

As Governor of an energy-producing State, I intend to do everything in my power to see that this is done and to seek solutions to both onr short and long range problems.

Today, Texas is supplying approximately twenty-five percent of the total energy demands of this Nation. More than one-half of the natural gas produced in Texas is transported out-of-state, and yet it is ironic that the State—which once literally sat upon one of the largest reserves of oil and gas in the world—now finds it is one of the first to feel the crippling effects of an inadequate gas supply.

The President, the National Congress, all of our Governors, federal and state agencies, environmentalist and conservation groups, the energy industry and business leaders in general must all pull together to solve our energy problems and the time to act is now.

First, we must move strongly to conserve our energy and fuel supplies.

I feel that state government should set the example and on June eighth, I appointed General Jim Rose of my staff to head up a State Energy Conservation Task Force involving all of the two hundred and forty state agencies in a massive and aggressive program of conservation.

All State Agencies have been directed to implement strict and effective conservation plans, and we are disseminating all of the known conservation ideas to the agencies.

We have called for a thirty percent reduction in the use of electrical power with all known economy measures in force at all times.

Working through our Board of Control, which handles State purchasing and contracting, we have established a control over the distribution of gasoline and diesel fuel to State Agencies, holding them to last year's levels.

In meeting with our largest agencies Thursday, we have found that they can live with these amounts without reducing essential services.

We are developing an intensive public service advertising and promotion program for energy conservation which will involve a series of television and radio spots, printed ads for newspapers, trade publications, pamphlets and useful give-away items. This publicity program will be State-Wide in scope and projected to develop an "Awareness" throughout the State in government, business, industry and among all of our citizens in general.

Our short range goals include the task of finding immediate ways and means of conserving energy in our State government agencies as well as finding ways of encouraging proper conservation practices throughout the State both in our business operations and in our homes.

Our long range goals include the task of finding solutions to our energy shortages.

By conserving the energy resources we have, we can gain the time to seek and find solutions to the overall problem of inadequate reserves to meet the ever-growing needs of our expanding population.

Our conservation efforts are working, and we are receiving outstanding cooperation from our State Agencies.

This planning is not only saving our vital fuel resources, but it is helping us to stay within the State budget requirements while fuel costs are moving upward.

Our lowest bids for next year's State requirements came in three cents per gallon higher on gasoline, and four cents higher on diesel.

Most important, we are getting the people of Texas thinking about energy conservation. Our "Awareness" program is making headway, and we are receiving many fine suggestions and ideas from business owners, people in government and citizens all across our State.

I have also created a Governor's Energy Advisory Council with the primary goal of recommending to me a State Energy Policy which will draw together the policy making activities of the public and private sectors of the State.

Our Texas Offshore Terminal Commisison has just completed its interim report, and we are now pushing hard toward the construction of deep water terminals off the coast of Texas to receive the new super-tankers or very large crude carriers. These ships of over three hundred thousand tons can move crude oil over long distances for less than half the cost of an "average" thirty thousand ton tanker.

In 1971, Texas exported to other oil-using regions of the United States an average of one point six million barrels of crude oil per day.

In 1980, the National Petroleum Council estimates that Texas will be importing three and one-half million barrels of crude oil each day, and this will increase to more than five and one-half million barrels per day by 1985.

Practically all of the oil imported into Texas after 1980 will have to come from the Persian Gulf, a distance of twelve thousand miles from the Texas Coast. Only super-tankers, with the economics of scale they offer, can deliver crude oil to Texas refineries at reasonable cost.

We must build these deep water terminals, and we must have cooperation and assistance from the Federal Government to simplify the procedures. To construct them will require thorough planning and coordination among federal, state and local agencies.

We need a single Federal Agency to handle these super port applications with a legislative mandate that requires *precise and expeditious* handling.

Even then, it will take several years to construct these terminals and we will have to double our refineries, pipelines and other transportation capability.

One thing is very certain—there is no assurance that the supply of foreign oil will be available in the quantities that we will need by 1980. Since by 1980, the world's consumption will have almost doubled. Surely the price will have gone up too.

In my judgment, our Nation is already dangerously dependent on foreign oil imports at a rate of more than one-third of what we consume.

I think it is imperative that the United States strive to regain its lost ability to meet most of its own *domestic* needs from *domestic* sources, and this should be a part of our National Policy.

We must develop *all* of the Nation's potential energy resources, not just oil and gas, but our coal, tar sands, nuclear potential, thermal well resources, solar—in fact, every possible energy resource.

This will require the cooperation of the federal government, state governments, and business and industry.

It will require the necessary incentives for the entry of new private companies into energy production and the adoption of more reasonable land use programs at both Federal and State levels that will promote, not discourage, the orderly development of public energy resources.

A primary goal must be the protection of our environment. We must find ways of using all of the sources of energy—safely, and efficiently to meet our Nation's energy needs and still assure that our children and grandchildren have a clean and safe America tomorrow.

As a start, the Federal Government should conduct a state-by-state inventory to identify:

The amount of energy now being consumed in that State.

The primary energy sources and the extent of other possible supplies.

The legal prohibitions that exist in the state—such as laws against strip-mining, or location of refineries. We need to know whether or not the coastal states have restricted offshore drilling or the development of deep water terminals.

And we must have an inventory that would show attitude, assets and liabilities of the state to meet its own needs.

We must look at a state to determine from what source that state should receive its supply. And we must utilize the fuel closest to the source.

Every state should develop its own ability to assess and develop its own energy resources.

And then—and only then—look outside the state to meet its additional needs.

Many states have energy resources that for one reason or another have not been developed while they import heavily from other areas. We must now fully develop all of our energy sources in all of our states.

Whatever it takes to get the job done, we must do. If new federal or state legislation is needed, we must push for it.

We must build the Alaskan pipeline.

We must build the needed refineries.

We must mine our coal and also reclaim the land for effective use.

We must develop our nuclear capability—and safety.

We must build our deep water terminals.

We must re-double our efforts to develop mass transit systems in our urban areas.

We must solve the pollution problems and protect our environment and keep a balanced environmental program going.

Throughout the long course of history of this great Country of ours, whenever the existence of the Nation was threatened from without or within, She has always responded strongly to meet the challenge. Such was the case in the dark days of World War Two when our survival was threatened by a force superior in numbers and weaponry—and we had to find a faster way to victory. From this challenge to freedom came the "Manhattan Project" and atomic power which brought an early end to the war and also changed the entire world.

Once again, we are besieged—but in a different way—but also in a way that affects our position and power in the world and our capability to defend our Nation. So, here today, I call on the President of the United States and the National Congress to establish a Manhattan Project for the research and development of energy resources:

To form all of the federal energy offices and departments in existence, and those proposed by the President along with the best expertise from the private sector in the fields of science—engineering—industry and education into a combined team as we did in Manhattan and NASA.

To incorporate the energy research and development administration the President is proposing into this task force.

To provide whatever financial support and governmental direction that is required to attract the finest talent in our land.

To support this force to the fullest to improve the technology, invent new equipment, discover new sources of fuel, develop new ways and methods to re-claim our land, to control pollution and to protect our environment without impeding industrial progress.

To step up educational grants for research in the energy fields at our colleges and universities.

Just as we brought the finest scientific, industrial, and engineering and military capability of the Nation together for the Manhattan Project to produce the atomic bomb—and again in our NASA Space Project to explore outer-space and put-a-man-on-the-moon—we must now do the same thing to solve the severe energy problems facing this Country. We must again explore and discover and find a way to eliminate pollution, re-claim our land, protect our environment and still develop and utilize all of our fuel sources, coal, nuclear power, oil, gas, tar sands, thermal well resources, solar and others we do not now know about. If the government provides the financial support and the organization and direction as they did in Manhattan and NASA, then I am confident the solutions will be found.

In short, just as we did during World War Two—to find the fastest way to victory—

All of this can be done—and it must be done.

For many years, Texas has made a significant contribution to the energy needs of the United States and the world.

And we shall continue to do so.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: A CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 4

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on a recent hot summer evening, Luis Torres and his wife, Carmen, were sitting in a park in The Bronx, N.Y., enjoying the night air. Mr. Torres was on a 2-week vacation from his factory job. His three young children were vacationing in Puerto Rico.

The night began peacefully and pleasantly, but it ended tragically. For without warning and without reason, a teenage robber fired two shots at Luis Torres with a pistol. The victim slumped to the ground, fatally wounded in the head and neck.

In a moment's time, one man was dead, one woman widowed, and three children were left fatherless.

Luis Torres' murder is the fourth one we have chronicled in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is one of 21,000 senseless deaths by handgun each year. An Associated Press Survey covering March 4 to March 11 of this year showed that in 1 week alone, 350 men, women, and children in the United States were shot to death, a 70-percent increase over the figure recorded in a similar survey 4 years ago.

The teenage boy who killed Luis Torres had no reason to shoot. But he had a pistol in his hand, and he used it. Our lax gun control laws have made killing very easy—far too easy. As long as people continue to own handguns, the opportunity to use them for violent ends will remain.

A strong Federal gun control law to control the sale and possession of handguns is vitally needed. It will come too late for Luis Torres, but it may save other human beings from useless, tragic deaths.

The article from the July 15 New York Times follows:

MURDER SCENE IN BRONX AN OASIS FOR MORRISANIA—SLAIN MAN HAD GONE THERE TO SEEK RELIEF FROM THE HEAT

(By Christopher S. Wren)

For the residents of the Morrisania section of the Bronx, Claremont Park is a vital urban oasis. During the day, the leafy green triangle, with its swimming pool, ballfields and playgrounds, belongs to the children.

At night, their parents, most of them black or Puerto Rican, come to claim it as a retreat from the stifling city heat.

But last Friday, the cycle of leisure in Claremont Park was interrupted. Luis Torres, a 28-year-old father of three children, was gunned down beside a park bench by one of two teen-age muggers, who then rummaged in vain through their victim's pockets while his terrified wife looked on.

"It was hot and so we went to take some air," recalled Carmen Torres yesterday. She sat with a few friends in the Torres's five-room apartment at 1365 College Avenue. Only a week earlier, Luis Torres had moved his wife and children from their old apartment several blocks north of Selwyn Avenue. The rent at the new place, Mrs. Torres explained, was less.

WERE DANCING

With their children vacationing back in Puerto Rico and Mr. Torres winding up a two-week vacation from his factory job, the couple had the evening to themselves. They strolled over to the park with their portable radio-tape recorder. "We were playing music and dancing," said Mrs. Torres.

About 10:30 P.M., as she rested on the bench, two teenagers sauntered up through the shadows to ask the time.

"I don't have a watch," Mr. Torres explained. He turned to walk over to his wife.

The older of the two teenagers pointed a small-caliber pistol and fired twice. Mr. Torres collapsed on the asphalt footpath, fatally wounded in the head and neck.

"They wanted to take the tape recorder," Mrs. Torres said. "When I saw my husband fall, I started screaming. I took the recorder and ran over to another bench."

The assailants paused long enough to search Mr. Torres before running from the park and down East 170th Street. Passers-by rushed over to help the dying man. A friend who came up said he found Mrs. Torres hysterical.

"Everybody was calling the police, calling the ambulance and nobody came," said Mrs. Torres. "The police came more than an hour later."

The victim died before he reached Morrisania Hospital.

"We had 10 years together," said Mrs. Torres. She planned to take her husband's body home to Mayaguez, P.R. She didn't know whether she would leave today or tomorrow, she explained, "because it's a homicide and I don't know if I can get his body from the morgue."

SIN NINGUNA RAZÓN

No one in the red brick tenement really knew the new couple. But upstairs, a neighbor shook her head and lamented, "Sin ninguna razón." She repeated in English, "There wasn't any reason."

On the front stoop, Kim Mason, 23, waited for the drizzle to stop.

"Everybody from this neighborhood goes up there and sits in the park and drinks beer and listens to the radio," he explained. "That's why I can't understand why it happened. It is usually crowded, especially on Friday and Saturday nights."

Some residents noted that two youth gangs skirmished at the swimming pool in Claremont Park only last week.

LACK OF POLICE CITED

"Mostly younger people go to the park," said Mr. Mason. "Older people won't go up there any more because it's too dangerous. There are foot cops on 170th Street in the daytime, but you never see them at night."

Although residents felt that the slayers were not from the neighborhood, detectives were searching the vicinity of the park for the two suspects, whom they said were about 17 and 19 years old. "We're looking primarily in that area," said Detective Warren Marschat, "seeking witnesses and confidential information if possible."

Yesterday, the park was nearly deserted in the rain, Carlos Rivera, a 16-year-old who lives across the street, pointed out the dark splotch on the asphalt where Mr. Torres had bled.

"At night, you'd always see people sitting around here and talking," said the youth. "But after the shooting, the people tipped [left]. And they haven't come back."

A WHITE HOUSE HOMILY—UNDELIVERED

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress an extraordinarily perceptive editorial in America, the national Catholic weekly.

This editorial was writen by Father Donald R. Campion, S.J., the editor-in-chief of America magazine.

The editorial raises some of the basic moral questions now confronting the White House.

This undelivered White House homily follows:

A WHITE HOUSE HOMILY—UNDELIVERED

(The Word of God is something alive and active: it cuts like any double-edged sword but more finely; it can slip through the place where the soul is divided from the spirit, or joints from the marrow; it can judge the secret emotions and thoughts.) (Heb. 4:12)

Mr. President, members of the White House family: The Bible tells us that God's word is a two-edged sword. Sociologists tell us much the same thing when they point out that the role of religion in society is twofold: to canonize and to criticize, to support society but also to judge it. Some of the most distinguished churchmen in America have, at your invitation, Mr. President, spoken at these White House Sunday services. My words this morning cannot be as reassuring as theirs often were. We would not be faithful to God's word or to you who listen to that word with us, if we did not speak this morning to what a member of the White House family has recently called a "political and constitutional crisis," so clearly also a moral crisis, the crisis of Watergate.

To remind ourselves that there are important moral issues involved in the complicated history that is emerging from the Senate hearings might seem unnecessary. It is all too obvious that blackmail, invasion of privacy, bribery, perjury, defamation of character, all involve moral values. Yet one of the chilling revelations has been the complete absence of moral concern at any stage of the conspiracy. The questions asked were pragmatic; the doubts and hesitations concerned expense or deniability. No one asked: Is this just and good?

It has been suggested that the Watergate conspirators were influenced by the spirit of civil disobedience that characterized the antiwar movement and were led into the activists' error of justifying means by ends. The analogy is misleading. It is not necessary to approve every instance of civil disobedience in the peace movement to recognize the vast difference between public protest and secret subversion. Those who protested against the war appealed to conscience and moral values and accepted the sanctions of the state as a part of their protest. The Watergate conspirators made every effort to conceal their actions and escape the sanctions of the state. And can the goals of the antiwar activists and the conspirators really be compared? An end to bloodshed has been the goal of all Americans, whatever their disagreement on the means to achieve it. The goal of the Watergate conspiracy—to dictate the result of a free election—is repudiated by all Americans, whatever their political differences.

It is important to be clear on what kind of moral issue was involved. One of the most prominent religious spokesmen in the United States has called Watergate the culmination of a national moral decline, the result of an era of permissiveness. Such a call for penance and discipline is always salutary, but in the present instance it blurs the nature of the evil we confront. The men of Watergate were not playboys of permissiveness but true believers in the work ethic. In the words of one of their colleagues, men of high private morality but lacking in a sense of public morality.

Prestige, money, advancement, the usual idols of the "American dream," were not completely absent from the motivation of the conspirators. Yet for all that, Watergate still represents a new kind of political corruption. American politics has known before men who abused positions of power for private gain. The Watergate conspiracy betrayed the public trust in more deadly fashion. It stole our birthright.

The actual incident of June 17, 1972, as is now abundantly clear, was no isolated adventure. It was part of a deliberate plan to subvert the process of democratic election. When those who broke the law were apprehended, some of the most highly placed men in the government attempted to enlist government institutions in a conspiracy against justice. If all this were simply an excess of campaign zeal, the result would be tragic enough. The apparent mandate the President received in November would be forever stained by the tactics employed in its pursuit. These tactics, however, cannot be isolated from the philosophy of the White House for the past five years.

There is much pressure at the present time, Mr. President, to determine who was ultimately responsible for Watergate in its various phases. The possibility of your personal involvement poses an embarrassing dilemma even for your friends. If you were aware of the conspiracy, you have participated in a crime. If you were unaware of the conspiracy, which touched at one point or another the most important personalities and agencies in your government, then the failure in leadership is, in a sense, even more disturbing.

As serious as this dilemma is, however, it is not the most important question to be asked this morning. The crisis the nation faces, regardless of your particular role in the Watergate conspiracy, is still rooted in the fundamental mentality of your Administration. It is a mentality that could be described as absolute righteousness, holding itself above and beyond the law. Absolute righteousness quickly becomes absolute ruthlessness.

Basically this mentality rests on the mistaken assumption that the origin of legitimate power in government is the White House and not the people of the United States. The result is that the men you selected and inspired, Mr. President, used the tactics of the police state to meet what they describe as threats to national security. The plans for domestic intelligence-gathering launched by your Administration, the special investigative unit attached to the White House and privately financed, illegal wire tapping, illegal entry, the use of tax audits against political opponents, the withholding and falsifying information given to the public—these were the real dangers to national security, the real subversion. An Administration parading under the banner of law and order, considered itself above the law. A President, whose extraordinary career had been on battling subversives, surrounded himself with men who made subversion the game plan.

How could this happen? Did the mistake lie in a fondness for the corporation mystique, an admiration for the methods of men who made money? Was the mistake to impose the techniques of American business on the process of American government? Was there too much of the image-maker's concern with selling the product, along with this occupational cynicism about telling the truth?

Or should we look further and find some clue in that rare, unguarded moment last November, Mr. President, when you told an interviewer that the American people needed to be disciplined like children? Children must, of course, be protected from freedom; Dostoevski's Grand Inquisitor argued that point quite well. But the American experiment was founded on the idea that citizens were not children but sovereigns.

No one ever claimed that a society of citizen kings could be a model of management efficiency. American democracy, with its clash of opinions and its checks and balances, is an untidy business. But when the last demonstrator has been swept from the sight of the White House, when all government agencies have become "politically responsive," when a cooperative media tells the American people only what is best for them to know, then the American experiment will be over, the victim of subversion in the name of security.

Mr. President, it is always unfair for the preacher to single out one member of the congregation for advice and admonition. But our Sunday worship in the White House today is not typical. Like the other ministers of the Gospel who have preceded me here, I have come, in a sense, to your church rather than you to mine. It is your wish that we pray together here at the center of the nation's life, that we listen, reflect and respond to God's word. The double-edged sword that is God's word does not deal in comfortable images but in painful truth. It inevitably presents us with a crisis, a turning point, a time for judgment—the kind of crisis to be resolved only through honesty and courage, not through counterattack. Quite simply, the crisis God's word presents is a call for conversion.

This morning, then, may we suggest that our national crisis, like the biblical crisis, calls for conversion. The people need and wait for some clear-cut sign, some evidence of a change in mentality, some realization that the direction of the past five years must be reversed. The answer does not lie in withdrawal, retreat within an ever more narrow circle and a claim that the President has been the victim of Watergate rather than its intended beneficiary. The pattern of insulation must be broken decisively, dramatically, before it works its ultimate disaster.

The American people need a sign in order to regain their confidence in their government. They need to see a change in direction, not a display of stubbornness under seige. They need to see a government that will be open, that recognizes the necessity of an informed citizenry, with a faith in the intelligence of the community that is an essential condition of democracy, and a healthy detachment toward its own positions that is a protection against demagoguery. They need to see a government committed to the untidy process of democratic debate rather than the efficiency of the game plan. Most of all, they need, for the rest of your tenure, a deliberately nonpartisan Administration that will guarantee the political independence of our system of justice.

Is it presumptuous to speak of such things from a pulpit? Ordinarily, perhaps. But on this particular Sunday morning conversion has become not only a test of personal integrity but a condition of political stability. Only your action, Mr. President, can restore the faith of our people, and indeed of the world, in the integrity and stability of American government. The crisis will not be solved by silence.

ANOTHER MINIMUM WAGE HIKE?

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, George Will, a very perceptive columnist who writes occasionally for the Washington Post, has written an extremely thoughtful column in today's issue which cites the possible consequences of denying a minimum wage youth differential, as well as the possible effects of the law on other marginal, unskilled workers. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to consider the arguments raised in this column:

ANOTHER MINIMUM WAGE HIKE?

(By George Will)

Acting in its traditional role of tireless protector of the strong, the Senate is about to follow the House of Representatives in voting to increase unemployment among the nation's vulnerable workers—especially black teenagers.

The Senate will do this in the name of humanitarianism as it votes another increase in the minimum wage. The Senate probably will adopt the House bill, as against the administration's proposals.

The main arguments between the House and the administration concern whether coverage should be extended; how fast the minimum should rise to $2.20 per hour; and whether there should be a "youth differential," whereby anyone under 18 and full-time students could be paid 15 per cent less than the regular minimum wage.

The House, reflecting the position of organized labor, wants to extend coverage to domestic and government workers. It wants to go to $2.20 one year quicker than the administration (by 1974) and rejects the "youth differential."

The administration's proposals are less toxic than those of the House. But the really striking and depressing thing in both wings of the Capitol is that so few politicians (Sens. Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.) and Robert Taft Jr. (R-Ohio) being honorable exceptions) acknowledge that minimum wage legislation usually is harmful to many of the people who are supposed to benefit.

I suspect that one reason economics is known as the "dismal science" is that it, unlike other social sciences, is insufficiently rigorous to occasionally reach clear conclusions that can interfere with political desires. Certainly today there is a remarkable consensus among independent economists about five matters relevant to minimum wage legislation:

Blacks suffer more than whites, and teenagers more than adults from sluggish job markets.

Minimum wage legislation makes it harder for blacks and teenagers to find employment in good times, and harder to hold jobs when times are not good.

White adult males benefit most from the effect of minimum wage legislation on lost job opportunities and increased job instability among blacks and teenagers.

There are more poor people whose poverty derives from unemployment than from holding jobs that pay inadequate wages.

While it is true that some workers are paid so poorly they must also draw welfare, it is equally true that raising the minimum wage will cause some of these people to become unemployed people on welfare.

None of these points is surprising. Minimum wage laws hurt marginal workers because their skills are least productive and most easily dispensed with. That is why it does not pay to pay them much.

Minimum wage legislation has a regressive cost-benefit distribution. It puts marginal workers in jeopardy while helping—not surprisingly—those who push hardest for such legislation, organized labor.

Of course, not all economists acknowledge this. The economists who work for organized labor deploy a lot of methodological arguments designed to show that the state of the economist's art is such that we can not know for sure who will be affected how by minimum wage legislation.

There are a couple of things to say about these arguments.

First, if the science of economics is not able to predict dismal results from such legislation, then it can not predict good results. So we should err on the side of caution and leave bad enough alone.

Second, there is something suspiciously selective about the epistomological scrupulousness of organized labor's economists. When labor is lobbying Congress for laws to protect the Republic from Italian shoes, labor's economists are remarkably confident about their ability to say just how many shoe makers will be booted into poverty by a given number of Italian shoes.

Organized labor wants a steadily rising minimum wage in order to raise the general wage floor, thereby giving an upward thrust to the negotiating position of unions that, one would have thought, were already powerful enough.

In addition, organized labor wants a high minimum wage enforced nationwide so there will be less temptation for industry to locate in poorer, low wage (often non-union) areas. The fact that minimum wage legislation causes unemployment in some areas, and hinders the growth of employment opportunities in other areas is of no concern to organized labor.

The only amusing thing about minimum wage legislation is that it, like most things in American economic life, confounds the Marxist prophecy.

Mark said capitalists will always act so as to create a reserve army of the unemployed to use in grinding the face of organized labor. But today it is organized labor, with its racial discrimination, its apprenticeship programs restricting access to professions, and now, again, minimum wage demands that is swelling the reserve army of the unemployed.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago this week President Eisenhower proclaimed the first Captive Nations Week which we have observed every year since then. Today, as world powers begin to exhibit signs of détente and a relaxation of tensions which divide them can be felt, we must not forget the many peoples around the globe who still do not determine their daily lives.

We in the United States have just celebrated the 197th birthday of a nation whose foundation remains the inalienable rights of the individual. For those in captive nations who do not share in the blessings of free speech, religion, and movement, we must extend our sincerest hope that the spirit of reapproachment of the 1970's will lead all nations to acknowledge the right of all peoples to determine their form of government. In observing Captive Nations Week, we recognize that the freedoms guaranteed us by the Bill of Rights are valid for all men and that political boundaries should not be barriers to individual freedoms.

Let us hope that our observance of Captive Nations Week will serve as an impetus for other nations to join in our efforts to promote the self-determination of all peoples.

INDEPENDENCE DAY ACTIVITIES

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, during the July 4 recess, it was my privilege to participate in the official Independence Day activities of the city of Birmingham, Ala., sponsored by WBRC-TV and to hear an excellent address by a very distinguished representative of the U.S. Marine Corps, Lt. Gen. R. P. Keller.

The general is currently the commanding general of the Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Va. He holds a bachelors degree from the University of Maryland and a masters degree from George Washington University.

He entered the Marine Corps during World War II and rose to the rank of major, having served as commanding officer of Marine Fighter Squadron 223 and later of Marine Night Fighter Squadron 533 in Okinawa. He was among the initial Marine Corps forces deployed to Korea in 1950.

He later served as assistant wing commander of the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing in Vietnam and later became assistant chief of staff, Pacific Command. General Keller's awards include the Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross with two gold stars, the Air Medal with one silver and three gold stars and three Legion of Merit citations.

General Keller offered a message which is particularly relevant in our times and I submit it for the edification of my colleagues:

GEN. R. P. KELLER OFFERED A MESSAGE

Congressman Buchanan, Mayor Seibels, distinguished platform guests, ladies and gentlemen, Birminghamians, Mrs. Keller and I are most happy to be in this fine city to participate in commemoration of Independence Day.

It is appropriate that at this gathering today we recall to mind the circumstances which led to the founding of our nation. We were born out of mankind's relentless pursuit of freedom, man's abhorrence of tyranny, his willingness to risk all to ensure that freedom will prevail. The urge and surge and strivings of man to attain the capacity for free determination of his own destiny are basic to his soul, are an unalterable and fundamental part of his total being. We stand here at this flag raising event keenly aware of the character and strength exhibited by patriots in generations past. From their example, and the inspiration of such occasions as this, today's patriots can draw sustenance and strength and purpose for their continuing efforts in furtherance of a free and responsible society.

Just two dozen days ago I was privileged to attend another flag-raising ceremony, that one at Fort McHenry near Baltimore, Md. There, on the day marking the commencement of National Flag Week, a replica was flown of the flag that inspired Francis Scott Key to write the words of our national anthem. Now, as then, I ask who here does not thrill to the soaring lilt of that stirring music, the inspired prose of those lyrics; who here does not feel strongly emotional impact, viewing the flag with its bright colors snapping in a brisk breeze, as it swiftly climbs the staff towards the blue sky or slowly descends late in the day to be enfolded in reverent arms and readied for hoisting on the morrow.

Surely it is well that our reactions are so, but here now—at this moment—we perhaps should examine more in depth why they are "so" and why that should be "well."

Certainly there is other music that evokes emotion. There are other banners that thrill us at their sight—but those of which now we speak are unique in their symbolism. They embody the exquisitely beautiful and simple concept which has been pursued by our people for two centuries—the concept that all men are created free and equal, and in possession of the essential right to opportunity—opportunity to make of their life what they will in a free and orderly society. We can recognize the merit of this concept, thrill to it, strive in its support, and simultaneously understand that absolute attainment of its full scope thus far has eluded us. Yet, more has been accomplished in our Nation, for more people than in any other society of which at least this speaker is aware. We build more libraries and institutions of learning, we give more to those in need both at home and abroad, we do more to defeat the scourges of disease, we do more to expand man's scientific and technological frontiers. We do all this and yet we do still more. We have battled—then bound the wounds of our opponents; we have accepted on our shores the poor, the ill, the repressed from other lands and given them and their children unparalleled personal freedom and precious opportunity. We have provided our support, our treasure, and indeed our blood, unselfishly, in the interests of our friends. Even so, realistically, we do recognize there exist doubters and critics and they may have their place, too, within reason, for our people are human, and subject to the frailties of mankind. We need to keep our perspective in our own best interests, and it helps greatly in that regard to be questioned, examined, made to think.

But what should our "perspective" be? Let me suggest that, first and foremost we need clearly to appreciate our Nation's goals and purposes so that we may consistently endeavor to achieve them. If we can do this, the validity of our perspective is assured. However, one legitimately may ask at this juncture what are these national goals and purposes: Peace?—Full employment?—A healthy population?—In a sense, yes. These and others represent some of our strivings. But even more fundamentally and comprehensively our national goals are eloquently inscribed in one special document—the Constitution of the United States. The preamble to that document states the purpose it is designed to serve and in doing that illumines these words, which are so familiar to us all—

"We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America"

Ladies and gentlemen, consider the effect of the provisions of that document, dedicated toward those purposes and adopted by a fledgling nation when its populace was fewer than 4 millions. Those provisions have defined and established the essential framework within which our people have developed into a nation increased by two hundred millions of citizens. We have built a society and transitioned it from little more than a simple agricultural community to one which spews forth an unparalleled scope and quantity of goods and services and opportunity toward an improved quality of life for our own citizens and, yes, millions upon millions of people of other nations. These surely are worthy accomplishments of which we always should be mindful and they have come about through the combined efforts of all major segments of our society, including that segment which I represent today.

Ladies and gentlemen, I stand here in uniform, in a uniform of which I am deeply proud. In so doing I represent all those who wear this or other uniforms of our defense establishment. As yet I have expressed no particular view as to our place in the present day and in the future. Perhaps, for part of our "perspective" appreciation, that should be done now. After all, each of us recognizes there continue to exist—and likely always shall, differences of opinion as to the merit of investing in certain military capabilities, compared to what otherwise might feasibly be accomplished for the public good in their stead. Certainly, there is room for discussion and consensus determination as to what portion of our national means should be dedicated to the defense of our Nation and all its people. However, there is one overridingly fundamental consideration which we would do well to keep in mind. It has been magnificently stated by Sir John Slessor in his book "Strategy for the West." He wrote—

"It is customary in democratic countries to deplore expenditures on armaments conflicting with the requirements of the social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service that a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free".

And that is what our armed forces really are designed to do—to keep our people alive and free. Then all other objectives can be sought. In slavery and death, all is lost. I believe history illustrates that we can have solemn and deeply rooted confidence in the validity of the collective judgment of our people as it affects *all* important national matters—not just that of defense. Under this representative government of ours we have done something less than perfectly—but surely, better than any other nation with regard to the scope of freedom and opportunity open to all its citizens. Accepting that premise, as I do, one still may agree with Johann Wolfgang Goethe, as do I, who has offered this thought—

"I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, but in what direction we are moving."

Where, in fact, are we going as we commence the 198th year of our national independence? In my estimation the response to that question can only be "excelsior"—onward and upward. We are aware of our significant problems and they are being addressed with ingenuity and energy and by the application of our formidable resources both material and spiritual. The outcome will be favorable; we will preserve our fundamental, free, national institutions. We will defend our people. We will protect our Nation's water and air and land from encroaching despoilment. We will expand the opportunity for all our people to live a meaningful life in a responsible society. We will continue to be good neighbors to our friends and formidable opponents to those who seek our ill. If we but remain humbly proud, unswervingly dedicated, compassionately disciplined, thoughtfully determined, and hard working, there is no limit in sight as to what we can accomplish for our people and mankind as a whole. Under no more appropriate symbol than the stars and stripes could such gloriously heroic and epochal efforts proceed.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I now share with you the beautiful words of Henry Holcomb Bennett, "The Flag Goes By":

Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
A flash of color beneath the sky:

Hats off!
The flag is passing by!
Blue and crimson and white it shines,
Over the steel-tipped, ordered lines.

Hats off!
The colors before us fly;
But more than the flag is passing by:
Sea fights and land fights, grim and great,
Fought to make and to save the State:
Weary marches and sinking ships;
Cheers of victory on dying lips;
Days of plenty and years of peace;
March of a strong land's swift increase;
Equal justice, right and law,
Stately honor and reverent awe;
Sign of a nation, great and strong
To ward her people from foreign wrong;
Pride and glory and honor—all live in the colors to stand or fall.

Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums;
And loyal hearts are beating high:

Hats off!
The flag is passing by!

A COMMITMENT TO MILITARY MANPOWER REFORM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the new Secretary of the Army—our former colleague "Bo" Callaway—has tackled his new assignment with vigor. His first major address outlines his belief in a strong, vibrant, and innovative military posture. I am inserting in the RECORD the text of his speech, along with an informative summary from the Army Times:

[From the Army Times, July 16, 1973]

DRAFT REMAINS OUT—CALLAWAY

LAS VEGAS.—There's no chance now that the Army can go to Congress and ask for reinstatement of the draft, the Secretary of the Army says.

In his first speech as Secretary of the Army, Howard H. (Bo) Callaway told the Reserve Officers Association that the service is dedicated to fulfilling its global mission without a draft. "And we are not going back to Congress to ask for a draft," the official said.

"That is not within the realm of political possibility today."

The new Army will be recruited with higher pay, better living conditions, more barracks privacy, freedom from unnecessary harassment and better educational opportunities, the Secretary said.

But Callaway, as did his predecessor Robert F. Froelke, pledged today's Army will be disciplined.

"We may not have reveille any more and this may bother some of you," he told ROA. "We may not be the spit-and-polish kind of Army that you and I grew up with. It's going to be different.

"The soldier is going to return to soldiering, and I give you my absolute pledge this is not going to be a permissive Army."

Without saying how it would be achieved, Callaway pledged the Army would be representative of U.S. society with soldiers from all walks of life, economic levels, regions and ethnic groups.

REMARKS BY HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

Today is the first day of my second month in office and it is the first occasion that I have had to leave Washington to address a military group. I want to thank you for inviting me so soon after taking office to be here with the Reserve Officers Association. I am very pleased that you want to hear from the Army. That's important to us, and I hope that the fact I'm here to make my first speech is a signal of the importance that the Army places on ROA and on Reserve affairs.

I realize that others on the program have already discussed many of the details that I am going to mention. I want to start from a very simple basis about the overall Defense Establishment followed by some specific comments on the Army. And to those of you who are non-Army, I hope that you will find that the things I have to say about the Army have a common interest with those of the other services.

As we all know, within the last four years we have had many changes in our Defense Establishment. In our relations with certain nations we have moved from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. We are moving from arms competition to arms limitation. We have seen the first two agreements between the USA and USSR limiting strategic weapons. Mutual and balanced force reduction negotiations are to commence in October as agreed to in exploratory talks. We are moving from a draft environment to an all-volunteer environment. We are also moving from a budget that was dominated by Defense to one that is now dominated by social needs. In other words, we have moved from war to peace in four years, from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy.

Four years ago the American people insisted upon a reordering of our national priorities, but very few in America realize how well we have succeeded and what a change there has been. Four years ago, Defense amounted to almost ten percent of the Gross National Product. Today it's about six percent. In 1968, 42½ percent of the Federal budget was spent on Defense. Today it's less than 30 percent. As a matter of fact, in Fiscal '73, we have, in constant dollars, the lowest Defense budget in 20 years, and it's going further down, not up. Twenty years ago, Defense spending was twice the total of all other Federal spending, and today that has been exactly reversed.

This reordering of national priorities has affected all the services, and it has certainly affected the Army. I would like to pause here and describe some of those effects.

Our most pressing problem for the last four years, of course, has been Vietnam. I say this with pride, because the Army faced a situation in Vietnam that was as difficult as any service has ever faced in history, and the Army performed superbly. Without mobilizing our Reserves, relying upon young men and women, many of whom did not agree with the war that was being fought, the Army conducted itself with great honor, and the Army can be justly proud of what it did in Vietnam! But the Vietnam experience was costly for the Army. To accomplish its mission in Vietnam, the Army had to drop almost everything else. This involved enormous personnel turnover and turbulence, and we saw in the Army a situation where too many people were transferred too often. This resulted in Company Commanders, platoon leaders, and senior non-commissioned officers serving less than six months in their units. This meant that they had no knowledge of the people they were training and little chance to master the essentials of command. In many cases, the Army ignored the principles of leadership upon which the Army had been based for so long, because nobody stayed in any job for very long. And as it always happens when we have ignored the lessons of history, we have paid the penalties. You have seen and read about the penalties of poor race relations, drug abuse, and a lack of discipline. And it has affected the Army very severely.

Now we find ourselves in a new world with new challenges. We have been called upon to accomplish something that the Army has never been asked to do in our history. We have been tasked with a large global mission, a mission with major requirements in Europe and Asia, as a large part of the Nixon Doctrine. We have been tasked to maintain 13 Active divisions plus Reserve Components—and all of this with no draft. The Army has maintained itself without a draft in the past, but never with such large commitments. How do we solve it? What can we do? It's never been tried before. I think we must all realize, and particularly the Reserve Components, that this is a new ball game. Many of our traditions, many of the things that we have always believed in, are going to be changed. We just can't continue business as usual. We must do a lot of things differently.

We are going to solve this problem in the Army in two basic ways. First, I want to clearly state that we are dedicated to solving the problem of having a global mission without a draft, and we are not going back to Congress to ask for a draft! That is not within the realm of political practicality today.

We are going to go about it in two basic ways; first, by making life within the Army the kind of life that a young man or a young woman, performing the same kinds of duties, would have in civilian life. This means all the things you read about in the press. It means higher pay, and I applaud that; it means better living conditions; it means privacy in barracks, better barracks; it means freedom from unnecessary harassment; it means better educational opportunities; and it means a standard of living that we can be proud of for our young men and women serving in the Army. This is essential. I don't think it's fair to ask our young men and women to make a financial sacrifice in order to serve their country. And we need your help, and certainly the help of Congress to bring this about.

This is only one half of the problem, and perhaps the other half is more important—what the soldier does to accomplish his mission. On this score I want to make several pledges to you today, and I cannot overemphasize the importance of these pledges:

First, today's Army will be a disciplined Army, prepared to perform its mission, and its mission is to fight. We may not have reveille any more—and this may bother some of you. We may not be the spit and polish kind of Army that you and I grew up with—it's going to be different. But as far as performing its mission, it will be a disciplined Army. We are going to treat today's soldiers as mature adults. We are gong to expect them to do their own thing, but it is not going to interfere with their mission. We are going to have a mission-oriented Army. The soldier is going to return to soldiering, and I give you my absolute pledge this is not going to be a permissive Army. Those of you who know our great Chief, Abe, know that he agrees with me on this point.

Second, our Army is going to be broadly representative of America. It is going to represent all walks of life, all economic levels, all parts of our country, all ethnic groups. It is going to be a mirror of our country. It's not going to be all-pro, all-south, or all-any one thing. It's going to be an all-American Army, and as such it's going to be just as strong as our country. This is important because the people in our country can trust the Army as long as it represents the mainstream—and it will.

Third, we will have a high quality Army. This is easier said than done, but it is going to be a high quality Army. We will continue to resist the pressure to man the Army with numbers, and we will insist upon high quality. It is going to be the kind of Army in which young men and women can be proud to serve and of which our nation can be proud.

Fourth, service in today's Army is going to be a meaningful experience. This is the key to today's Army. A young man or woman will be proud of his or her service in our Army. It is not going to be looked upon as an interruption. It is going to be looked upon as a vital and important part of the life of the young man or woman who serves. And as the people who serve in the Army can be proud of it, the wives and sweethearts and mothers and fathers to whom they return can also be proud.

I have been speaking primarily of the Active Army, but everything I say applies to the Reserves also. How do the Reserve Components fit into today's Active Army? As you well know, particularly with the Active Army's preoccupation with Vietnam, the Reserves have often been second best. We know that. The Reserves had a questionable mission when in 1965 the decision was made not to call up the Reserves in Vietnam, and to use the draft instead. They traditionally lacked equipment, just having whatever was left over from the Active Army. And, of course, the Army, particularly in Vietnam, has been preoccupied with its own problems, not with the problems of the Reserves.

That brings us to where we are today. Today we hear a lot of talk about a total force concept—one Army—but I am sure that some of you question whether we really mean it. I pledge to you that we do mean one Army when we say it. There is no way the volunteer Army can accomplish its global mission without Reserve Components. We must rely on our Reserve Components. We simply cannot man a large enough Active force to do the job. Secondly, we cannot afford to do it on today's budget with all Active forces. Today's Reserve Components, as you well know, envisions 8 combat divisions, 21 combat brigades, 13 training divisions, and hundreds of supporting troop units. All of this put together at approximately one-sixth of the cost of Active Forces.

You have probably never thought about it in this way, but someone figured out the cost of the entire Reserve Components to every man, woman and child in America. It's $9.77 a year; $9.77 a yecr. What else can you buy with that? Well, you can buy a fifth of Scotch; you can buy a nine-month subscription to Playboy, you can buy six cans of shaving cream, the kind Joe Namath uses. You can also have 8 combat divisions, 21 combat brigades, 13 training divisions, and support units. And for $9.77 I think it's worth it. I think we must have it and it must be a top priority for our nation.

Just in case you are saying, we have heard this before, and you are still wondering whether we really mean it, I am going to talk about a couple of specifics affecting our Reserve Components. I hope you are aware of many of these and I hope putting them together will be of interest to you. I don't know how many of you have had a chance to read today's newspaper, but if you did, it was announced at eleven o'clock yesterday that we have replaced Al Haig as the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army—we have replaced him with a man who is familiar to many of you, General Fred Weyand. Fred Weyand is an ROTC graduate from the University of California, and I think that in itself is significant. The Army thinks enough of an ROTC graduate to make him the number two man in the Army. Furthermore, he is the former Chief of the Office of Reserve Components, the highest Reserve office in the United States Army, and a man who has had an active career as a strong proponent of the Reserve. Now this man is at the very highest level of the Army, and I can promise you that he will be effective in promoting the Reserve Components of the Army. I think that's important.

At long last we have made the PX fully available to Guardsmen and Reservists of the Selected Reserve during the day or days of their performance of inactive duty training. This is long overdue. It removes an irritant that was not necessary. Instructions are going to the field now to put this in effect.

We are also reorganizing the Army with more active commitments to Reserve Components than ever before, and Guard and Reserve support will be a primary dedicated mission of a number of senior Army Commanders.

We are seeking to guarantee training spaces for most of the MOSs used by the Guard and Reserves and we think we will be able to tell the potential Guard and Reserve enlistee when he can serve, when he can begin his training, and this is of tremendous importance.

We are also going to begin almost immediately some experiments with the six year obligation. To an 18 year old, six years is forever. This is one of our problems. We hope to have some plans within 90 days, one option perhaps for three years in a unit, three years in the individual Ready Reserves. We hope that things of this kind will help in recruiting Reserve Components. We are pushing hard for Reserve Component enlistment and reenlistment bonus legislation that is now before Congress. We support this strongly, and of course need your help. The Serviceman's Group Life Insurance coverage for Reserves has passed the House and we hope the Senate will pass it soon. These are a few of the things we are going to try to show the members of the Reserve Components that it is one Army and that we are all part of the same Army.

I want to re-emphasize that there is no way that today's Army can possibly accomplish its mission without well-trained Ready Reserves. As the Reserve Officers Association has correctly pointed out, you have never failed our nation, and I am sure you never will. I also want to say that the Reserves have never been more important to our country. Their mission is more important today perhaps than ever before. Because today we are plowing new ground. We are on an unchartered course. We do have a mission that is important, difficult, and without a draft it is a mission that we have never performed before. It is not going to be easy. We do not have simple solutions. We are still experimenting with many, many things, both with the Active and Reserve Components in order to solve this problem. But we are going to do it, and we are going to do it thanks to your help, to the help of the people of our country who believe in a strong Defense. Our Army will meet the challenge and prove worthy of our nation's trust.

JAMES V. SMITH

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our former colleague and friend, James V. Smith, was a reminder that in the midst of life we are in death. Seemingly in the price of life, it appeared to me that he was destined for many years of service to his fellow men.

Although he was with us in this great body for but a short time, I was greatly impressed by his qualifications, his knowledge of the legislative processes, and his devotion to the interests of his district, his State, and the Nation.

My sympathies are extended to his loved ones. May the Almighty comfort them and ease the anguish of their bereavement.

MASS TRANSIT WILL HELP ALLEVIATE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, distressed as I am by some evidence of a national energy crisis, I remain skeptical of the efforts of the major oil companies designed to perpetuate the same transportation systems which currently devour one-fourth of our energy supplies. The pitifully low efficiency level of the internal combustion engine, the tremendous land waste necessary to maintain our automobile culture, and the poisonous pollutants pouring into our atmosphere all indicate the impracticality of reinforcing and developing our current automobile-oriented transportation system.

Recognizing this, former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall recently wrote a perceptive column in The New York Times in which he called for the construction and development of urban and intercity mass transit systems. I wholeheartedly agree with this fundamental reorientation of our resources and submit the text of Mr. Udall's column for the consideration of the other Members.

The column follows:

THE ABC'S OF ENERGY REFORM

(By Stewart L. Udall)

WASHINGTON.—Various experts recently proposed assorted remedies for the oil-auto energy crisis. Dr. Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve has suggested a horsepower tax; Secretary Morton has urged the states to lower their speed limits, and Secretary Shultz has proposed voluntary car pools. My quarrel with such proposals is that they assume the petroleum crunch will diminish if we merely exercise a little self-restraint and make some modest adjustments in our automobile etiquette, all the available facts deny the validity of such assumptions.

Petroleum consumption is increasing 7 per cent each year, and we are manufacturing and buying a record number of new autos this year. The official statistics show that the U.S. oil shortage is worsening daily—and it will grow until we take drastic action to reverse our voracious consumption of petroleum products. It is urgent to deter wasteful travel now; but it is ten times more important to initiate sweeping changes in our whole petroleum-based transportation system.

What might be the first part of such a two-step program has been proposed by Dr. Paul W. McCracken, President Nixon's first chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mc-

Cracken called for an immediate increase of ten cents per gallon in the Federal tax on gasoline—and an additional ten-cent tax in 1974. He reasoned that such a stiff increase in the gas tax would dampen demand by penetrating the consumer's "threshold of awareness" of the energy shortage. In all likelihood, McCracken's plan would curtail unnecessary travel and help us cut oil consumption in the near term. However, his stopgap measure does nothing to bring about the structural changes in our transportation system that can save us from a far worse crisis a few years from now.

Bold action is imperative. I propose that we convert McCracken's short-term deterrent into a dynamo for long-run reform. The McCracken tax (a ten-cent Federal gas tax will produce over $10 billion in annual revenues) should be enacted and allocated to an emergency transportation fund. This fund should be expended on a crash program to rebuild our public transportation systems, reduce our consumption of oil, and avoid our impending economic bondage to a few nations in the Middle East.

How would the money be spent?

As a starter, we should subsidize current intracity mass transit systems to the point that fares are free—or at least dirt cheap. (This would be a temporary act of equity to low-income people who would be hurt by the regressive nature of the McCracken tax.)

The cities (most of which are ready for action and begging for funds) should be given billions to build and subsidize versatile mass transit systems—everything from bikeways to modern bus systems to monorails. The construction of cheap, pleasant and convenient public transportation would make our one-man, one-car transportation system obsolete. Indeed, "second cars" would soon become an intolerable expense. (We have the technology—and the nearby example of Toronto—so let no one argue that this is an impractical plan.)

The railroads should be subsidized and encouraged to produce a new generation of fast trains that would shift much of our intercity passenger and freight traffic from highways and aircraft to fuel-saving railways.

The automakers should be encouraged (to the extreme of a partial subsidy if necessary) to bring about a swift transition to small, lower-horsepower, 25-miles-per-gallon automobiles. (And Congress could do its part by mandatory laws regulating the weight of autos and the size of their engines.)

The environmental and energy-economy dividends to the nation from such a program would be enormous.

We would cut back the air pollution which is choking our cities.

We would save precious land by slowing down urban sprawl. (In fact, we should spend 10 to 15 per cent of the fund on emergency grants to cities to enable them to purchase open space and greenbelts that would check sprawl and guide urban growth.)

We would probably save at least 15,000 lives annually by reducing and decelerating auto travel.

We would avoid the periodic dollar devaluations that will inevitably plague us if we become economic satraps of the oil-producing countries.

A program of this magnitude would get at the roots of the oil-auto energy crisis and force us to come to terms with our own gluttony and waste. Last year, for example, we burned nearly 55 per cent of the world's gasoline. The behemoth "American car" is now an economic hemorrhage and an energy disaster. Drastic reforms are needed now. Unless the President's new "energy czar" produces a program of the scope I have suggested, hardships and dislocations will impinge on the lives of millions before this decade has run its course.

RETAIL CLERKS BEGIN PREVENTIVE HEALTH-CARE PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, at a time of increasing concern over preventive health care, the action of the Retail Clerks Local 919, in Hartford, Conn., is noteworthy.

This farsighted group of workers purchased six healthmobiles to upgrade preventive care for their members.

I know my colleagues, and the readers of this RECORD, will appreciate a description of this worthwhile action.

The description follows:

SIX HEALTHMOBILES KICK OFF GIANT PREVENTIVE HEALTH-CARE CAMPAIGN FOR UNION IN CONNECTICUT

Six fully-equipped healthmobiles have been brought to Hartford by the Retail Clerks Local 919 to dramatically announce the start of a major preventive health-care program for their members.

Called "Multiphasic Screening," and available to each member at no cost, the tests consist of electrocardiograms, tuberculin skin tests, x-rays, blood pressure, height, weight, tonometry test (glaucoma) and numerous tests on a small sample of blood to determine many liver, kidney, heart ailments, and diseases. For the convenience of the Retail Clerk members and to insure the greatest participation, the healthmobiles will be brought right to the store. Meaning, that after Hartford, the units will visit every city and village in Connecticut that employ Retail Clerks to examine them right at their place of employment.

To witness its introduction onto the labor-management scene in the Hartford Area, Arnaldo Espinosa, President of the Retail Store Employees' Union, Local 919, invited labor leaders; local, state and federal officeholders; leaders of industry; and members of his and other unions to come by on Tuesday, June 19, 1973, to see "Tomorrow's Health Care in Action Today."

Mr. Espinosa is careful to point out that this complete set of tests is not designated to replace the physician, but (1) the screening results that fall outside the norm are forwarded to the family physician for his determination, or (2) in a case where the participant, outside the norm, does not have a physician, the program is designed to encourage members to establish a medical relationship with a personal physician.

The results of the tests, carried out by United Health Maintenance, Inc., are completely confidential. The medical information, Mr. Kenneth Blum, President of UHM, points out, is not available to either the Union or to the employer.

Mr. Blum also points out that information gathered on the UHM healthmobiles is evaluated by specialists in the medical field and the information is then sent to the participants' own physician.

The mobile screening, which was negotiated by the Retail Store Employees' Union with the company employers, will be administered by the Retail Clerks' Health and Welfare Fund. Mr. Espinosa states that the tests will also cover eligible members over the entire state and part of Massachusetts.

Mr. Espinosa, in viewing the expanding benefits for the Retail Store Employees' Union, later said, "I will not really be satisfied until every union member in the Connecticut area and then every union member in the United States receives one of these health care screenings each year." Mr. Espinosa then added, "If there is anything more humane than curing an illness, it has to be in preventing one."

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Dixie Post 220, in Louisville, Ky., recently sponsored their annual essay contest. The subject of the essay—"What the Flag Means to Me."

I have had the privilege of reading the three winning essays submitted by Miss Angie Carby, Mr. Tony Bell, and Miss Karen Newton, all students in my congressional district.

These youngsters have, in their essays, done a fine job of recapturing the key elements of that traditional love of country known as patriotism. Their words reflect an awareness of what it really means to be an American and to live beneath the Stars and Stripes.

I think we of the "older generation" might well gain needed inspiration for the work we are trying to do from a careful reading of these essays.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert the full texts of the winning essays on "What the Flag Means to Me."

The essays follow:

OUR AMERICAN FLAG AND WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Angie Carby)

The American flag is a great emblem to me because of the beauty it brings to any place at all. The American flag shows pride, beauty, warmth, love, encouragement, and other great things. But most of all I love to hear the "Pledge of Allegiance." It goes like this:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands; one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

I like that speech or whatever you want to call it. Whenever I grow up I want to help my country any way I can but while I'm young I'm going to do as much as possible. I think everyone should try to help as much as they can no matter what age. It doesn't take much effort to say the "Pledge of Allegiance." Or put their hand over the heart. When I do any one of these I get a warm, deep feeling inside. But I guess that's natural for me. At my school I'm on the "School Safety Patrol Team." And when I watch the boy patrols put up the flag it makes you think twice before you make your move. But when I watch other people just ignore it like it wasn't even there it makes me and some other people pretty sad.

The reason I'm writing this essay isn't because I have to or because I could possibly win four great prizes but I've been thinking about the POW's and how they can still stand up to their country and stand up to their flag, and say "God Bless America" after being tortured and walking the path to death.

Getting back to the flag, I know that white stands for purity, but to me it means the paleness in the mother's face as her son leaves for war. I know that red stands for hardness, but to me it means that hundreds of boys have shed blood for our country, flag, and freedom. I also know that blue stands for justice, but I think it shows the beauty of the sea and sky. To me the flag is a beautiful symbol of love.

WHAT THE AMERICAN FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Tony Bell)

The first Flag made by Betsy Ross, on June 14, 1777 which is known today as Stars and Stripes, had 13 stars and 13 stripes. When I look up at the flag it reminds me of our nation being a free and independent nation. Francis Scott Key saw the American Flag still flying after the war, so he decided to write about it. It is better known today as "The Star Spangled Banner." Every morning before school we say the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

I feel very fortunate to have been born in this land of freedom. We have a choice of what we want to do with our lives. We have laws to insure everyone's rights.

Because of our great Flag the United States is a democracy. Democracy is a form of Government in which all the people together have the power to decide what the laws will be, and how the Government should be run. Sometimes we take our Flag, country and freedom for granted. We seldom stop to think how fortunate we are to have them. In many countries of the world, the people do not control the Government; a few of the people, who are rich or noble or powerful in a big political party, can decide what all the other people do or must do. Because of these very great and meaningful words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The Declaration of Independence was really written for each and every one of us.

Because of our flag we have so many rights and choices but I think the greatest of all is the right to choose what religion we feel in our hearts. We are free, every day if we wish to go to church and adore our God. I wish that every child could be as fortunate as me and been born under a flag so free.

OUR AMERICAN FLAG AND WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Karen Newton)

To me, the Flag represents a country united under stars and stripes. Everyone who ever was or is a citizen of the United States has pledged allegiance to the Flag.

Our Flag also symbolizes the union of the greatest Republic on earth. Over a half million human lives have been laid on the altar of Freedom so that our Stars and Stripes might fly over a free and peaceful land. When we look at "Old Glory" we must realize how lucky we are in this great place.

The Flag means a lot to most people. It stands for our country and all the people in it. There is a certain day when people all over the United States show a special respect for the Flag. This is Flag Day, which is celebrated on June the fourteenth. Everyone displays their flag with honor and respect.

Betsy Ross is the "mother" of the Flag. President Washington personally asked her to make it in 1777. From then till 1794 the Flag had thirteen stripes and thirteen stars. This symbolized the original thirteen colonies.

On January thirteenth, 1794, a new flag was made. This flag had fifteen stars and fifteen stripes. Eight stripes were red and seven were white. Our flag looked like this from 1795 until 1818. This was the flag Francis Scott Key saw flying over Fort McHenry the night he wrote "The Star-Spangled Banner."

On April fourth, 1818, Congress passed a law reducing the number of stripes to the original thirteen. Congress also decided that when a new state was admitted to the Union, they would add a star, but not a stripe.

It's odd to think that a piece of cloth can represent a whole country, and that people can love and respect it. But all people do, and they always will. I have deep feeling for the flag and a deep respect. I know I always will.

SCHOOL DESTRUCTION

HON. LAMAR BAKER

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

OF TENNESSEE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, volumes have been written about the hardship and real tragedy to which we are subjecting our children by requiring more and more crosstown busing in order to achieve some sort of mythical racial balance.

Every poll of public opinion shows additional opposition to this abuse of little children. A recent poll by the U.S. Catholic Magazine, generally considered as being read by moderate or middle-of-the-road Americans, indicates that more than 80 percent oppose busing, and favor the neighborhood school where possible.

Despite much crosstown busing in my hometown of Chattanooga, the courts continue to be dissatisfied with the situation and have ordered the school board back to the drawing boards to come up with a plan which will make additional mass transportation by bus mandatory. This means more small children will be standing on corners waiting for buses which may be late or will be left on the street when they are even a minute late for the school bus. It means more disruption of education, separation of school friends, breaking up of basketball, baseball, and football teams, bands, and other groups in order that the time may be spent simply getting to and from school on a bus.

The well-known columnist, Lester Kinsolving, who can hardly be called a segregationist, discussed the problem recently in his column. Mr. Kinsolving said:

It is my conviction based upon reading, listening and observing, that most people, including many black and white progressives—and almost all parents of small children—don't approve of busing.

Neither black nor white children should be used as pawns in games their parents and local, state and national governments are playing. Being thrust unwanted into a group of strange and different children, who can be cruel, may or may not damage their psyches and may or may not risk the chance of making them bigots.

It is simply another form of racism to assume that although white parents may object, black parents will be delighted with the prospect of their children being bused into the land of wild white yonder.

Let us stop playing games with the lives of our children and their parents. Let us return to them the freedom to attend their neighborhood school should they so desire. To do otherwise is to fail our obligation as their representative.

I insert the editorial entitled "School Destruction" from the June 28th edition of the Chattanooga News Free-Press in the RECORD at this point:

SCHOOL DESTRUCTION

Under federal court pressures, the Chattanooga School Board is attempting to draw up plans that will do the very disagreeable thing of destroying the city school system.

It is as plain as that.

If the full "desegregation" plan is put into effect, the school board's information shows, most of the city schools will have black majorities, with many students being prompted to flee the city system and others being dislocated from their neighborhoods and transported to distant and, for many, unacceptable circumstances.

This would not favor black students or white students. It would destroy the hope of quality education in the city system and lose the taxpayer support that is necessary for the kind of educational progress that is desirable for all.

It should be remembered that what the city schools are being forced to do is not be free from racial discrimination but to impose racial discrimination to bring about artificial patterns of attendance. This is exactly opposite the "color blind" standard that was established when the Supreme Court first moved unconstitutionally into the field of school mastering in 1954.

The question in Chattanooga, sadly, is not whether there is going to be good and improving public education to the satisfaction of its people, but to what degree there will be destruction of the school system and how fast. It is not a question of whether there will be integration but how rapid will be the resegregation as high-handed plans force those who can to leave conditions they do not like.

There was a real, fair, honest solution available. It was freedom of choice, allowing each student and his family to decide freely and without discrimination where he would like to attend. But the courts would not allow that constitutional, sensible approach.

So we have the destructive one. Some don't like to face up to the truth and call it what it is. But it is evident.

YATES COUNTY CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 27, Yates County in the Finger Lakes area of New York State celebrates its 150th anniversary. This birthday is a milestone for Yates County—a county which has contributed much to the progress and development of New York and the Nation. The story of that 150 years is one that I would like to share with my colleagues.

Yates County was formed from Ontario on February 6, 1823, and named for Joseph Yates, then Governor of New York State. Barrington and Starkey were added from Steuben in 1824. The early history of the county is closely associated with the history of the "Friends," a religious sect founded by Jemima Wilkinson. Her first settlement in 1790 was near the present village of Dresden, but a few years later was moved to the Town of Jerusalem.

The Friend was a patron saint to all the early settlers and her large fields of grain and herds of cattle were a source of supply on which pioneers drew for a start in the new country. The grist mill built by her people was one of the first in western New York and people came many miles to have their grain made into flour.

During the year 1816, in which frost occurred every month, many new families would have died of starvation had not the Friend been pleased to share her abundant stores with them.

After her death in 1819, the Society which she had established and kept active, gradually ceased to exist.

Another early local historical figure was Marcus Whitman, American missionary and pioneer born in Rushville in 1802. He married Narcissa Prentiss, also a missionary. The two, accompanied by the Reverend and Mrs. Henry Spaulding and W. H. Gray, journeyed west to Oregon where they worked among the Indians. The Whitmans and 11 of their associates were massacred by the Cayuse Indians in 1847.

At Dresden, the famed agnostic, writer and orator, Robert Ingersoll, was born.

Penn Yan, the seat of county government was incorporated in 1833. The first Yates County courthouse was erected there in 1824, but destroyed by fire in 1834. In 1835, the present red brick building was erected at a cost of $12,000. A jail, detached, was built the same season. These two buildings with modern additions are still in use.

Yates County has nine townships: Barrington, Benton, Italy, Jerusalem, Middlesex, Milo, Potter, Starkey and Torrey. Yates is located in the Central Finger Lakes region and is 22 miles wide and contains only 344 square miles, but makes up for its smallness in natural beauty. Seneca Lake forms the eastern boundary and Canadaigua Lake part of the western boundary. Keuka Lake, the only Y-shaped lake in the Northern Hemisphere, is near the center of the county. The topography and climate make this country an ideal location for grape culture and general farming. Each year, thousands of tourists and summer residents enjoy the beauty and recreational and cultural advantages of the area.

The cultivation and production of grapes began in Yates County in 1853 with a vineyard of 3 acres of catawbas along the shore of Keuka Lake. During the next 25 years, hundreds of acres were planted throughout the ccunty. At the present time there are at least 6,000 acres of vineyards with more being planted each year. The four leading varieties are Concord, Catawba, Delaware, and Aurore, a French hybrid. Demand for the wines of the Finger Lakes is credited with the rapid growth of the industry in our area.

In 1875, the Yates County Grange was organized with 400 members. Throughout the years the grange has continued to take an active part in agricultural affairs.

For 50 years, the Finger Lakes Association, which has its main office in Penn Yan, has promoted recreational activities and facilities. There is a 500-acre State park near Branchport, numerous small parks, several boat launching sites and marinas, campgrounds, and motels. There is no finer fishing anywhere than in the three lakes.

Special area events include the Glenora Music and Art Festival, the Starkey Antique Show, and Antique and Art Show at Esperanza, an historic landmark completed in 1838 and the Festival of Lights around Keuka Lake. There are many festivals, carnivals, antique shops, flea markets, and the Penn Yan and Dundee Fairs. Lakeside Country Club has a nice nine-hole golf course on the eastern shore of Keuka Lake. Sailboat races are run each summer weekend from the Keuka Yacht Club on the west shore. Airports in Penn Yan and Dundee are busy centers for business and pleasure.

Keuka College, on the west shore of Keuka Lake, is a small 4-year liberal arts college for women. It is noted for its field period, a program combining classroom learning with work experience. As a center of cultural activities for the area, the influence of the college is widespread. It sponsors movies, musical events, theater, and lectures.

The Yates County branch of the American Association of University Women is very active in cultural, political, and social affairs.

There are fine public libraries in Penn Yan, Branchport, and Dundee; the rural areas also receive added library service from the Southern Tier Library System Bookmobile.

Stately Oliver House on Penn Yan's Main Street is the home of the Yates County Historical Museum. Guyanoga Chapter, DAR, is also very active in historical affairs.

The first public school in the county was the old log meetinghouse of Jemima Wilkinson. It was built in the town of Torrey in 1790. Here, Sarah Richards, manager of temporal affairs for the Friends, taught the first classes in the county. In 1848, Starkey Seminary in Eddytown—now Lakemont—was incorporated by the regents as a secondary coeducational school. Dundee Academy in 1855 and the Penn Yan Union School District in 1857 were incorporated. At the present time, there are two large centralized school districts within the county at Dundee and Penn Yan. St. Michaels Catholic Church in Penn Yan has elementary classes in its parochial school.

After the Society of Friends, the First Methodist Society in western New York was organized in Yates in 1792. At the present time there are churches in every hamlet and village. Throughout the county the programs of lodges and service clubs add to the betterment of the communities.

The county medical society was organized in 1823 with 12 members. Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hospital serves the entire community with modern facilities, efficient personnel and dedicated volunteer groups. Yates County Medical Health Services has offices in the hospital. Community-sponsored Penn Yan Manor Nursing home is run in conjunction with the hospital. In downtown Penn Yan, St. Marks Terrace is an apartment complex for senior citizens.

Although primarily an agricultural area, Yates County has several large business and industrial plants. Among these are Transelco Inc., Greenidge New York State Electric and Gas generating plant, Lakeland Farms Co., and a branch of Mercury Aircraft in Dresden. The U.S. Navy also maintains a testing station there.

In Penn Yan, are located Penn Yan Express, and interstate trucking service; Penn Yan Boats Inc.; Birkett Mills, the largest producer of buckwheat products in the world; Michaels Stern and Co., manufacturer of men's clothing; Coach and Equipment Sales Corp.; a branch of Seneca Foods Corp.; Walkerbuilt Woodwork, Inc., and Barden and Robeson, makers of baby furniture.

In Himrod, Morton Salt has a very large mining operation. Rushville has Comstock Greenwood Foods, Inc.; in Middlesex are Beacon Farms and Lohmann Foods, Dundee has the home plant of Seneca Foods.

Fire protection for the county is ably handled by dedicated volunteer companies in various locations.

There are four banks in the county, the Dundee State Bank being the only one independently owned.

The Penn Yan Chronicle Express and the Dundee Observer, weekly newspapers, provide their readers with local news. Radio Station WFLR, in Dundee, broadcasts daily on AM and FM a wide variety of news, sports and music.

How can one help but agree with Stafford Cleveland when he said:

> Few localities in all our favored country are so rich as this in advantages of soil, climate, scenery and situation. Its abundant products find an easy and convenient market, and the fatness of the land has been well transmuted into wealth and easy conditions of life by its enterprising farmers. If salubrity, material prosperity and very advantage of mental and moral culture at their doors, can make a happy, intelligent and exemplary community, we should expect to find it here. Beginning with pioneers of the better class, it must be admitted there has been on deterioration, but a gratifying progress in social elevation.

TILLEDA, WIS., CENTENNIAL

HON. HAROLD V. FROEHLICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, July 20–22, the community of Tilleda, Wis., is celebrating the 100th anniversary of its founding. I am delighted to take this opportunity to congratulate the residents of Tilleda and to wish them continued success in the years to come.

Located in the heart of Shawano County, Tilleda was named after a town in what is now East Germany. Like many communities in northeastern Wisconsin, the settlement's early history was closely associated with the logging industry. It has often been the experience that when a logging camp closes, the town where it was located also closes. I am pleased to say that this was not the case with Tilleda. When floods washed out the sawmill, dam and bridge in 1912, the logging camp soon died, but the hardy community lived on.

Today, Tilleda's citizens embrace an exceptional sense of civic spirit and responsibility. Approximately half of the hamlet's 66 residents are serving on a planning committee for the Centennial celebration. This willingness to contribute has been the key to Tilleda's past development, and, no doubt, will continue to guide the community's future growth.

While the population of Tilleda may be small, the pride of her citizens is immense. Extending an invitation to one and all, their centennial theme bids, "Come See How We've Grown."

Mr. Speaker, I join with the citizens of Tilleda, Wis., in commemorating their 100th anniversary. The civic spirit of this proud little community is an example that the rest of the Nation should admire. My warmest congratulations and best wishes to the people of Tilleda.

TRIBUTE TO MR. THOMAS C. KEMPIN

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure to be the guest speaker at a dinner at the Frankford Arsenal on July 2, 1973. The purpose of the dinner was to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Mr. Thomas C. Kempin, who was retiring from the Frankford Arsenal upon completion of 32 years and 5 months of loyal service to his Government. At the time of his retirement, Mr. Kempin had served in the capacity of civilian executive at the Frankford Arsenal for 20 years. As the top civilian, Mr. Kempin provided continuity of administration at that installation through change of command for 11 commanders.

Mr. Kempin had a stellar career. He began his Federal service on October 2, 1939, as an apprentice tool, die, and gage maker and rose through the ranks of management to the senior civilian position at an almost meteoric rate. In 1942 he interrupted his civil service career to enlist in the U.S. Army where he served as Chief of the Fire Control Section of the 283d Medium Maintenance Ordnance Company. Upon completion of his military service, Mr. Kempin returned to Frankford Arsenal but took a leave of absence in 1946 to organize Catholic War Veteran Posts throughout the United States. It was upon his return to the Frankford Arsenal in 1948 that Mr. Kempin began his rapid rise through the management ranks to the position of civilian executive.

In this latter position Mr. Kempin developed a program of liaison with Federal, State, and municipal elected and appointive officials which contributed immeasurably to improved service to the various constituents who worked at Frankford Arsenal. In fact, many of the gentlemen present in this Chamber today have had direct dealings with Mr. Kempin and are well aware of the responsiveness and sense of urgency with which he handled their inquiries and representations.

At the beginning I noted my attendance at his retirement dinner. I want to tell you how impressed I was with the many testimonials which were tendered to Mr. Kempin that evening. Over 200 turned out to honor Mr. Kempin. It was my privilege to have the opportunity to recognize Mr. Kempin for his executive talents, his many efforts to aid the Frankford Arsenal and its employees and his many contributions to the entire Philadelphia community. It is primarily through Mr. Kempin's efforts that the Frankford Arsenal survived attempts in 1969 to transfer its research, development, and engineering missions and to place the installation in an inactive status. Indeed, the entire Delaware Valley area is deeply indebted to Mr. Kempin for his help in the retention of the $60 million annual payroll of Frankford Arsenal in that section's economy.

I might add that Mr. Kempin has been very active in community affairs having served as president of the Philadelphia Business Association and the William Penn Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army. He also served as a member of the executive committee of the Philadelphia Federal Executive Board and was chairman of the Cancer Crusade for the northeast Philadelphia region. He is chairman of the Catholic Charities Campaign for his parish.

A singular honor was paid to Mr. Kempin at the dinner when the commanding officer, Col. James L. Wallace, on behalf of the Secretary of the Army presented him with the Civilian Meritorious Service Award for his outstanding work as the civilian executive. In addition, Mr. Kempin received testimonial letters from each member of the Philadelphia congressional delegation, including the Senate minority leader and the junior U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, the mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable Frank L. Rizzo, and many other governmental and civic leaders.

During his career as civilian executive, Mr. Kempin received six outstanding performance ratings, three sustained superior accomplishment awards, and three quality step increases.

Of equal import to this occasion, I believe, was the fact that the date of the dinner occurred on the occasion of his mother's 83d birthday, which resulted in a chorus of 200 voices singing happy birthday since Mrs. Catherine M. Kempin was in attendance with Mr. Kempin's charming wife, Betty, and their two children, Mary Ann 10, and Mary Elizabeth, 6.

VITAMIN BILL REMAINS TOPIC OF CONCERN

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, WTAQ radio in LaGrange, Ill., recently aired an editorial about the Food and Drug Administration ruling that many of the vitamins and food supplements now sold over the counter are to be available only by prescription as of January 1, 1974.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 643, to counteract the FDA's authority in restricting the manufacturing and sale of vitamins and food supplements. Currently there are 160 Members of the House of Representatives who have joined me as cosponsors of this legislation.

Also, we have received many letters of support for H.R. 643 from individuals across the Nation.

The WTAQ editorial, which follows, supports H.R. 643 and points out why the FDA's ruling should be of concern to us all.

The editorial follows:

WTAQ EDITORIAL

The bureaucrats at the Food and Drug Administration in Washington, D.C. have outdone themselves in the pursuit of the absurd and outrageous in coming up with a ruling that should be of concern to us all, whether or not we have any interest in the specific involved.

The F.D.A. has ordered that as of January 1, 1974, about 80% of the vitamins and minerals now sold freely over the counter are to be available only by prescription.

Now mind you, the agency doesn't even claim that these substances do harm to the human body . . . except when consumed in enormous and unheard of quantities. Rather, the restrictions are based on the F.D.A. *claim* that it is aware of no benefit to the human body achieved by consuming the dietary supplements.

The most startling provisions of the F.D.A. ruling constitute a blatant violation of the constitutional right of freedom of speech. It actually prohibits public statements which ever, or even suggest or imply that dietary supplements are helpful in any way to prevent, treat or cure disease: that any diet of ordinary foods cannot supply adequate nutrients; that inadequate or insufficient diet is due to or in any way related to the lack of minerals in, or fertility of, the soil in which food is grown; or that refining, transportation, storage, preservation or cooking foods may result in inadequate or deficient diet.

We believe this extraordinary regulation is but another of the government's steady, gradual steps in its attempt to control every facet of the lives of the American people, and so does Congressman Craig Hosmer of California who has introduced a bill designed to override part of the F.D.A.'s edict.

We recommend support of Congressman Hosmer's bill, H.R. 643, and believe that no government in a free country has a right to forbid its citizens from stating publicly what they believe are the benefits of food supplements. Furthermore, we oppose any regulation restricting easy access to safe, non-toxic food supplements.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, in our pursuit of détente with the U.S.S.R. and Communist China, let us not forget those people who are forced unwillingly into the Communist alliance—those we remember this week during the 15th observance of Captive Nations Week.

Let us continue to applaud and encourage trade, travel, cultural and scientific cooperation and mutual reductions of weapons and forces as a means of easing tensions in this atomic age. However, we should not forget our principles of freedom. In our negotiations with the U.S.S.R., let us continue to support the rights of those in Communist-held countries to individual freedom and national self-determination.

For example, I believe we should stand firmly behind Hungary's right to full member status at the mutual balanced force reduction—MBFR—talks in Geneva this fall. Peaceful coexistence should not have to be maintained by a show of arms.

The intention of the conference was to have all Central European countries participate and to plan mutual cuts of all stationed troop forces—with no exceptions. We should not allow the Soviet Union to force us to accept observer status for Hungary. How can we expect the conference to be effective if even one area is excluded?

LET US RETURN TO THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there is now a great deal of discussion as to what phase 4 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 will bring to the American consumer. Several of us who are members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, have recommended that we return to the free-market system which has proven to be the most stable and productive in the world—that is, when it is allowed to function fully and freely.

Several newspapers, in their editorial sections, and various television and radio stations have commented on wage and price controls and I believe that my colleagues would be very much interested in an editorial broadcast by KNX radio in the Los Angeles area on June 28, 1973. It reiterates the theme: Why do we not bring the free enterprise system back to America? In another broadcast, June 26, the KNX editors discuss President Nixon's phase 3½. I recommend that my colleagues review the ideas that are presented in these two editorials:

WHY DON'T WE BRING THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM BACK TO AMERICA?

Today, we end our series on consumer prices with a radical idea. It's this: why don't we bring the free enterprise system back to America?

We have been taught that the free enterprise system is the best way of producing and distributing goods and services. It is the most efficient. It is the fairest. It is the ideal.

We have been taught this by our schools, our Republican President, and our Democratically-controlled Congress. At least, we have heard them all *talk* about free enterprise.

Yet, there is nothing praised as highly by politicians with words and more consistently ignored in action. It has been hobbled, hampered, and hamstrung by politicians who obey the demands of special interests. These are often too inefficient to meet competition in the open market. So, they get Congressmen and State Legislators to legislate the free enterprise system out of existence.

Consider just a few items: government permits artifically set prices for many farm products, airlines and so-called fair traded items. It mandates that laborers must join a union, which, in turn, sets the price of labor. It indirectly sets interest rates charged by banks. It uses tax money to encourage farmers not to grow things. It bails out inefficient companies with subsidies and loan guarantees and that drives prices up. It provides numerous tax loopholes that favor one segment of the economy over another. And, on and on and on.

KNX believes in the free enterprise system. We think it should be brought back into use in America. That will happen only when government stops meddling, mixing and mucking up our economy.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PHASE 3½

President Nixon has brought us Phase 3½. He has bought some time with some words. That's the only bargain in town.

Following his speech, the Democrats who control Congress gave us their ideas on stopping runaway consumer prices. Both continue to be long on talk and short on action. The result is a spiral of inflation unmatched in a generation.

Once again, the President has used his favorite gimmick of selective controls. Everything produced is a combination of raw materials, labor, capital, and management. Mr. Nixon has consistently put controls on only some of these things.

He has, for example, frozen retail food prices at their all-time high. He has not frozen raw food prices. So, we have controlled retail prices floating on top of uncontrolled raw food prices. The President refuses to control profits. This, in the face of record level First Quarter profits. The Wall Street Journal, for example, reports the after-tax profits of 655 major companies were up 27.8% in the first quarter.

The President refuses to control interest rates. So, the rates are going through the roof. June 8th, the Federal Reserve Board jacked up its discount rate to the highest point since 1921. Commercial banks have been raising rates over and over again in recent months.

KNX opposes President Nixon's idea of selective controls. They help the wealthy corporations and banks and hurt you.

However, the Democratically controlled Congress is also to blame for inflation. Tomorrow, we'll look at that.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN SURVIVAL

HON. DICK SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, Prof. R. W. Behan of the University of Montana School of Forestry made some interesting comments concerning the Earth's rapidly dwindling resources. Professor Behan concludes that we have infinite quantities of resources, many of which are considered neutral now, but we must develop technology to adapt them for human use. He points out that social problems are of a higher priority that are those concerning resources and our attention should be directed accordingly. I would like to share with you a paper he presented to the annual meeting of the Pacific Division of the American Association for the Advancement of Science which occurred on June 12 in Salt Lake:

NATURAL RESOURCES AND HUMAN SURVIVAL

I suppose it is axiomatic that human survival depends upon natural resources. Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot preached this in the first great conservation movement some 65 or 70 years ago, and we hear the same kind of rhetoric today.

We have come to be rather certain that the earth and its resources are fixed and finite. The current and popular books make this case in unequivocal terms. One is particularly apropos with respect to our symposium today; it is entitled *Blueprint for Survival*. It is a fine, lively, incisive, and polemical bit of purple nonsense that advocates a steady-state equilibrium between population and natural resources. The other book is also a fine, lively, incisive and polemical bit of nonsense, but it relies less on purple prose and much more on the M.I.T. computer and the book, of course, is *The Limits to Growth*. This book, too, sternly advocates a steady-state balance between people on the one hand and natural resources on the other.

I want at this point to disclaim a number of accusations that might come my way. I am highly critical of the two books I have mentioned, by no means do I favor the orthodox counter-arguments frequently offered by the business community.

I am firmly convinced, for example, that a great deal of our National Product is gross, indeed, and I do not advocate unlimited economic growth simply for the sake of more consumer durables per capita. My home today contains more goodies and toys than I have time to play with, and I suspect yours does too. Neither do I wish to be allied with corporate capitalism, for I think the pathologies of the institution are abundant, conspicuous, and serious.

I am concerned with these books and others like them because they rest on a faulty assumption of comprehensive resource scarcity; I do not think mankind faces such scarcity, and my argument will comprise most of this paper. But I am also concerned that the books maintain an old image that is faulty, too. This is the image of a balance of nature or, in more arcane terms, the idea of ecological equilibrium.

The survival problem is formulated in terms that are far too simplistic when we become enraptured with equilibrium, all we have to do to survive is to adjust human numbers to the output of a natural, homeostatic system. So goes the standard refrain.

I am convinced that such a problem formulation, such simple minded thinking, can lead to disastrous responses, both in terms of individual and social behavior and in terms of public policy. There are good and legitimate reasons why minority groups are glaringly absent in our domestic politics of the environment. And there are good and legitimate reasons why the developing nations were less than enthusiastic a year ago at the UN conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm.

My discomfort rests on a conviction that mankind's social problems are far more crucial than his resource problems. Historically the record is clear: we have learned how to survive in nature; we need to learn how to live with each other. And if we spend all our energies trying to solve a trivial issue—the problems of man and nature—we are distracted from the more important one—the problems of man and man. Well, I am soaring off into vague ambiguities here that are more fun to articulate than to listen to.

The orthodox survival problem is formulated in the well-known Malthusian equation. S.L.=R/P. or, in words, standard of living is determined by the ratio of resources to population.

The resource term, typically, is subdivided into categories. We have a stock of nonrenewable resources on one hand, and flows of renewable resources on the other. In either case, however, the resource is a particular substance, and it is quantified by a static or dynamic inventory. We might say the R=S; resources are substances, and the inventories of substances are fixed and finite.

The flow-inventories of renewable substances—food, fiber, wildlife, water—are fixed by the balance ecosystem on which man depends. The image here is one of an equilibrium-seeking production mechanism, and its maximum output will determine the carrying capacity of Spaceship Earth. And, according to much of the environmental rhetoric today, there is only one decision-variable that is available, if we are to avert disaster.

That is the denominator term in the fraction, the human population term. According to accepted doctrine, we *must* reduce human population, to align it with that carrying capacity which is determined, we know, by the natural production of renewable resources. With natural production and human consumption in balance, we will achieve a global equilibrium, and that is what *Blueprint for Survival* calls for, and so does *The Limits to Growth*.

But the human population, if we found Paul Ehrlich compelling, is growing exponentially, beyond human comprehension and control, becoming an ominous *Population Bomb*. Facing the spectre of this population explosion, we have been treated to such staggering nonsense as *Famine, 1975!* by the Paddock brothers, who seriously suggested writing off 600 million people in India as lost and hopeless.

We have, then, an exploding population pressing on a fixed base of resources as inventories of substances. The ratio R/P is seen distinctly as an independent variable, and the consequence is alarming. The standard of living *must* decline, and we see this term distinctly, too, as a *dependent* variable, wholly determined by the R/P ratio.

In order to avert the disastrous decline in standard of living, we must bring the human population within the carrying capacity of the renewable natural resources that a homeostatic nature provides. Survival is thereby assured.

And that, I submit, is not only redundant with respect to my paper here, but it is also orthodox nonsense. The arithmetic involved, and the quantitative relationships, are intractable, of course. Given all the implicit assumptions and concepts, disaster is inescapable. We would be well advised, I suppose, to inspect the assumptions and concepts.

I don't really think human population is exploding beyond human comprehension and control. Quite the contrary we comprehend human population growth quite well, and we are very much in control of it.

All of the apocalyptic-environmental reports that I have read assert one outstanding premise: "if present trends continue". *Because* human population is determined by human decisions made in family situations all over the world, present trends have *never* continued. Families assess their environments with values provided by their cultures, and family sizes and hence social populations—are adjusted accordingly; assessments have changed, and so have both family size and populations. My most recent information about U.S. birth rates, for example, is really alarming. We are now producing babies at less than replacement levels, and if that trend continues, Zero Population Growth is unattainable; we will achieve instead, obviously, Zero Population.

I also think the concept is faulty that resources are inventories of substances. At best, the notion "resource equals substance" is incomplete, because there is an enormous amount of substance aboard Spaceship Earth that we don't recognize as "resources" at all. We see a great deal of excess baggage. And in addition to the excess baggage of substance, there are enormous reservoirs of unused energy sources as well—tidal flows, geothermal sources, and direct solar energy come to mind.

In an ingenious book with an inauspicious title, *World Resources and Industries*, Eriea Zimmermann uses the term "neutral stuff" to describe the excess baggage aboard Spaceship Earth.

What is the distinction between "resources," then, and "neutral stuffs." One distinction, presumably, is the *utility* we perceive in certain naturally occurring substances, energy source, and amenity services in our environment, and fail to perceive in others. Another distinction relates to our stock of knowledge; we need to know how to translate the potential utility in neutral stuff into the actuality of realized satisfactions. I prefer to call this knowledge "technology," and add quickly, if awkwardly, that technology by any other name is still human knowledge and ingenuity: malignantly no more and benignly no less.

It seems to me that a resource is uniquely and completely determined, then, not by a single factor, but by all three: a resource is a function of neutral stuff, technology and utility. One of my students, in a moment perhaps of insight *and* malice, formulated the relationship as R=f(N.U.T): the rest of the class, with a sense of subdued but nearly unanimous glee, quickly named it the Nut Theorem, and preferred this formulation to others equally, I imagine, as rigorous.

Several consequences are immediately apparent when we conceive of resources as functions rather than inventories. One, of course, is the paramount significance of human decisions: utilities and technologies achieve parity with the neutral stuff involved, and they are both products of human perception and imagination. At least indirectly, this does away with the image of a balanced nature providing man's needs. Quite directly, on the contrary, man provides man's needs: it is irrigated, fertilized, hybridized, and often corporate agriculture that feeds us, not a balanced, climax ecosystem. And a second order consequence may be more alarming to conventional thinking: in anything but the very short run, resources so conceived are not comprehensively scarce at all. As utilities and technologies change, so do the neutral stuff parameters, and resources as functions become comprehensively abundant.

The relevant questions, accordingly, become different questions. We needn't be terribly concerned about the sufficiency of iron ore to build more and more automobiles. Instead we can ask what other neutral stuffs, with what other attendant technologies, are available or discoverable with which to make auto bodies. Fiberglass? Or old car bodies perhaps? Or we can inquire about the utility variable: do we want to build more automobiles at all, or are there other means for moving people to and from their jobs, schools, and vacation sites? On my campus I have noticed our parking lots becoming increasingly vacant as the number of bicycles increases: I see this as a tangible example of resource abundance. And I see this example as ho-hum typical, for all resources, and even in physical terms; we are on the technical brink, so to speak, of a 10-billion-year supply of energy when we look at the fusion reaction of deuterium, the hydrogen isotope in seawater.

We needn't resort to that degree of utopianism, I suppose, to make my point: resouces as functions are comprehensively abundant, and we can substitute a term now in the Malthusian equation:

S.L.=f(N,U,T)/Population

Having done that we can breath a great deal more easily about doomsday.

But a further consequence is more interesting, at least from an analytical point of view. I have argued that human population is the collective result of human decisions, and I think, obviously, that's true. (If we have a population problem, it is a fairly difficult and ugly problem at that: the decisions of other people and other cultures, about how many people is too many people, simply don't agree with our own.) Population then, the denominator, is decision determined. And so, it should be obvious, is the resource numerator: we decide on utilities and technologies continuously, adopt one sort or another of neutral stuff, and resource are decision-determined, accordingly. And this can only mean one thing: the R/P ratio cannot possibly be an independent variable, as the orthodox Malthusian equation would have us believe.

And neither, of course, is the standard-of-living variable *dependent* on the ratio of resources to people. Indeed, we choose our standard-of-living first and independently: we fashion our family size accordingly, collectively determining population, and we make our utility-technology-neutral stuff decisions, accordingly, as well.

These relationships or something similar, prompted UN Secretary General U Thant to make this statement several years ago:

"The truth, the central stupendous truth, about developed countries today is that they can have—in anything but the shortest run—the kind and scale of resources they decide to have . . . It is no longer resources that limit decisions. It is the decision that makes the resources. This is the fundamental revolutionary change—perhaps the most revolutionary mankind has ever known."

And therein lies my major concern: survival—in terms of resource sufficiency—is guaranteed in circumstances where "decisions make the resources." But not, it is apparent, under other circumstances, where the grinding intractability of Malthusian law still holds.

In many of the developing countries today these circumstances are realities, and we need desperately to help, as humanely and magnanimously as we can, to change these circumstances. We need, in short, to foster the development of these countries.

And there are many sectors of the American society as well—we have called them disadvantaged minorities—that face circumstances of scarcity, poverty, and need. This, I think, constitutes a problem of distribution, not of development, but the effects are no less crucial to those who face them.

Worldwide, I think our species has learned quite well—in some cases too well—how to live in the physical realm of nature. Human survival no longer depends upon—nor is it constrained by—the physical aspects of natural resources. Instead it depends on our successful efforts to share our knowledge, our compassion, and our wealth. We have learned to live with nature, as I suggested earlier; we have not to learn to live with each other. For I agree, finally, with author Richard Neuhaus: "The goal is not survival, but survival as human beings."

ANOTHER MINIMUM WAGE HIKE?

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, having passed this House on June 6, this year's minimum wage legislation will be taken up by the Senate before the end of this week. I retain the serious reservations that I voiced about the bill during its consideration by the Committee on Education and Labor and the full House, and I want to commend to the attention of my colleagues an excellent column on this issue by George Will which appears in the July 17 edition of the Washington Post.

Mr. Will reiterates the point that many of us tried to make during the House debate that "minimum wage legislation usually is harmful to many of the people who are supposed to benefit." For example, despite the emotional cries of "child labor" that were bandied about by advocates of the House bill, it is very clear in this case that the lack of a "youth differential" provision will harm the employment prospects of those young people who most need to work—high school drop-outs and especially those from minority groups.

With the distinct possibility of a House-Senate conference on this legislation, not to mention a Presidential veto, I ask my colleagues to take the time to consider Mr. Will's cogent arguments. The full article is reprinted herein below:

ANOTHER MINIMUM WAGE HIKE?

(By George Will)

Acting in its traditional role of tireless protector of the strong, the Senate is about to follow the House of Represenatives in voting to increase unemployment among the nation's vulnerable workers—especially black teenagers.

The Senate will do this in the name of humanitarianism as it votes another increase in the minimum wage. The Senate probably will adopt the House bill, as against the administration's proposals.

The man arguments between the House and the administration concern whether coverage should be extended; how fast the minimum should rise to $2.20 per hour; and whether there should be a "youth differential," whereby anyone under 18 and full-time students could be paid 15 per cent less than the regular minimum wage.

The House reflecting the position of organized labor, wants to extend coverage to domestic and government workers. It wants to go to $2.20 one year quicker than the administration (by 1974) and rejects the "youth differential."

The administration's proposals are less toxic than those of the House. But the really striking and depressing thing in both wings of the Capitol is that so few politicians—Sens. Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.) and Robert Taft Jr. (R-Ohio) being honorable exceptions—acknowledge that minimum wage legislation usually is harmful to many of the people who are supposed to benefit.

I suspect that one reason economics is known as the "dismal science" is that it, unlike other social sciences, is sufficiently rigorous to occasionally reach clear conclusions that can interfere with political desires. Certainly today there is a remarkable consensus among independent economists about five matters relevent to minimum wage legislation:

Blacks suffer more than whites, and teenagers more than adults from sluggish job markets.

Minimum wage legislation makes it harder for blacks and teenagers to find employment in good times, and harder to hold jobs when times are not good.

White adult males benefit most from the effect of minimum wage legislation on lost job opportunities and increased job instability among blacks and teenagers.

There are more poor people whose poverty derives from unemployment than from holding jobs that pay inadequate wages.

While it is true that some workers are paid so poorly they must also draw welfare, it is equally true that raising the minimum wage will cause some of these people to become unemployed people on welfare.

None of these points is surprising. Minimum wage laws hurt marginal workers because their skills are least productive and most easily dispensed with. That is why it does not pay to pay them much.

Minimum wage legislation has a regressive cost-benefit distribution. It puts marginal workers in jeopardy while helping—not surprisingly—those who push hardest for such legislation, organized labor.

Of course, not all economists acknowledge this. The economists who work for organized labor deploy a lot of methodological arguments designed to show that the state of the economist's art is such that we can not know for sure who will be affected how by minimum wage legislation.

There are a couple of things to say about these arguments.

First, if the science of economics is not able to predict dismal results from such legislation, then it cannot predict good results. So we should err on the side of caution and leave bad enough alone.

Second, there is something suspiciously selective about the epistemological scrupulousness of organized labor's economists. When labor is lobbying Congress for laws to protect the republic from Italian shoes, labor's economists are remarkably confident about their ability to say just how many shoemakers will be booted into poverty by a given number of Italian shoes.

Organized labor wants a steadily rising minimum wage in order to raise the general wage floor, thereby giving an upward thrust to the negotiating position of unions that, one would have thought, were already powerful enough.

In addition, organized labor wants a high minimum wage enforced nationwide so there will be less temptation for industry to locate in poorer, low wage (often non-union) areas. The fact that minimum wage legislation causes unemployment in some areas and hinders the growth of employment opportunities in other areas, is of no concern to organized labor.

The only amusing thing about minimum wage legislation is that it, like most other things in American economic life, confounds the Marxist prophecy.

Marx said capitalists will always act so as to create a reserve army of the unemployed to use in grinding the face of organized labor. But today it is organized labor, with its racial discrimination, its apprenticeship programs restricting access to professions, and now, again, minimum wage demands that is swelling the reserve army of the unemployed.

NIXON USES DOUBLE-THINK, DOUBLE-TALK

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago Journalist Ray Stephens, head of the Washington bureau of the Booth Newspapers, wrote a compelling analysis of the Presidential role in the Watergate case.

Although his analysis was published in the Flint Journal of May 27, it makes valuable reading today. I insert the article for the interest of my colleagues.

NIXON USES DOUBLE-THINK, DOUBLE-TALK

(By Ray Stephens)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's 4,000-word rationalization of his own contribution to the Watergate scandal amounts to a denial that he violated the law or ordered anyone else to do it.

But beneath the disclaimers and repreated protestations of innocence, the President concedes that he was fully prepared to authorize such violations, even to breaking and entering.

"It is not my intention to place a national security 'cover' on Watergate," The President said. Whereupon he proceeded to do exactly that.

Protecting the "National security" is the only defense offered by Nixon in a statement that is a remarkable example of both double-think and double-talk.

In short, he contends that the ends justified the means. Ironically, that was precisely the unsuccessful defense offered by Watergate conspirator James McCord Jr. at his trial.

McCord had argued he was justified in breaking the law because he acted solely out of concern for the President's safety.

National security is a legitimate and basic concern of government. It also is a euphemism frequently employed to justify suppressing political skeletons as well as military secrets.

Nixon's statement indicates that his close associates, if not the President himself, were at least as concerned with the former as with the latter.

The President admitted as much. At critical points in the events surrounding Watergate, he said, various people "saw the same situation with different eyes and heard the same words with different ears."

"What might have seemed insignificant to one seemed significant to another," the President continued. "What one saw in terms of public responsibility, another saw in terms of political opportunity; and mixed through it all, I am sure, was a concern that the Watergate scandal should not be allowed to get in the way of what the administration sought to achieve."

Precisely. And, two examples make the point.

The President's overriding concern, by his own admission, was to ensure that an investigation of Watergate did not expose covert operations of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) "nor the operations of the special investigations unit."

Why, you may ask, should the President fear that the CIA might somehow be involved in a purely domestic matter?

The answer, in Nixon's statement, is that the President himself sought in 1970 to enlist the CIA in investigations of domestic dissent—anti-war demonstration and the like—despite the fact that the law flatly prohibits that espionage agency from taking part in any form of internal security work.

Furthermore, the White House investigators had obtained CIA cooperation in what that agency had to know was an internal matter, even if it didn't know that the plan involved breaking into the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Not that the CIA should, or would, have been surprised. According to the President, his 1970 plan for coordinated domestic intelligence "included authorization for surreptitious entry—breaking and entering, in effect. . . ."

That plan, Nixon said, was never put into effect, but he made no bones of the fact that he approved it; that he was prepared to countenance the commission of felonies.

The President again cited national security as justification, implying that violence by antiwar and racial militants threatened to undermine the Republic. Whether or not you accept that as true, you must also concede that the dissidents' success in generating opposition to Nixon's policies posed an even bigger threat to his political future.

Nixon's determination to protect the secrecy of his own special investigations unit raises a question as to how far you can carry concealment before it becomes the crime of obstructing justice.

The early reports on Watergate, the President said, "led me to surmise, correctly, that since persons originally recruited for covert national security activities had participated in Watergate, an unrestricted investigation of Watergate, might lead to and expose those covert national security operations."

Therefore, he ordered his two top aides, H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman, to ensure that the existence of the special unit be kept secret from FBI agents then investigating the case.

It must be remembered that the special unit was under the overall supervision of Ehrlichman, and under the direct command of his No. 1 assistant, Egil Krogh.

Further, it was Krogh who authorized E. Howard Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy, the men who subsequently were to lead the Watergate raid, to burglarize the office of Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

The president's order to Haldeman and Ehrlichman thus amounted to blocking any inquiries that might connect Hunt and Liddy to the White House unit.

"It now seems that later, through whatever complex of individual motives and possible misunderstandings, there were apparently wide-ranging efforts to limit the investigation or to conceal the possible involvement of members of the administration and the campaign committee," Nixon said.

Given their instruction, it is difficult to see how the President's aides could have done anything less. Protecting the secrecy of the special investigations unit demanded that Ehrlichman cover his own tracks since he was the man in charge.

Since the central question to the Watergate burglary was, and still is, not who carried out the crime but who ordered it, the effect of the President's order was to impede the investigation, and shield his associates.

OUR ECONOMY—TELL IT LIKE IT IS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, those responsible for our economy must have the courage to acknowledge past mistakes and to tell it as it is to the American consumer—even if that reality presents some bleak prospects. The harsh reality is that as a result of past economic mistakes, we are now confronted by substantial supply shortages in energy, agricultural commodities, and ferrous scrap. These shortages will inevitably lead to price increases once the present freeze is over, and the American consumer should be prepared for those increases. Moreover, these shortages are not temporary phenomena; they are long-term problems which demand long-term solutions directed at allocating existing stocks and increasing future supply. Short-term attempts to deal with these shortages—without long-term solutions—may only exacerbate the problem.

In a recent telegram, C. W. Cook, chairman of General Foods Corp., has had the courage to tell it like it is. His concise, but alarming, remarks are worthy of our attention:

OUR ECONOMY—TELL IT LIKE IT IS

Several factors inherent in our country's food supply and pricing systems, I am convinced, make it inevitable that food prices will rise significantly in the months ahead. As the administration develops phase four of its economic control program and as Congress deliberates the farm bill, it is imperative that we face squarely the facts as they are. As chief executive of a major food processor, I feel obliged to provide you with this unpleasant information as an aid in considering legislation and to assist you in communications with constituents on this subject.

Because of the manner in which phase two, phase three and the present freeze have been supplied, today's food prices are deceptively low. They are based on farm prices far below present levels because of controls at wholesale and retail. Current controls result in costing ingredients at original price and not at replacement, and this results in a time lag in reflecting rising farm prices in finished products. When sharp commodity price increases are reflected at retail, as ultimately they must be, the resultant rise in food costs is certain to shock consumers. And as higher priced agricultural products work their way through inventories, the situation is certain to be aggravated further. Even excellent crop prospects this year will not be sufficient to curb this spiral significantly.

For these reasons I and many of my industry colleagues believe food prices are destined to rise sharply this year regardless of provisions for control that may be incorporated in phase four regulations. We believe the consuming public should be made aware of this distasteful prospect now because we fear many consumers expect food prices to hold steady or possibly decline once new crop estimates are in. We believe both industry leaders and elected public servants have this obligation.

The foregoing is predicated on the assumption that phase four will permit pass-through of all cost increases. Any continued squeezing of processors' and distributors' margins will only result in sharply reduced food supplies with all that implies, and simply delay but aggravate the price increases which are inevitable.

OLDER BUT NEVER OLD

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district in the Bronx is fortunate in having many lively and concerned senior citizens who take an active role in their community. One such senior citizen is Mr. Paul Leith, whose exceptional record of involvement in organizations and concerns for the elderly deserves particular recognition.

Mr. Leith founded and was for 5 years president of the Senior Citizens Club of Crompond, N.Y., in Westchester County. He is, at age 79, an active member of the Gerontological Society, the National Council on the Aging, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and the American Association of Retired Persons. He is currently a columnist for City News of Co-op City in the Bronx, and recently organized a session on "The Experience of Retirement" as part of Fordham University's weeklong conference on "Aging—Its Challenge to the Individual and to Society."

I am submitting for the RECORD excerpts from two of Mr. Leith's weekly "Older But Never Old" columns dealing with the Fordham University session. I find his statement stressing "the importance of social action and legislative activity by the elderly in their own behalf and for all other Americans," particularly noteworthy.

The excerpts follow:

OLDER BUT NEVER OLD

(By Paul Leith)

Bronx Senior Citizens attend a Professional Conference on Aging. With permission from the sponsors, I organized a group of ten senior citizens from the Bronx to attend without charge the Wednesday afternoon June 20th session of the all-week Pastoral Psychology Institute at Fordham University (Bronx) on "Aging—Its Challenge to the Individual and to Society" (June 18–22). The Wednesday afternoon session dealt with "The Experience of Retirement."

The group consisted of Mr. Charles Alverez of the South Bronx, a Vice President of the Greater New York Congress of Senior Citizens; Mrs. Madeline Aurichio from the Boston-Secor Senior Center; Mrs. Virginia McGuinness and Mrs. Nora O'Brien from the Eastchester Senior Center; Mrs. Harriet Conway and Mrs. Elizabeth Williams from the William Hodson Senior Center; Mr. Fred Berkowitz, president of the Friendship Senior Citizens Club of Co-op City; and Mrs. Esther Leith from the Retired Members Local, District 65, Distributive Workers of America. Mr. Daniel Sullivan from St. Michaels Parish of Co-op City could not attend, due to the death of a relative.

After the talks by scheduled speakers, Mr. Alverez, Mrs. McGuinness, Mrs. Conway and your columnist spoke. Mrs. McGuinness explained the telephone reassurance program of the Eastchester Center. Mrs. Conway outlined the many activities of the William Hodson Center, and expressed her pleasure from participating in these programs. Mr. Alverez stressed "the misery that befalls a great proportion of our elderly when they retire or lose their mate." He cited as the three main problems facing the elderly: income, health and loneliness. He declared that "use must be found for the vast knowledge that the elderly possess, thus assuring them that they are a needed element in our daily lives" and he called on the Conference delegates "to show the retired that they are needed." The remarks of your columnist will be printed next week.

OLDER BUT NEVER OLD

(By Paul Leith)

My Remarks at the Fordham Institute Session on "Experience of Retirement." Last week, I referred to the participation of nine Bronx senior citizens, including three from Co-op City, in the June 20th afternoon session of the Fordham University Conference on Aging, and to the talks by three of them. This is a revised version of my talk. (I am availing myself of the privilege of Congressmen to revise their speeches before they are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"My experience indicates that a meaningful life in retirement is best attained by activity in senior citizens groups affiliated with the National Council of Senior Citizens; and by membership in national professional organizations like the Gerontological Society, by attending their national Conferences on Aging, and by reading their Journals. Contributing a weekly column "Older But Never Old" to the City News, a neighborhood paper in Co-op City, Bronx, N.Y. requires that I keep in touch with happenings in Washington, Albany and New York City on the legislative front, and with the activities of senior citizens center and clubs. I have tried, since retirement in 1958, to be active, but always looking for new challenges.

"I should like to stress the importance of social action, of legislative activity by the elderly in their own behalf and for all other Americans; especially on behalf of the poor, and the low middle income people.

"On all sides, we hear rejoicing over every step, however small, to benefit the elderly. But I should like to emphasize the failure of our society to provide for the elderly a fair share of the products of industry, of services, of medical, educational and recreational resources. I welcomed the establishment of Social Security, Medicare, the Older Americans Act and programs like Foster Grandparents. But all of these programs leave the elderly in an inferior position. The various programs like Foster Grandparents which provide partial employment benefits only a comparatively handful of elderly poor people. This is tokenism, not justice. Medicare is becoming more costly for the elderly. The percentage of total medical costs paid to the elderly by Medicare has dropped from 1966 to 1972. In 1966, Medicare paid 50 percent; but in 1972, it dropped to 42 percent! Furthermore, President Nixon has proposed in his budget for the fiscal year 1974 to make the elderly pay more for hospitalization and doctor's fees.

"Loud hosannas are exclaimed about the number of older people who reach up to the poverty level, but what's there to brag about when the total income of a single person reaches $40 a week, and of a couple $50 a week?

"Dedicated professionals working with older people should be doing all they can to have the elderly get a fair share of what is produced in the United States. Are you professionals concerned with this?

"The 1971 White House Conference on Aging urged participation of senior citizens in planning and carrying out programs affecting them. Is this the practice in your organizations which have such programs?

"Elderly people are urged on all sides to adjust to their new situation, when they retire. This means generally to adjust to an income about or less than half of what they earned while working. In 1967 in New York City one out of every three elderly households had an annual income of less than $2000 a year, and an additional 18 percent (about one out of every five) had an income between $2000 and $3000. Together, 51 percent (one out of two elderly households) had an income of less than $3000 a year. Despite Social Security benefit increases since then, there is still a wide gap between the elderly and those working, as far as income is concerned.

"We hear, especially during election campaigns, about the great contributions made by the elderly to the building up of this country to the point where those now employed have a standard of living much higher than that which the present elderly had when they were employed. But the reward for such contributions to society is still pitifully small.

"During the past decade, millions of elderly people have not been meekly adjusting to their disadvantaged position, but have been demanding the right to live decently and in dignity.

"On March 6th of this year, thousands of elderly people, on the call of the Greater New York Congress of Senior Citizens, presented their demands to the New York State Legislature leaders in Albany. On June 6–8, ten thousand senior citizens went to Washington to attend the National Legislative Conference of the National Council of Senior Citizens. I urge all of you professionals to support the senior citizens in the legislative proposals."

Do you agree with this estimate? Is it too harsh? Does it tell it as it is? Let me know.

THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of serving as the commander of the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, USAF Auxiliary. Created in 1941 as part of our domestic defense operation during World War II, CAP has continued its existence since 1948 as the official auxiliary of the Air Force. Brig. Gen. Leslie J. Westberg, USAF, commands USAF personnel assigned as CAP advisors. General Westberg is also National Commander of the CAP and advises and assists CAP in carrying out its responsibilities as a private, nonprofit corporation.

CAP members give generously of their time and effort in search and rescue operations, particularly during disasters, such as plane crashes in isolated areas, flood, tornado and other severe weather-induced catastrophes. They serve ceaselessly, using their own equipment, collecting only reimbursements for their expenses, when governmental facilities are taxed to their utmost.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend the many thousands of CAP members around the Nation—young and old. I am certain I speak for all Members of Congress when I extend my personal thanks to CAP members for their dedication to the principles which led to the birth of the United States, for these are truly the Minutemen of the skies.

In their honor, I would like to include a recent article from the July issue of the Civil Air Patrol News, which describes the formation of the CAP and a few of their many contributions to this country's well-being.

CAP: ITS CONTRIBUTIONS

(By Brig. Gen. Leslie J. Westburg, USAF)

In March of this year, a letter of Background Data on Civil Air Patrol was forwarded to the Congress of the United States and provided those who read it a capsule report of the history, organization and recent achievements of CAP. Also, detailed and documented were the benefits this nation, and the Air Force, have derived from Civil Air Patrol.

I believe that it is vital that each CAP member know and understand the contributions Civil Air Patrol and the Air Force have made to each other, and, in turn, what both have done for the nation. That is why this month, General duPont has agreed to relinquish the space for his column so that this data can be shared with you. For the remainder of this year, the CAP NEWS will extract and reprint portions of the supporting documents that we supplied to the members of Congress.

I hope each member will clip and save this column, and the ensuing items, as a personal reference file. In my estimation, all members can greatly benefit Civil Air Patrol by sharing this information with their neighbors and the people they come in contact with on a day-to-day basis. The initial data follows:

The Civil Air Patrol was organized on Dec. 1, 1941, as a part of the United States' civil defense structure. From that time until the end of World War II, CAP performed coastal and border patrol duty, primarily along the Nation's eastern and southern coast lines.

Following the War, in 1946, CAP was established as a private, nonprofit corporation under Public Law 476, 79th Congress. Two years later, Public Law 557, 80th Congress, designated CAP the only official auxiliary of the Air Force.

CAP has a current membership of 62,000, including 27,000 cadets between the ages of 13 and 21, and 35,000 adult, senior members. Organizationally, CAP is divided into eight geographical areas called Regions, each Region being composed of at least five states or Wings. In all, there are 52 Wings in CAP, one in each state, plus one each in Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. The basic unit of organization within CAP is the Squadron. There are nearly 2,100 Squadrons within CAP, ranging in number per Wing from 135 in California to 10 in Delaware. Each Region and Wing has a commander and headquarters staff to direct the activities of its various subordinate units.

On the National Level, CAP is governed by a National Board, which is composed of a Board Chairman, several special staff officers, the eight Regional Commanders, and the 52 Wing Commanders. The National Board elects the Chairman and establishes board corporate policies. The National Executive Committee, which has the same membership as the National Board minus the 52 Wing Commanders, is responsible for conducting most of the Corporation's business. Much of the routine management of CAP is handled by the Exectuive Director, a paid civilian employee of the Corporation.

Public Law 557; which established CAP as the official auxiliary of the Air Force, also authorized the Secretary of the Department of the Air Force to assign members of the Department of the Air Force to duty with CAP at National, Region, and Wing levels. There are currently 116 officers, 128 enlisted personnel, and 106 civil service employees in the Air Force assigned to duty with CAP. These personnel, who are assigned to Headquarters CAP–USAF are under the direct command of Brig. Gen. Leslie J. Westberg. General Westberg is not only the Commander of CAP–USAF, he serves as National Commander of CAP as well. In this latter capacity, he is a voting member of CAP's National Board and National Executive Committee. Neither General Westberg nor any members of his CAP–USAF are empowered to exercise any direct control over the activities of CAP. Their role is confined to advising and assisting the Corporation in carrying out its mission.

At the present time, 132 of the 350 members comprising Headquarters CAP–USAF are located at Maxwell AFB, Ala. The remaining 218 members are performing field liaison duty with CAP and are located throughout the country at Region (multi-state) and Wing (state) levels. National Headquarters for CAP is co-located with Headquarters CAP–USAF at Maxwell AFB, Ala.

As it has always been, CAP's mission is primarily humanitarian. Foremost among its activities are search and rescue (SAR), disaster relief, and civil defense. Approximately 70 percent of all the search and rescue missions undertaken each year in the United States are flown by CAP personnel using their own or Corporation-owned aircraft and other equipment. In 1971, CAP flew nearly 31,000 hours on 389 officially-authorized USAF missions. In 1972, CAP expended 27,400 flying hours on 349 officially-authorized USAF missions. CAP responds nation-wide to such disasters as tornadoes, hurricanes, snow storms, forest fires, floods, and earthquakes with every kind of emergency relief assistance it can provide. During the past two years, CAP personnel have participated in 35 significant disaster-relief missions. As for CAP's involvement in civil defense, should a national emergency arise, each Wing is prepared to fly lifesaving missions and otherwise lend strong support to its state's civil defense efforts.

To help defray the costs involved in flying USAF-directed missions, the Air Force is authorized under Public Law 557 to reimburse individual CAP members for the expenses they incur for aviation fuel and oil and communications while participating in Air Force-authorized search and rescue missions, and civil-defense missions. In 1972, Air Force reimbursements to members of CAP flying search and rescue mission averaged about $9.50 per authorized flying hour, or approximately 2.5 percent of the amount it would cost the Air Force to fly these missions using its own personnel and aircraft ($400.00 per hour). As a result, CAP saves the U.S. government and the Air Force several millions of dollars annually. In 1971, it is estimated that these savings amounted to more than $12,000,000 and in 1972 more than $10,000,000.

CAP's support of aerospace power through its numerous aerospace education programs constitutes yet another corporate endeavor. Included in these programs is the CAP Cadet Aerospace Education Program, which seeks to develop within the cadet a greater understanding of the total impact of aerospace on our society while providing training in leadership and citizenship.

One of the most successful features of the CAP Cadet Aerospace Education Program is the International Air Cadet Exchange, which has served for many years to promote understanding, good will, and friendship among the young people of the world by providing them with the opportunity to visit in foreign countries. Since 1948, more than 6,000 air cadets in this country and 41 foreign countries have participated in this reciprocal visitation program.

Another significant benefit accruing to the Nation through CAP's affiliation with the Air Force is CAP's proven value as a source for volunteer recruits in the Air Force. By joining CAP, the cadet demonstrates his interest in aerospace, his acceptance of a military-type uniform, and his willingness to work within a quasi-military organization. His training in CAP further orients him toward Air Force life. The net result is that a relatively high percentage of CAP cadets are motivated to join the Air Force when they reach enlistment age. This recruiting advantage assumes even more importance as this country moves closer toward the goal of an all-volunteer military force.

CAP obtains much of its equipment, including aircraft, and supplies through DOD excess sources. This was made possible under another provision of Public Law 557. However, this is the extent to which the Corporation currently receives federal support, except for the reimbursements mentioned earlier that are made to individual CAP members by the Air Force for the costs they incur while participating in officially authorized USAF missions. As for income to support its numerous programs and activities, CAP relies mainly on dues from members, donations, and monies resulting from various local fund-raising activities. Some states also help support their CAP wings through grants of funds.

At the present time, CAP has a fleet of some 6,100 aircraft. Approximately 800 of these belong to the Corporation, while the remainder are privately owned by CAP citizen members. In addition to having virtually every type of civilian light aircraft made in its inventory, CAP also has numerous T-34, U-3, U-6, T-41, and O-1 aircraft, all of which have been obtained through military excess sources.

CAP also operates some 17,500 licensed citizen radio stations; some of this equipment has also been obtained from military excess.

Though much more could be written of CAP, the foregoing should suffice to show the importance of this all-volunteer, humanitarian organization to the American people. Without the personal sacrifices made by the dedicated members of CAP, who willingly give their time, talents, and personal treasure to provide vital volunteer services to their fellow Americans, this Nation and the Air Force would be hard pressed in numerous ways.

RULES CHANGES PROPOSED FOR FEDERAL PAY, WORK HOURS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission has recommended to the Congress certain adjustments and improvements in existing statutes as they apply to pay and hours of work of Federal employees.

Chairman Robert Hampton of the Commission has submitted a proposed text for legislation and a full explanation in a letter to the Speaker.

I am today introducing the recommended legislation so that it will be before our committee for consideration.

As part of my remarks, I am including the text of Chairman Hampton's transmittal letter to the Speaker, as well as the text of the Commission's statement of purpose and justification.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
July 13, 1973.

Honorable CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Civil Service Commission submits with this letter for consideration by the Congress proposed legislation to make certain adjustments and needed improvements in existing statutory provisions relating to pay administration in the Federal Service.

Enactment of this proposal will provide greater flexibility in fixing the initial salaries of superior-quality appointees to positions under the General Schedule; extend eligibility for within-grade increases under the General Schedule to employees serving under temporary or limited appointments and provide that certain pay adjustments and actions are not equivalent increases; make the requirement for premium pay for work in excess of eight hours a day inapplicable when such duty results from the establishment of special tours of duty to permit employees to attend educational institutions; authorize the establishment of stipends for certain postdoctoral and other research associates; and permit compensation for Federal employees on special projects under nationwide economic or educational opportunity programs to be fixed by methods more suited to the nature and purpose of their employment.

A more detailed description of these provisions is contained in the accompanying statement of purpose and justification.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HAMPTON,
Chairman.

STATEMENT BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker, following is the statement submitted by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to describe the purpose and the justification of the bill to amend title 5, United States Code, relating to pay and hours of work of Federal employees:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION

SUPERIOR QUALITY APPOINTMENTS

The first section of this proposal would authorize appointments of certain individuals at rates above the minimum of the rate range in the first 17 grades of the General Schedule on the same basis that they are now authorized in grades GS-11 and above—the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government. In addition to its existing responsibility for issuing regulations to govern appointments under this law, the Civil Service Commission would be given discretion to prescribe conditions under which an agency could take final action on such an appointment without prior approval by the Commission as is now required.

Extending flexibility of this type to all grades in the General Schedule could mean that by paying say $300, $600, or perhaps $900 more per annum in beginning salary the Government could get the services of a talented individual who might be particularly needed to begin a career in an important social, economic, or scientific program or the services of an experienced technician who might be needed for a specialized occupation.

Given the challenge of its programs, the good opportunities for advancement, and Federal salaries which are generally comparable with private enterprise salaries, the Government could well expect to retain the individual's services for years to come. An inadequate and noncompetitive initial salary offer, on the other hand, could be the deciding element in that individual's decision to start with another employer.

In the case of beginning professional employees, the additional expense to the Government would be limited to the first year or two, because upon promotion most would be entitled to the same rate they would have received had they originally been appointed at the beginning salary for the particular grade.

The added flexibility afforded by this amendment is intended especially to permit the Government to compete for the services of superior candidates with a bachelor's or master's degree in specializations for which there is a particular need. It would, however, be available also for the appointment of other persons at rates above the minimum of the range where appropriate under the statutory criteria and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission can, and does, under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, authorize special salary ranges where it finds the Government is significantly handicapped in recruiting or retaining well-qualified personnel by substantially higher rates paid by private enterprise.

While the situation is different at present, in recent years the labor market at times has been so competitive that without these special rates Government recruiting in many occupations would have been almost impossible. Nevertheless, when special rates have been authorized the Government has not always been able to compete on even terms with industry especially for candidates with graduate training in certain fields.

On the other hand, the Commission may find that although private employers are paying higher salaries on the average to candidates in some occupations the Government recruitment picture does not warrant the establishment of special rates under 5 U.S.C. 5303.

For example, no special rates have been established for persons with a masters' in business administration (MBA). These candidates are basically eligible for entry into the Federal service at grade GS-9 with a current entry rate of $11,614 a year. Yet according to College Placement Council data, industry is offering $14,000 to $15,000 a year to those graduates from leading universities such as Harvard, MIT, and Stanford.

Federal agency needs for MBA graduates are highly selective and involve searching for quality candidates who can bring to bear their specialized backgrounds and training on complex programs. Recruiting for MBA graduates is highly individualistic and extremely competitive for the most part. Therefore, the greater salary flexibility proposed by this draft bill is needed in addition to the authority that is available under 5 U.S.C. 5303.

Below the college entry level, authority to make superior quality appointments would be particularly pertinent for one- or few-of-a-kind positions such as medical machine technicians, health technicians, and pharmacy assistants in GS-2, GS-3, and GS-4. In a Veterans hospital, for example, one or two vacancies may occur for medical support personnel where it would be unnecessary to authorize special rates under 5 U.S.C. 5303 and to make the accompanying adjustments for on-duty personnel as well, if the authority to make superior quality appointments above the normal minimum salary were available.

If the Government is to receive maximum benefit from the superior quality appointment authority in 5 U.S.C. 5333, it is highly desirable that the Commission be in a position to permit agencies to make firm on-the-spot offers under certain limited circumstances. The present requirement that each appointment be approved in advance by the Civil Service Commission reduces an agency's responsiveness in the recruitment of highly qualified candidates often where the agency has the greatest need to be in a position to make an immediate and firm offer. While the Commission makes every effort to act expeditiously on agency requests, there are occasions when the time required for an agency to prepare the submission, transmit it to the Commission, and receive a response may unavoidably result in the loss of superior candidates.

Amending the present authority to permit the Commission to prescribe conditions under which an agency may take final action on certain kinds of superior quality appointments would not diminish the Commission's control over such appointments. Under the amendment proposed in this draft bill, the Commission could still require prior approval in each individual case where it is deemed appropriate.

However, in its discretion, the Commission would be able to prescribe conditions under which an agency could take final action on certain superior quality appointments. These conditions could be modified or withdrawn by the Commission at any time. The Commission could review the appropriateness of quality appointments made by the agencies by requiring periodic reports on the actions taken.

PERIODIC STEP-INCREASES

Section 2 amends the eligibility requirements for periodic step-increases under 5 U.S.C. 5335 to provide more equitable treatment for employees in General Schedule positions.

One of its provisions eliminates the requirement that an employee must occupy a "permanent" position to be eligible for a periodic step-increase under the General Schedule. This requirement was evidently intended to exclude from eligibility employees whose service, because of its temporary nature, could not be properly evaluated in terms of efficiency and conduct for purposes of determining entitlement to salary advancement.

If an employee has met the minimum 52-week service requirement for a within-grade increase, however, there would seem to be sufficient time to evaluate his performance. Under the law as presently written, most employees whose appointments are limited to a specified period are not eligible for their increases even though their tenure may exceed the prescribed waiting periods.

Frequently in authorizing Schedule A appointments outside the competitive service the Commission finds it appropriate to limit such appointments to specified periods but in some instances to permit certain extensions. For example, an authority may limit initial appointments to two years but provide that, with the approval of the Commission, the total employment may be for as long as three years. Or the authority may simply limit total employment to a specified number of years (e.g., four years) or provide that an appointment may not exceed a specified date. Although individuals serving under these authorities may remain in Federal service for a number of years under a series of appointments, they cannot earn within-grade increases because of the limitations on their tenure.

One particular kind of inequity this amendment seeks to correct may be illustrated by a situation that arose in the Bureau of Customs a few years ago. To aid in the reorganization of that bureau under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965, the Civil Service Commission authorized the retention of certain former Presidential appointees as staff assistants (Program Advisors) under Schedule A appointments for not more than three years. While the purpose of continuing these employees on the rolls was to take advantage of their years of experience in the Bureau of Customs, they became ineligible for within-grade increases because of the three-year limitation on their tenure.

Section 2 also amends 5 U.S.C. 5335 so as to exclude general adjustments in prevailing wage and administratively determined salary schedules from consideration in determining whether an employee who moves to a General Schedule position has received an "equivalent increase" for periodic step-increase purposes. When an employee receives an "equivalent increase" (that is, an increase in dollar amount to a step-increase) he must begin a new waiting period for his next periodic step-increase.

Under present law and interpretations of the Comptroller General, only those increases "granted by statute" are excluded from consideration as equivalent increases for this purpose. Although the present rule may have been reasonable years ago, when wage schedules rose every year and adjustments in the General Schedule were few and far between, the two systems are now quite similar in the frequency and bases for schedule adjustments.

They are also both subject to central, Government-wide coordination, whereas wage schedule increases were then within the uncoordinated discretion of individual agencies. While administratively determined salary schedules are still adjusted by the individual agencies, the common practice is to make the amount of increase and the effective date coincide with adjustments in the General Schedule.

There is also a provision in section 2 to remove the requirement that under certain circumstances an employee must be treated as having received an "equivalent increase" on promotion when in fact there has been little or no change in his rate of pay. This situation arises when an employee who has been demoted with salary retention is promoted to a higher grade and continues to receive the same dollar amount as his retained rate.

The Comptroller General has ruled that the rate the employee would have been receiving in the lower grade if he had not been entitled to salary retention, rather than his retained rate, must be used in determining whether he has received an equivalent increase. The following example illustrates what may happen:

An employee demoted from GS-7 to GS-5 has a "retained" rate of $10,471 and a "constructed" rate of $10,007. If he is promoted to GS-6, an intermediate grade, his salary would be fixed at $10,574, the lowest rate that would give him two step-increases over his "constructed" rate of $10,007. Although his new rate is only $103 over the "retained" rate he was receiving at the time of his promotion (actually giving him much less than the equivalent of a one step-increase in the lower grade), he must begin a new waiting period for his next periodic step-increase.

Even more inappropriate is the situation where the employee receives no actual increase in salary at all. If this same employee's "retained" rate had been $10,788, there would be no change in his salary rate on promotion to GS-6. He would continue to receive that rate until the expiration of the two-year retention period at which time he would be reduced to the rate to which he would have been promoted if he had not been receiving a retained rate (i.e., $10,574, step 8 in GS-6). His 156-week waiting period for advancement to step 9, however, must be computed from the date of the promotion.

VARIATIONS IN WORKWEEKS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Section 3 makes a minor perfecting change in the statutory provisions authorizing agencies to establish special tours of duty for employees attending educational institutions. The present language, which was intended to provide flexibility without requiring the Government to pay premium compensation, proscribes payment of permium rates for Sunday, night, or holiday duty due solely to variations in workweeks for educational purposes.

Shortly after this language became law, a new provision was enacted requiring payment of overtime for work in excess of eight hours a day. The proposed amendment will restore the intended flexibility by adding a proscription against premium pay for work in excess of eight hours a day.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROJECT EMPLOYEES

Sections 4, 5, and 6 are designed to permit greater flexibility in fixing pay for special groups of employees who will be designated, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, as "research associates" and "special project employees".

Research Associates—The proposed amendments relating to this group are intended principally for application to postdoctoral research associates in programs sponsored by the National Research Council but they are broad enough to permit application to other employees in positions established primarily to provide an opportunity for advanced professional training.

They would not authorize any new positions or any new programs for the employment of research associates but would simply permit agencies, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, to designate employees in positions under existing programs, or under programs subsequently established under other authority, as research associates.

Greater flexibility in selecting appropriate rates of compensation for these research associates will be provided by exempting the positions from the General Schedule classification system and the usual premium pay provisions in title 5, United States Code.

When a position has been designated as a research associate position under these new provisions, the Civil Service Commission will issue regulations governing the fixing of the stipend for the position. As appropriate the Commission may consult with the agencies and the National Research Council in fixing these limitations. Different rates or minimum and maximum rates can be set for different classes of positions.

Stipends for individual research associate will be fixed by the agencies in accordance with the Commission's regulations. If for a particular type of position a single uniform Government-wide rate is deemed desirable, the Commission could fix a specific amount thus leaving no discretion to agencies. In other cases, it could provide minimum and maximum limits within which the agencies may select appropriate stipends.

It is believed that with these proposed amendments a more suitable method of compensation can be provided for a person who is assigned to work in a laboratory or other Government activity, not primarily for accomplishing the mission of the activity, although this might be an important aspect of the assignment, but primarily for the purpose of developing the individual's skills and expanding his worth to the profession.

Freedom from the General Schedule classification system is needed because of the substantial learning-experience element in the position and because the usual concept of assigned duties and responsibilities is not really applicable. Greater freedom in selecting appropriate rates of compensation is needed because, at the present time, for postdoctoral research associates there is little alternative to simply using the beginning rate of either GS-11 or GS-12. While the beginning rate of GS-11 is currently used, there is no assurance that either of these rates will in the future be suitable.

Special Project Employees—This group will include employees designated by the agencies, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, who enter the Federal service on a parttime or temporary basis under special economic or educational opportunity programs like those related to the Federal Summer Employment Program for Youth and the President's Stay-in-School Campaign.

Under the proposed amendments, the Civil Service Commission will be authorized, for the purpose of employment under these programs, to approve exemptions from the statutory classification and pay provisions and to issue regulations governing pay for such employment.

Individuals employed on these programs are not required to meet the usual qualification standards for appointment or to maintain the performance standards expected of regular employees. Accordingly the usual compensation provisions are not always suitable.

In view of the nature and purpose of nationwide programs of this type, Federal agencies should be free to compensate their participating employees in a manner similar to that followed by private employers without regard to the normal requirements for classification of positions on the basis of duties and responsibilities.

The pay of individuals already on the rolls in positions designated under the proposed new authority as either "research associates" or "special project employees" will be preserved by the provisions in section 7 of the draft bill.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 8 fixes the effective date of the amendments in the bill not later than the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after 120 days following the date of enactment except where an earlier date, after enactment, is provided by the Civil Service Commission in appropriate regulations.

OIL SHORTAGE?

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, no one can escape the seriousness and confusion that has engulfed the current energy issue. We are all being presented "facts" suggesting we face serious shortages of petroleum products to the point where gasoline rations may be required, yet, at the same time hear that "in truth" no shortage exists at all but the current problems are the result of conspiracy by the Nation's major oil companies to raise prices and drive independents out of business.

During the 93d Congress, over half of the 38 congressional committees have held hearings which relate to the energy crisis. In this time more than 300 days of hearings have been completed with many more yet scheduled.

I believe it imperative that we receive the most accurate assessment possible of our present position in order to establish a sound foundation for policies and programs that will guide us in the future.

I submit the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News, "Dispel the Oil Shortage Confusion," for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, July 11, 1973]

DISPEL OIL SHORTAGE CONFUSION

The causes of the nation's spotty gasoline shortages are complex, but no more so than getting at the truth of the charges attributing these to monopolistic-type marketing practices by the major oil companies.

A suit brought by the Florida attorney general against 15 companies charges a conspiracy to keep gasoline prices high and drive out independent competitors. Congress, meanwhile, is feeling intense pressure from the non-brand-name service stations, nearly 2000 of which have either closed down already or are on the verge. The independent dealers blame their scarcity of supplies on the big "integrated" oil companies which control oil production from the time it comes out of the ground and is refined until it is pumped into auto gas tanks.

The inference here is that the major companies are using a gas shortage as an occasion to squeeze out their small competitors. While supporting that charge, a report by Federal Trade Commission investigators goes beyond it to suggest federal anti-trust action to separate the crude-oil production business from refining and marketing operations.

We use the word "suggest" advisedly, because it is hard to tell from what is being leaked from the report by Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D., Wash.) just what the FTC's intentions are. If the FTC after two years' investigation has solid evidence to substantiate its inferences of exclusionary marketing practices, it should bring it out in the open.

Emphatically denying any plot to throttle competition, the petroleum industry insists that the "energy shortfall" is anything but artificial, and blames it on skyrocketing consumer demand, environmental restrictions on new oil supplies, and on ill-advised federal regulatory policies.

While these certainly were significant factors, we venture that Sen. Jackson is right in also citing such other factors as the oil industry's faulty predictions that refinery capacity was sufficient to satisfy demand, and the government's delay in lifting import restrictions on foreign crude oil.

Errors of judgment or shortages aggravated by such unforeseen developments as delays in the Alaska pipeline and the impact of auto emission controls on gas consumption, hardly lend support to claims of a calculated conspiracy to engineer a temporary shortage for profit and market advantage.

The causes of present shortages aside, however, the allegations that the big vertically-organized oil companies are favoring their own retail outlets over independent low-price competitors does raise searching questions about an industry structure which roughly resembles that of the movie industry before the divestiture of producers' control over theater chains.

In any case, the public's interest lies in whatever national fuel-allocation requirements are needed, beyond voluntary guidelines, to ensure that an energy squeeze doesn't eliminate healthy competition. And as for the confusion over whether the energy shortage is genuine or contrived, let Congress and FTC investigators produce whatever objective data they have to support or refute charges of improper market practices. If the public is to take the energy crisis seriously, it must have all the facts.

SKYLAB MISSION TO STAND AS TRIBUTE TO SPACEMEN'S INGENUITY, PERSISTENCE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patrick Young writes in the National Observer of June 30, 1973, of the ingenuity and persistence of the Skylab astronauts in their contribution to our national space program. These outstanding men—astronauts Charles "Pete" Conrad, Jr., Dr. Joseph P. Kerwin, and Paul J. Weitz—have not only performed an exceptional mission in space which contributed both new scientific knowledge and practical benefits but also rescued a mission which could have ended in failure. The astronauts intervention and repair of Skylab ranks as a major first in our national space program. It points out the advantages that will accrue from the development of the Space Shuttle for space transportation which is now underway. When the Space Shuttle is available, refurbishment, repair, and recovery of expensive hardware will become routine. Mr. Young, in his description of the first of three Skylab missions, signals the importance of this activity as part of the foundation for the use of space in future years. The article follows:

SKYLAB MISSION TO STAND AS TRIBUTE TO SPACEMEN'S INGENUITY, PERSISTENCE

(By Patrick Young)

For Skylab, it's one down and two to go.

Astronauts Charles "Pete" Conrad, Jr., Dr. Joseph P. Kerwin, and Paul J. Weitz splashed down safely into the Pacific Ocean last week after a record-setting mission of 28 days and 50 minutes during which they traveled some 11.5 million miles in earth orbit. It was the longest manned space mission yet, surpassing by more than four days the Soviet Soyuz 11 flight in 1971, which ended in the deaths of three cosmonauts when their cabin depressurized at landing. And it set the stage for the longer July and October Skylab missions.

It was not a letter-perfect mission for Skylab. But the fact the flight took place at all was a tribute to the ingenuity and persistence of the crew and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) personnel who overcame the obstacle of a seriously damaged craft.

EMERGENCY REPAIRS

During Skylab's May 14 launch, a shield designed to protect it from micrometeorite punctures ripped free, taking one panel of solar cells with it and jamming a second so it wouldn't open properly. This cut Skylab's power supply in half. And since the shield was painted to ward off the sun's heat, its loss sent temperatures in the space station soaring above 120 degrees Fahrenheit.

After a 10-day delay, the crew rocketed to a rendezvous with Skylab and installed a sun shade that had been hastily designed and stitched together on earth. It worked, lowering temperatures to livable levels. Later Conrad and Kerwin, in a dramatic space walk, cut a thin metal strip blocking the jammed solar panel and then popped it into proper position.

These two emergency repairs, and several more minor ones, saved the first mission and left NASA officials confident the two remaining flights, both planned for 56 days each, could go ahead.

LOSS OF MUSCLE TONE

The crew apparently survived its month in the weightlessness of space in good physical condition. "I think I'm in as good shape now almost as when I left," Conrad said less than two days before landing. And Kerwin, the first physician in space, commented, "I'm tremendously encouraged about the future of long-duration flight."

The astronauts did lose some weight and muscle tone, and on landing they had difficulty walking. But this was expected. Soviet cosmonauts had reported similar problems after long flights. The reason, NASA doctors explained, was that the heart does not have to pump as hard without gravity and the body's cardiovascular system grows weak. When spacemen return to earth it takes time for their hearts and blood vessels to regain their full strength.

More than 30,200 photographs of the sun came back with the crew, including pictures of a solar flare, a giant explosion on the solar surface.

"Flares are the most intriguing solar-physics phenomena," says Guisseppi Vaiana, one of the scientists working with Skylab's solar telescopes. "We do not understand how this energy is stored and how it is released. Now we've been able to observe a flare with the best instruments ever built."

If all goes well, the new space record will fall soon. Skylab's second crew—Alan L. Bean, Owen K. Garriott, and Jack R. Lousma—is set for launch in late July on a planned 56-day mission. They will carry out solar-astronomy, medical, earth-resources, and technological experiments similar to those just completed. The third and final Skylab mission is set to begin in October.

WATERGATE: PARALYSIS OR JUST THE "BUG"

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, many commentators have attributed America's financial difficulties, both at home and abroad, to fallout from the Watergate. Several articles have come to my attention, especially in foreign newspapers, which claim that Watergate has paralyzed the Government and has impaired America's ability to deal with economic issues.

One of the most enlightening comments in this regard appeared in the New York Times of July 16, 1973, in a story by Edwin L. Dale, Jr. Mr. Dale develops the argument that although what we may have is governmental paralysis of a sort, the disease reaches much deeper than Watergate. We in Congress should examine his contention that the paralysis stems more from the President's relations with Congress—over spending—than with Senator ERVIN and Special Prosecutor Cox. The so-called battle of the budget has not been lost by the administration or won by Congress, is an issue that will confront us for some time to come, with or without Watergate.

The text of the article follows:

WATERGATE WEIGHED AS A PARALYZER

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 15—"There were early market expectations that the Government would act resolutely to deal with this unfavorable development [a further increase of the rate of inflational], but the Watergate inquiry apparently immobilized governmental economic decision-making . . ."—Salomon Brothers, in the firm's recent review of the bond market for June.

"It is not that the currency dealers are worried about who bugged whom, but that the scandal has literally paralyzed the United States Government at a time when it is facing a formidable resurgence of price inflation at home and major international negotiations on monetary and trade reform."—John Palmer in the Guardian, of Britain.

Has Watergate paralyzed the United States Government and, in particular, the Presidency, as the current talk here and abroad would have it?

The answer turns out to be a good deal more subtle than the citations above imply. Indeed, a case can be made that if there is paralysis at all, at least in the economic policy area, it is for reasons other than Watergate.

An exploration of this subject must begin with an appreciation of how the American Government works. A good starting place, obvious perhaps, but often overlooked, is the Federal Reserve System.

If the Fed is paralyzed, it would be hard to find a bank or a money-market operator who thinks so. The nation's central bank has not, of course, been touched in any way by the scandals. In any case, it has been conducting a much tougher monetary policy of late, with both publicly announced actions and daily operations in the money market.

Monetary policy is at least as important as anything else the Government does under the heading of "economic policy." And the anti-inflation effort there has obviously proceeded with full vigor, regardless of varying views of the rightness of the policy.

BUSINESS AS USUAL

Elsewhere, the Treasury Department continues to roll over and otherwise "manage" the national debt. The United States position in the international monetary reform negotiations continues to be developed. The regulatory process including such vital matters as the future of the Penn Central Railroad proceeds at a pace neither slower nor faster than before.

What is more, there have even been some agonizing difficult decisions made by the President, during this period.

One was the price freeze—a decision that more and more people are coming to regard as a mistake, but still a decision.

Another, equally tough, was to impose exports control on many farm products and iron and steel scrap—a move that involved partial abrogation of contracts in some cases and major outcries from foreign countries.

But despite these things, a case that something like paralysis exists might yet be made.

TAX POSSIBILITIES

By far the best example is the issue of whether to take the painful step of proposing a tax increase of some kind as a decisive measure to cool the boom and curb inflation.

To the person who strongly believes such a step is necessary, the failure of the President to take it is evidence of "paralysis". But the real problem is not Watergate.

Although Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, strongly favors a tax measure, the advice Mr. Nixon is getting is by no means unanimous on the point. Secretary of the Treasury George P. Shultz, for example, strongly indicated to reporters last week that he was against it.

And there is the problem of Congress. Could Congress possibly pass a tax increase in time to cool the boom, or would it wait so long that the increase would wind up, as one official put it, by "kicking the boom when it's down"?

In brief, a seeming paralysis on the tax question results far more from the inherent dilemmas in the problem than from anything to do with Watergate.

And the same thing goes for Phase 4 of price and wage controls.

Here again, there are simply no good answers, and the officials involved, such as John T. Dunlop, director of the Cost of Living Council, are the first to admit it. The President had begun to tackle the issue just before his recent illness, and he did so as soon as it was presented to him—in the same week that the labor-management advisory committee unanimously recommended a complete end of controls by the end of the year.

CRITICAL RELATIONS

The true problem of paralysis stemming from Watergate, if there is one, comes not in those things but in a different area: The President's relations with Congress and his centrally important effort to try to check the rise of Government spending.

Here there are several things that observers in the capital point out.

The first is that the President's "leverage" over Congress has probably been weakened though the degree cannot be measured. His general reputation with the public has dropped—at least as measured in the polls. That is bound to hurt him somewhat in any struggle, as the one over spending, with a Congress in the control of the opposite party.

But the other side of the coin is the remarkable growth of consensus in Congress itself than an outer limit on total spending in this fiscal year of $268.7-billion, as proposed by Mr. Nixon, is good economic policy—though there are all sorts of disagreements on how this huge pie should be sliced.

Congress has not yet found the way to exact an effective spending ceiling, and it will probably alter the President's priorities to a significant degree, but there is no desire to be spendthrift.

While Mr. Shultz expressed fears last week that Congress was falling back into its old habits of raising spending in piecemeal actions on individual bills—and while bills already enacted would raise spending by about $1-billion over the budget—the basic "battle of the budget" is by no means lost, Watergate or no Watergate, according to a fairly general assessment here.

Mr. Shultz took heart in the outcome of the sudden move late last month to increase Social Security benefits, a move originating in the Senate Finance Committee. After much maneuvering, a key vote in the House changed the measure so that the benefit increase would be delayed until next June and would be "paid for" by a higher Social Security tax-wage base. In Mr. Shultz's view this reflected not only a victory for the Administration position but also a basic sense of fiscal responsibility, at least in the House.

DISEASE IN CONGRESS

In any event, the difficulty of the budget issue, from the point of view of the President as well as of the Congressional budget reformers, would be great even if Watergate had never come up. If there is paralysis, it is because of a disease that began to afflict Congress long before Watergate. Most members know this and many are trying to do something about it.

Even if one concludes that the case for paralysis as a result of Watergate, certainly in economic policy, is a weak one, that does not change the separate, but related, problem of psychology, or confidence.

If people think there is paralyses, they sell stocks or in the foreign exchange market, dollars. By the confidence measure, Watergate may well have affected markets whether the Government is or is not actually hampered in its functioning.

ST. MARY'S PARISH, EAST HARTFORD: 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, Saint Mary's Parish in East Hartford, Conn., has been an historic participant in the growth of the Hartford area. This year begins the 100th anniversary of this great parish, which is a monument to the dedicated parishioners and religious leaders who have made this parish a noteworthy addition to Connecticut's history.

The history follows:

HISTORY OF ST. MARY'S PARISH

On August 1, 1873, Saint Mary's Parish of East Hartford, Connecticut was formed. The area of the parish was East Hartford, South Windsor, Glastonbury, South Glastonbury, Wethersfield and Rocky Hill. The same area today is served by 14 parishes in addition to Saint Mary's. Until the formation of Saint Mary's, the area was part of Saint Patrick's Parish in Hartford, Connecticut.

The first pastor was Rev. Patrick F. Goodwin who served from August 1, 1873 to February 15, 1877. He was a native of County Tyrone, Ireland and at the time of his appointment to Saint Mary's he was serving as a curate at Saint Patrick's in Hartford.

The first masses of Saint Mary's were celebrated at Elm Hall on Main Street near Church Corners. Father Goodwin purchased land for the first church on the corner of Woodbridge Avenue and Main Street.

Father Goodwin died on February 15, 1877 and on February 22, 1877, the Rev. John A. Mulcahy was assigned as second pastor.

Father Mulcahy continued with the plans for the church and on April 1, 1877, ground was broken; on June 3, 1877 the corner stone was laid and on November 11, 1877, the church was dedicated by Bishop Galberry. The church was built by John Mead of Hartford and had a seating capacity of 600.

On April 11, 1878, the corner stone was laid for a mission church, Saint Augustine's of South Glastonbury and in that same year, land was purchased in Wethersfield for the Sacred Heart Church. Money was also set aside for the erection of a church in Rocky Hill.

Father Mulcahy was transferred to Saint Patrick's in Thompsonville on November 1, 1878 and Rev. John T. McMahon was assigned third pastor.

Father McMahon planned the dedication of Saint Augustine's in South Glastonbury and on November 17, 1878, the Very Rev. Thomas Walsh, Vicar General officiated at the ceremony.

Rocky Hill was cut from Saint Mary's Parish in 1880, and was placed under the jurisdiction of Saint John's Parish in Cromwell. This was the first break in the original parish.

The first curate to be assigned to Saint Mary's on March 31, 1881 was Rev. J. Curtin.

The fourth pastor, Rev. James T. Gleeson, a native of New Haven, Connecticut was assigned to Saint Mary's on November 1, 1884.

The first rectory was built on Woodbridge Avenue, behind the church in August 1888.

In 1902, electric lights were installed in the church and Saint Augustine's of South Glastonbury became a parish. The second part of Saint Mary's to go on their own.

Father Gleeson was moved from Saint Mary's and the new pastor, Rev. Thomas S. Duggan, came to East Hartford from Saint Joseph's Cathedral in Hartford.

Land was purchased for a cemetery in the Burnside area of East Hartford, and on May 17, 1903, the ceremony of consecration was performed by Bishop Tierney.

For many years, the "Sisters of Mercy" sent nuns to Saint Mary's to assist with the Catholic education of the children, and on April 23, 1904, land and a house were purchased for them on Main Street. Four nuns were assigned to the parish with Sister Mary Leonard as the Superior. The house was converted to a convent.

May 19, 1905, Father Duggan returned to the Cathedral as Rector and was replaced by Rev. Dennis P. Hurley, a curate from Saint Patrick's in Hartford. Father Hurley equipped a library of over 500 volumes that was used in connection with the Sunday School. The school had an enrollment of 400 and an average attendance of 300.

Rev. Timothy E. Sullivan, curate at Saint Joseph's in Chester, replaced Father Hurley as pastor on September 4, 1919. Father Sullivan immediately purchased land at the corner of Main and Stanley Streets where it was planned to erect a recreation building. Father Sullivan died in December of 1922 and his successor, Rev. Dennis F. Baker was appointed seventh pastor. At the time of his appointment to Saint Mary's, Father Baker was serving as pastor of Saint Augustine's in South Glastonbury. Much of his time and effort was spent in organizing the parish into clubs and societies. The "Guild of Saint Mary's" was organized in January 1927 and is still active.

Father Baker was transferred on June 16, 1928 and was replaced by Rev. Thomas J. Drennan, D.D. Prior to his appointment to Saint Mary's, Father Drennan was Vice-President of Saint Thomas Seminary in Bloomfield.

In January of 1929, Father Drennan announced plans to build a school on the property at Main and Stanley Streets. Ground was broken in August, and the school was open to students in September 1930. Saint Mary's was the first Junior High School to be built in the Hartford Diocese, which at that time was the entire State of Connecticut. In 1959, there were 609 students enrolled at Saint Mary's.

1941 saw another section of Saint Mary's set aside for a new parish. This time, it was the South Windsor section, and was named Saint Francis of Assisi.

During World War II, a part of Saint Mary's School was turned over to the 198th Coast Artillery.

Father Drennan saw his parish through the great depression of the 30's. It took many years and great effort to clear the school of debt but it was accomplished.

Father Drennan died on June 7, 1959, and was replaced by Father John Dial. Before coming to East Hartford, he was Principal of the Sacred Heart School in Waterbury. Father Dial faced the problem of rebuilding. The church, rectory and convent were old and the school was in need of repairs. The building program was launched immediately. On December 22, 1962, Archbishop Henry J. O'Brien dedicated the present church that is located on the corner of Main Street and Maplewood Avenue. Adjacent to the church, on Maplewood Avenue, the rectory was built and in 1963, a 16-room convent was erected on the site of the original church.

In January of 1973, Father Dial announced his retirement and his replacement by a "team" pastorate. He was appointed Pastor Emeritus by Archbishop John Whealon, and in March 1973, Father James Smith and Father James Nock were appointed co-pastors.

In February 1973, the Sisters of Mercy were removed from Saint Mary's. This was followed by the announcement in April, that due to financial reasons, Saint Mary's School would be forced to close in June.

Saint Mary's Parish is embarking on its second 100 years. Time has brought many changes since 1873 for the people of the parish, and the people of today face the future with faith. The parishioners of 1973 are the beginning of the second 100 years and they mean to have it said, "They made a good beginning".

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT EXPERIMENTS CONTINUE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, comprehensive child development, the theory of collectivist child rearing which has caused a great deal of alarm to many parents in this country, apparently is becoming more comprehensive as educational experiments continue.

Psychological probing into the minds of American children as early as 2 weeks of age is being undertaken in Brookline, Mass., under the name of the Brookline Early Educational Project—BEEP. Tests of mental and physical development administered by BEEP psychologists begin soon after birth and continue until the child reaches regular school. The announced purpose of the experiments is to program the infant so that he will earn better grades when he entered elementary school 6 years later.

According to Harvard educator, Burton L. White, who researched the methodology a child who is 6 months behind at the age of 3 "is not likely to be successful in his future educational career." So the answers presented is to trap the child into a controlled environment where his behavior can be monitored from his earliest weeks. Other educational planners are working on additional methods of modifying children's behavior to conform to a new set of standards dictated by faceless psychologists.

If we are to follow the recommendations of some educational scientists, our classrooms would become laboratories to change the behavior of the students, rather than to present them with the information needed for a viable education. The theories of a number of modern planners move toward "correcting" the values and standards established in the home. If the attitudes a child develops at home can be "overcome in the classroom," comprehensive child development shall become a reality in this country.

BEEP is funded with $750,000 from the Carnegie and Robert Wood Johnson Foundations for its first 2 years. But White is quick to point out that if the program's experiments are successful, BEEP has "an interesting potential for drastically altering the pay public money is spent for education."

The cradle-to-the-grave monitoring of the activities and minds of the American people by elite groups of psychotherapists is a dangerous step toward limiting individual liberty in a free society.

The great national debate on child rearing called for by President Nixon continues on a one-sided basis, funded by tax-free foundations. The side of the American parents, however, is not being heard.

I ask that the related news clipping follow:

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1973]

SUBURBAN SCHOOLS BEGIN TESTS OF CHILDREN AGED 2 WEEKS

(By Andrew Barnes)

BROOKLINE, MASS.—For most of the babies born in this Boston suburb during the rest of this year, public school will start at the age of two weeks.

It will not be the school of books and yellow buses, but an experimental program aimed at producing children who earn better grades six years later.

A baby's first introduction to this unusual education will be a new and thorough test of his mental and physical development, administered by a physician from the Harvard Medical School. These tests will continue until the baby enters regular school.

The other major aspect of the experiment will be instruction for parents in how to do a better job of raising children. No one style of child rearing will be advocated. Rather, parents will be taught to understand the likely effects of what they are doing, and the possible alternatives.

The experiment was conceived when school officials found that even here, in a wealthy community where most children do well on tests and get into choice colleges, some children get to school at the age of six already in a "cycle of failure," and they never pull out of it.

Brookline schools, for all their excellent reputation, did not make much difference for these children. Those who started behind, stayed behind.

Attempts to prevent these school failures by starting children in school at four years of age and then three years of age, like the national Project Head Start, have not proven consistently effective.

The Brookline Early Education Project, known here as BEEP, is focusing on even younger children, and on families instead of schools, as the result of research by Harvard educator Burton L. White.

White's central conclusion is that a child who is six months behind at the age of three "is not likely ever to be successful in his future educational career."

The education of children in these earliest years is up to families, and yet "we do not prepare prospective parents to do the job of helping children acquire the foundation requirements for formal education," according to White.

Robert Sperber, Brookline's superintendent of schools, was persuaded by White's ideas, and the Carnegie and Robert Wood Johnson foundations have given $750,000 for the first two years of what will be a five-year tryout of White's proposal.

And so, all over this town of 60,000, there are posters proclaiming "Give your child a good start. BEEP will help you, mothers and fathers, with diagnostic exams for your new baby, with educational ideas, and much more, free."

BEEP's medical aspect begins with an hour and 15 minutes of neurological tests.

The physician follows an intricate pattern of stroking and thumping to test reflexes, clapping his hands and clicking his fingers to see the child react, pushing on the newborn's feet to see how strongly he pushes back.

The doctor shines lights into the baby's eyes, spins him around to see whether the eyes can keep up with the body's motion. Changes in the baby's mood, from smiling to bawling, are also noted.

The reactions on these tests vary with age, and the tests are repeated every three months.

The Dutch physician who developed the test, Heinz Prechtl, has been able to use it to identify problems of tiny infants that lead to later school failures, and the Harvard doctors hope to be able to duplicate Prechtl's results.

To allay apprehensions, Dr. Melvin Levine assures parents their child cannot "pass" or "fail" the Prechtl test. The results are intended to spot development peculiarities that may cause the doctor to suggest remedies to avoid later difficulties.

The examinations will also spot hearing loss and bad eyesight so they can be corrected before they become major obstacles to a child's learning.

The family instruction aspect of BEEP is of tremendous importance to the child's later school success, Professor White believes.

"If a mother does a fine job in the preschool years, subsequent educators, such as teachers, will find their chances for effectiveness maximized," White has written.

Teaching parents to do a better job means seminars with child development experts and other parents, home visits, and use of the BEEP facility, conveniently located next to a midtown shopping center.

The central theme of the seminars and home visits is assisting a parent in observing the child's development.

As Marsha Rogers, one of the home visitors, describes it, she begins a visit by asking what a baby has been doing. The mother's first answer is often, "Oh, nothing much."

She is then able to elicit from the mother that the baby has used new words, or learned to handle new words, or learned to handle new situations. She also helps parents perceive how they are acting toward their baby.

The home visitor might make the parents aware of alternative ways of handling their child. To a mother who kept her infant in a playpen all day, it might be suggested that more varied surroundings would interest the baby and help it grow.

Rather than teaching any particular techniques, the visits and seminars will focus on the situations and problems of the individual families in each group.

Simply providing someone to talk to about the problems of being a parent will be important in improving the job parents do, the BEEP organizers believe.

Parents are encouraged to drop in at the BEEP offices. There is a room where mothers can sit and chat, a coffee pot down the hall and a playroom for older children.

Educational toys can be borrowed, free, and there is a library of books about children and families. For many parents, this is the first exposure to the varied materials and ideas that are available.

If this all sounds a little formal and instructive, the parents more often see it as helpful and enjoyable. "Little things we can try with our babies" and assistance in understanding their development were welcomed by all the mothers present in the center recently.

All the children in BEEP will get the full diagnostic testing. They will be divided into three groups, at random, for the home visits and seminars.

One group will cost $400 per child, one $800, one $1,200 varying according to the amount of followup the staff will provide. The foundation grants will meet all expenses. The intent is to find out how expensive such a program needs to be in order to be effective.

Because BEEP is an experiment, voluminous records are kept, but nothing is written down that parents may not see.

The program is voluntary, and so Professor White says potential charges of meddling in the private affairs of the family are not valid. "I have no desire to help any family that doesn't want to be helped."

Offering the program to all families in the community, not just to the poor, will make it more politically acceptable here, and possibly elsewhere as well, White says.

If it works, BEEP has "an interesting potential for drastically altering the way public money is spent for education," White says.

"I want to see if we can make a difference of real significance," he says. "We need to be able to show something fairly dramatic."

Success will be measured in terms of standardized tests, and also by tests of maturity and capability in non-school areas.

If a whole class of abler children and parents is indeed the result, teachers will have to be retrained, and the entire reading and arithmetic curriculum may have to be redrawn, according to Superintendent Sperber.

Plans call for 225 children in BEEP by next Jan. 1, with about 60 being black and Spanish speaking from Boston, included to create a more representative sample than the white affluent Brookline population.

The hope is that at least 100 will stay in the area for the next six years so their school success can be charted. They will be compared with a control group of children one year older who have not taken part in BEEP.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. CHARLES ROSE III

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, the 14th of July, it was my privilege to address the 51st annual convention of North Carolina's Disabled American Veterans in my hometown of Fayetteville, N.C.

The men and women who make up this organization have all made tremendous sacrifices for the United States of America. This organization exists because somebody somewhere along the way taught these people that they had an obligation to their country. And when their country called them, they came forward and fulfilled that responsibility. They did not flee their country, they did not dodge the draft, and after the conflict ceased, they did not ask for special permission to be excused from obeying the law. No, they gave their lives and their limbs and their physical health to keep freedom strong in this country.

This year, the convention honored as the Disabled American Veteran of the Year, in North Carolina, Mr. George A. "Sack" Little. The presentation of this award was made by Robert L. Lowder, adjutant of Chapter No. 12, DAV.

George A. "Sack" Little enlisted in the U.S. Marines on September 6, 1942. He completed basic training at Parris Island, S.C., and was assigned to the 2d Marine Division. His first combat action was on Guadalcanal where he was wounded in the leg.

"Sack" earned the Silver Star while serving in Saipan and the Tinian Islands. The survivors of several Marine units had been joined with new recruits to form the 6th Marine Division for the assault on Okinawa, and "Sack" was a rifleman in C Company, 1st Battalion, 29th Regiment. While in charge of a patrol, he spotted a fleeing Japanese lookout. Realizing that to fire a shot would give away their position, "Sack" gave chase on foot up a narrow, winding road with bayonet in hand. As he rounded a curve, a machinegun bullet ripped into his face near the left eye. Staggering backwards, "Sack" collapsed face down, permanently blinded from his wound. Before his discharge in November 1946, "Sack" had undergone 27 different operations.

Returning to his home at Oakboro, N.C., George A. Little married his sweetheart, Miss Marie Smith. Together they purchased a farm and built an eight-room house. For the next 10 years, "Sack" raised chickens, building the flocks to 12,000 layers. A continuing eye infection in "Sack's" damaged eye finally prompted his doctors to order him to get out of the poultry business.

"Sack" and Marie rented their farm and moved to Norwood, N.C. George supervised and helped build a structure to house the town's first laundry and dry-cleaners. Singlehandedly, the Littles built a successful business. "Sack" learned to repair his machines and did his share of the other labor. After 6 years, he sold his business to one of his own salesmen, naming his own price.

George and Marie moved back to Oakboro and began remodeling their home. Upon completion of this project, their neighbors contracted with them to remodel their homes. "Sack" hired a couple of carpenters, and before he knew it he was in the construction business.

Today, "Sack" is owner of George A Little, Inc., Construction and Realty Co. He is the first blind person to be licensed in North Carolina as a general contractor. "Sack" and Marie are both licensed real estate brokers in North Carolina.

During the last 12 years, "Sack" has constructed hundreds of homes, commercial complexes, churches, and the Disabled Veterans Service Center, home of Chapter No. 12, DAV, of which he is a life member.

"Sack" and Marie are the parents of a son and daughter, both of whom have completed their college education. The daughter is married, and she and her husband have one child, a daughter, whom "Sack" promptly spoiled.

After these accomplishments were made known to the convention in Fayetteville, George Little was led to the front by his wife, Marie. Through tears of appreciation, he told the convention that there were four things in this life that were important to him. First, he said, was God Almighty; second, was his wife, Marie, who had stayed by his side; third, was his two children; and fourth, was the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, George Little is a great American, and I hope that the news of what this man has accomplished will travel from one end of this country to the other.

THE DRUG PROBLEM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, recent editorials by WCBS-TV in New York concerned themselves with the American problem of addiction.

In that they made some excellent points, I am submitting two of the editorials for the collective attention of my colleagues and all CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readers.

THE DRUG PROBLEM—7

Broadcast: June 12, 1973

The drug problem to most people is synonymous with heroin. Stop the traffic in heroin, they think, and you've got the problem licked. Well, the use of heroin appears to be levelling off across the country, in part due to strong law enforcement efforts that have cut down the supply of heroin. But the theory that a heroin drough+ would drive addicts into treatment programs or reduce the number of drug abusers appears so far to be wrong.

What seems to be happening instead is that heroin is going out of fashion and young people are turning to other drugs like black market methadone, cocaine and a variety of pills—especially barbiturates and a sedative called methaqualone. At parties and at so-called "juice bars," young and not-so-young people are mixing these pills, sometimes with alcohol, and the combination can be lethal.

What this means is that some people are becoming addicted to more than one drug. And this mixed addiction presents new problems for drug experts. For withdrawal, particularly barbiturate withdrawal, is more dangerous than heroin withdrawal and can lead to convulsions, psychosis and even death. Although government officials and drug experts recognize the growing problem of these pills, little government effort is directed at helping thousands of pill-using addicts. Most government addiction programs are concerned with heroin, and while we don't question that these programs must also be continued, they should also be changed and expanded to include those addicted to barbiturates and other pills.

Right now in New York City there are not enough facilities to handle the increasing number of cases requiring barbiturate detoxification—a process much more difficult medically than heroin detoxification. Existing treatment programs lack the psychiatric services to deal with the problems of multiple drug users—problems thought to be more acute than those of heroin addicts.

THE DRUG PROBLEM—10

Broadcast: June 20, 1973

Heroin, cocaine, LSD, even marijuana—tend to horrify most Americans. These drugs are not only illegal and some highly addictive, but they symbolize an alien and evil culture. But other mind-affecting and addicting drugs, like alcohol and some sedatives, are considered quite respectable—even necessary.

This complacency about legal drugs is insidious. Far more damage to individual's and society is inflicted by these drugs than by illegal drugs. That's why any solution to the drug problem must be framed in a perspective that includes legal as well as illegal drug use.

The basic premise of the drug problem is that dependence on mind-altering drugs must decrease. But this dependence is something that people give up most reluctantly. That's why there are no simple answers or short cuts for the drug problem. It will require a persistent attack on many fronts—an attack in which government, the family, the medical profession, drug companies—and yes, even the media—all have roles to play.

First it means cutting back the supply of drugs through strong law enforcement aimed at big-time traffickers in heroin and other illegal drugs. But cutting back on drugs must also include tighter controls over the manufacture of legal mind-altering pharmaceuticals, and it must also mean greater restraints on the part of physicians in prescribing these drugs. The resulting scarcity should put increased pressure on those already addicted and should decrease the numbers of new recruits. Then, every effort must be made to encourage addicts to go into treatment, either after they are arrested for drug-related crimes, but preferably before. Most addicts do not appear motivated to seek treatment but in a climate of real drug scarcity, they should be more inclined to do so.

At the same time, the attitudes and behavior of so-called "straight" America must begin to change. That means playing down and deglamorizing alcohol. It also means swallowing fewer pills to change the way we feel.

We can't expect the movies, the media, advertising agencies, the liquor industry and drug manufacturers to do the whole job. If we are really serious about diminishing drug dependency, we have to take a good look at ourselves—at our behavior and our values. If we want to begin to solve the drug problem in America, that's probably what it's going to take.

ILLUSION AND REALITY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many of those who have had some reservations about revenue sharing have had their skepticism reinforced by the actual implementation of this program.

In this connection, the Nashville Tennessean, in a recent editorial entitled "Illusion and Reality" provides an interesting insight on the use of revenue sharing funds and points out furthermore that it was the understanding of many municipal leaders that revenue sharing was to be a supplement to grants-in-aid.

As we all know, subsequent developments have proven that revenue sharing embraces the concept of a phasing out and terminating of many vital and important programs, the net effect of which results in lesser funds for our cities and counties because of the termination of grants-in-aid programs provided by Congress and of proven value.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the editorial in the RECORD herewith.

The editorial follows:

ILLUSION AND REALITY

When revenue sharing was launched as a new method of solving America's problems, it was frequently alluded to as a means of returning power to the people and giving them a choice in setting priorities.

Revenue sharing is not the Aladdin's Lamp its proponents indicated it would be and random surveys across the country have made it plain that social services generally do not have a very high priority in spending.

In New Jersey, for instance, only 1% of revenue sharing funds in counties and cities have been earmarked for social services. In other counties and municipalities across the country, the spending is largely aimed at capital improvements or equipment—from fire trucks to electronic equipment.

In St. Louis, controversy erupted recently over a plan to spend some revenue sharing funds for a golf course.

One might assume from the various ways the county and city governments are earmarking spending is that priorities of the people at local levels tend to be for new public safety buildings, shiny cars and new tennis courts.

That is not to say these are irrelevant. The needs of local governments tend to be many. But on the question of priorities, it isn't clear that the citizenry has more voice than before.

It sounds nice for somebody in Washington to say that local people know more about their problems than some bureaucrat in Washington. They certainly ought to, but that doesn't mean the citizens are given much choice, much voice, or even adequate information about revenue sharing funds.

At the beginning, many people were led to believe—and the administration helped that belief—that revenue sharing was a supplement to grants in aid. The administration now makes it crystal clear it considers revenue sharing a replacement for, and not a supplement to such programs.

Thus complaints of cuts in funds to libraries, health, housing and other social services draw a stock answer that any losses can be made up through revenue sharing.

A good many who had doubts about such a program from the first are finding those doubts justified, but that will be of cold comfort unless Congress can somehow keep vital grants-in-aid programs alive.

OIL COMPANY MANIPULATIONS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, last week the American Petroleum Institute announced that it was changing the method by which refining capacity utilization is calculated. Apparently, the API and big oil have been stung by criticism from many Members of Congress concerning the industries obvious under-production of gasoline early this year and underproduction of fuel oil early last fall. It was not until prices had dramatically risen that the major oil companies really utilized their refining capacities.

Mr. Speaker, the major oil companies are manipulating their own statistics in order to cover up any future attempt to underproduce gasoline during a shortage and then dramatically increase production once prices go up. The change proposed by the American Petroleum Institute increases by 5 percent the rate at which U.S. refineries are operating during the week of July 6. API is proving once again the old adage that figures do not lie, but liars can figure.

During the first 20 weeks of 1973 refineries operated at less than 90 percent of capacity. Once gasoline prices increased by 33 percent, production skyrocketed and U.S. refineries operated at more than 93 percent of capacity. Oil companies are juggling their own figures in an attempt to hide future production holdbacks while they wait for prices to increase.

Mr. Speaker, this change in statistical methods is another conscious attempt by the oil industry to deceive the American people. The only group in the country with a wider credibility gap than big oil today is the former officials involved in the Watergate scandal.

Mr. Speaker, it is also disturbing to note that it was a self-serving industry group that announced this change in statistical methods. The U.S. Bureau of Mines, despite its statutory responsibility to collect data on the petroleum industry is going along as a patsy with the oil companies and their statistical scheme. The Bureau of Mines theoretically compiles statistics on the oil industry for the Government, but, in reality, they depend almost entirely on self-serving industry data. It is the Government that should be compiling these statistics and reporting them regularly—not a self-serving industry group.

This API statistical change, while technical in nature, will give the appearance of higher U.S. refinery utilization than is actually occurring. Obviously, the oil industry is embarrassed by its own statistics which indicate that it caused the shortage and held back production until prices had risen dramatically. This is just the latest in a series of cheap tricks and deceptions used by the oil industry to cover up the gouging of the consumers.

SENATE—*Wednesday, July 18, 1973*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

Rabbi Kenneth I. Segel, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

God of all generations—These, Thy children, seek Thy help. In loving kindness guide and protect them. Through their efforts may hope be sustained, faith strengthened and human dignity and decency upheld. May the blight of war be forever banished so peace in freedom may prevail.

Attune our hearts for communion with Thee. Aid us to be uncomplaining and unafraid. Teach us to face life with the confidence and courage that we may see the blessings hidden away even in its discords and struggles. May we realize that life calls us not merely to enjoy the fatness of the Earth but to exult in heights attained after the toil of climbing. Thus will our darkness be illumined by Thy light and our weakness made strong by Thy strength, lifting us above fear and defeat and sustaining our steps with an immortal hope. Praised be Thou, O God, whom alone we serve in reverence. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 17, 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.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 299 and 300.

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

LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2087) to amend title 38 of the United States Code relating to basic provisions of the loan guaranty program for veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", strike out "a period." and insert "the following: 'except that in establishing the rate of interest that shall be applicable to such loans, the Administrator shall consult with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development regarding the rate of interest the Secretary considers necessary to meet the mortgage market for home loans insured under section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, and, to the maximum extent practicable, carry out a coordinated policy on interest rates on loans insured under such section 203(b) and on loans guaranteed or insured under this chapter.' "; so as to make the bill read: