

By Mr. YATES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 3185. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft into or over the United States until certain findings are made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 249. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that any district, from which an official is elected to a legislative body, within a State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia shall contain substantially the same numbers of citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution relating to the war power of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide an age limit and a single 6-year term for the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide an age limit for Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of office of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to designate the Manned Space Craft Center in Houston, Tex., as the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center in honor of the late President; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution to authorize the emergency importation of oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating March of each year as Youth Art Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H. Res. 167. A resolution to amend rule XI of the House of Representatives to provide for adequate minority staffing on committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to authorize each Member, Resident Commissioner, and Delegate to hire within the monetary limits of the existing clerk hire allowance two additional clerks who are physically handicapped; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Res. 169. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives regarding instructions to members of committees of conference; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 170. Resolution: Canal Zone sovereignty and jurisdiction resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 72; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

20. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 3186. A bill for the relief of Jerry A. Langer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 3187. A bill for the relief of Fredi Robert Drellich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 3188. A bill for the relief of Thomas G. Jolley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Elmer Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Edgar Buchowiecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 3191. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. McSPADDEN:

H.R. 3192. A bill for the relief of Larry

Hoyt Lunsford and Estelene Lunsford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 3193. A bill to provide that Maj. Carvel de Bussy shall be advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3194. A bill for the relief of certain members of the civilian guard force of the 6487th Air Base Squadron, Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3195. A bill for the relief of John Balaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3196. A bill for the relief of James H. Davidson, Vincent W. S. Hee, and Kay M. Mochizuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Davis, Mrs. Carol Dumbaugh, Mrs. Judith Haworth, and Mrs. Doris Chula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3198. A bill for the relief of James L. Gerard, James W. Summers, and William D. Cissel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3199. A bill for the relief of Plotemia Mabanag Bareng and Bastiana Lillian Mabanag Bareng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3200. A bill for the relief of Servillano C. Espi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3201. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toyo Shota Ikeuchi and Mrs. Katherine Keiko Aoki Kaneshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3202. A bill for the relief of Takehito Kobayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3203. A bill for the relief of Nepty Masauo Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3204. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Corazon Evangeline Quimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3205. A bill for the relief of Esther Nano Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3206. A bill for the relief of Francisco M. del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRITCHARD:

H.R. 3207. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Enid R. Pope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 3208. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Trimarchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

35. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Fresno, Calif., relative to President Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 55th anniversary of Ukraine's independence.

In 1917, as the tsarist regime crumbled and Russia was torn by internal forces; the non-Russian areas of the empire were afire with a struggle not only to attain social freedom but national independence as well.

Nowhere was the drive for independence more alive than in Ukraine. Amid the complex events of that year the Ukrainian masses created a movement that led to the Ukraï'ka Narodnia Respublika—Ukrainian National Republic.

However, as the new nation was hard at work establishing itself, its freedoms and its independence were snatched away. In 1922, the Bolsheviks, disregarding national boundaries and identities, seized Ukraine, clamping despotism over this nation of beauty, vast resources, and 50 million people. The result was, and is, that Ukraine is the largest non-Russian captive nation both in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe.

Since the plundering Bolsheviks enslaved this nation 50 years ago, repression has been a way of life in Ukraine. Yet, hope and the will to be free has not been taken from the people. The belief in the Ukrainian will and national spirit remains alive.

I also think something should be said here about the 2,000,000 Ukrainian-Americans and a tremendous effort they have undertaken.

Not only has knowledge of their homeland, its history, literature, and culture been disproportionately minimal despite Ukraine's importance, but the Ukrainian-American's experience as a community, their integration into the mainstream of American life, and their contribution to

the growth of this country have been inadequately studied. As a result of seeing this need a professorship in Ukrainian studies has been created at Harvard University.

In Ukraine itself, the range of scholarly research in the humanities has been one of the fields most sharply circumscribed since the 1930's. The task of Harvard's Ukrainian center will be to fill the gaps.

This tremendous and vital effort at Harvard is the result of the work of many, but most importantly involved is a group of Ukrainian-American students that concluded that the only way to perpetuate their cultural inheritance and share it was through the endowment of a permanent chair of Ukrainian studies at an American university. The unprecedented initiative of this group of students made possible the collection of the necessary funds for the endowment of a professorial chair. Because of this effort, Harvard shall be the home of a \$3.8 million Ukrainian studies center providing the means to fill the cultural gaps forcibly created in Ukraine by Communist ideology and anti-Ukrainian discrimination.

This effort by the Ukrainian-American community is indicative of the cultural pride and spirit of a strong-willed people. In their dedication to keep a culture alive there is a lesson for we who too easily take our freedoms for granted.

I salute all Ukrainians on this 55th anniversary of their national independence. I applaud their national spirit and strength, and I look forward to a day when Ukraine will again freely stand among the nations of the world.

JERRY MOLLOY, NEW JERSEY'S
TOASTMASTER GENERAL

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most entertaining persons in northern New Jersey is Jerry Molloy of Hoboken whose ability as a wit and raconteur has earned him the title of Toastmaster General of New Jersey. I know of no one who is more consistently funny than Jerry and, I must say, very often at my expense.

Jerry Molloy is more than a comic. He is a man who has devoted his life to make a better life for other people and there are thousands of young people who have followed the right path in life because of the inspiration of the jolly Hoboken Irishman. As teacher and coach for more than three decades he has taken nothing for himself and given to others. I know Jerry would guffaw if he heard these words, but he is truly one of God's noblemen.

Recently, Carmine Bilotti of the Dispatch, of Union City, N.J., devoted his popular Sportscope column to Jerry Molloy and I include it in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article follows:

THE TOASTMASTER GENERAL

There will be a moment at the New Jersey Sportswriters Association dinner Sunday afternoon at the Greenbriar Inn when everybody in the place will wake up. Jerry Molloy's booming voice has the effect of an alarm clock but his chatter and charm are intoxicating.

"Just a few minutes ago," Molloy will begin, "the mike was on the bum. Now a bum is on the mike."

Molloy will smile and the audience will laugh. They always do. Laughter is the middle name of this fat, smiling Irishman from Hoboken.

Molloy is called the Toastmaster General of New Jersey, a title reconfirmed by every governor since Robert Meyner. The sportswriters will send Molloy to the microphone for about the 8,000th time in his long, happy life that began June 1, 1910, near one of Hoboken's many cabarets.

"I gave my first dinner talk at a Kiwanis luncheon at old Meyers Hotel in Hoboken in 1945," Molloy recalls. "The principal speaker didn't show and my old buddy, Yorke Calabro, suggested they let Jerry tell a few stories."

Molloy was a successful high school coach at the time and in the space of a few minutes, he became an equally successful after-dinner speaker. Molloy has been a guest speaker for the Hoboken Kiwanis every year since his debut on the "rubber chicken" circuit. "In appreciation, they've made me an honorary member," says Molloy. Jerry won't say his membership in the Kiwanis is more compensation than he usually receives.

Molloy has brightened audiences in most parts of the country. He shared a dais with the then Vice President Hubert Humphrey at an International Longshoremen's Association convention in Miami Beach, which may be one of the reasons the ex-veep is always smiling.

One of his most interesting engagements, however, was in a suburb of Pittsburgh, Pa.—McKees Rocks. "I felt at home because it reminded me of Hoboken," Jerry spoke for 20 minutes in what he describes as an "abandoned mine shaft." He recalls an elderly lady at a front table playing solitaire. "I had them rolling in the aisles," Molloy remembers, "and then one of the good fathers took the dice away."

He finished his talk with a "prayer." It went like this. "Now I lay me down to slumber, I hope and pray I hit the number. If I should die before I wake . . . Play a deuce on 208."

THE NUMBER HIT

That was April 1970 and the number was a winner the next day. He received a letter of thanks from the dinner chairman on behalf of all the lucky people who played 208. "We need more people like you," the letter said. "But there was no money for me," Molloy said.

Molloy played a return engagement at McKees Rocks last year without a fee. Even the travel expenses were out of his pocket. "They're good people," he reasoned.

Currently, Jerry is the coordinator of youth activities in Hoboken. He points with pride to the young people in his town where, he claims, JD stands for juvenile decency rather than juvenile delinquency.

Molloy has worked with kids most of his life. He was 23 when he signed on as coach of basketball, baseball, football and tennis, director of athletics and teacher of physical education at St. Mary's High School in Paterson in 1933. He was paid \$50 a year. He stayed on the job until the school closed in 1971. The building has since been converted to the Jerry Molloy Youth Center.

He also coached at St. Michael's, Newark, from 1939 to 1943; at St. Mary's, Elizabeth from 1943 to 1946; and at St. Patrick's, Eliza-

beth, from 1946 to 1962 when he retired there after coaching his 200th basketball victory.

COLLEGE COACH

On the college level, Jolly Jerry served a score of seasons as baseball coach at St. Peter's on spring afternoons at the cavernous Roosevelt Stadium, Jersey City. The chief of Hoboken police used to chase foul balls in the empty 25,000-seat stadium and Frank Sinatra's father an ex-boxer who used the name of Marty O'Brien brought the bats back to the dugout.

Molloy feels best among "little people." He once turned down a chance to speak at a prestigious dinner in Washington, D.C., because he had committed himself to appear at a friend's bachelor party in Hoboken.

Jerry, too, was regarded as one of the best officials in college basketball, a position he attained much the same way he became an after dinner talker. "I was at a game and the referee didn't show up. They were paying a dollar so I jumped at the chance to sub," he says. You can expect Molloy to toss a quip. "They said I was one of the best referees money could buy." It always draws a laugh.

He continued as a referee for a few games and "retired." He quickly made a comeback when the fee jumped to \$1.50. Eventually his colorful court antics landed him work at Madison Square Garden where he became one of the most popular officials of all time.

Molloy's funny experiences are myriad. One he recalls occurred while his team was playing St. Joseph's of Paterson. "I lost my choppers yelling too hard. I was so incensed I followed the referee across the court, screaming at him and all of a sudden my teeth fell out. I didn't know what to do—keep after him or pick up my choppers. I kept after him."

Later that year, Molloy, whose teams won more than 500 basketball games, was the guest speaker at the St. Joseph's sports dinner. "They presented me with a set of chattering teeth."

It was another of the more than 8,000 nights that Molloy put a smile on peoples' faces.

"I'm not an entertainer," he points out. "I just like to have fun."

MAY THE PEACE BE PERMANENT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the cease-fire which took place in Vietnam on Saturday and the signing of agreements by the four parties directly involved, which hopefully will lead to a permanent peace in all of Southeast Asia, are indeed most welcome news.

As I know my colleagues are, I am elated that the two agreements which have been initialed and were signed Saturday means that at long last we have in sight that day when all American prisoners of war will be released and returned home and there will be the fullest possible accounting of our servicemen who are listed as missing in action. I am pleased that these POW-MIA lists, which we have sought for so long, have been made available immediately and at long last the long vigil of the families of the prisoners of war and those missing in action will be ended.

Within 60 days we should have the remaining troops in Vietnam en route

home. That indeed will be a wonderful day—one that we have hoped and prayed for for a long, long time.

The President's report and the lengthy and thorough briefing in which Dr. Kissinger spelled out the many details of the peace agreements give us real assurance that we have a bona fide negotiated peace, one which has been achieved with honor.

The task facing the Nation today, one emphasized both by the President and Dr. Kissinger, is how to achieve a permanent peace—a peace which will bring together in a spirit of cooperation and conciliation not only the people of Southeast Asia but also our own people here at home and the peoples throughout the world. I would join our President in his closing comments last night in which he emphasized how much President Johnson desired and sought actively a lasting peace in the world:

No one would have welcomed this peace more than he. And I know he would join me in asking—for those who died, and for those who live—let us consecrate this moment by resolving together to make the peace we have achieved a peace that will last.

May we dedicate ourselves to the achievement of this goal.

SCOUTING'S MORE THAN YOU THINK

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, during the entire month of February we will commemorate the 63d anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America who, as you know, were the first and the largest youth organization to be chartered by Congress. Certainly I am always proud and delighted to have the opportunity to pay tribute to and express my sincere appreciation for the outstanding accomplishments rendered by this splendid organization since its inception.

All down through the years we have witnessed wonderful achievements brought about by the emphasis which scouting has placed on fellowship, citizenship, and respect for God as evidenced by the more than six million members and leaders who are truly committed to this program. However, scouting today has changed in its total concept. It is an organized, contemporary, and universal program used to tackle drug abuse, pollution, juvenile delinquency, and unemployment problems, and in its continuing concern for American youth BSA began a nationwide program to combat drug abuse. Operation REACH, inaugurated in 1971, has made highly successful and indispensable approaches to drug abuse prevention and was developed to supplement scouting's traditional physical and mental fitness program. This project provides for the distribution of reliable drug information to youth and their parents thereby creating an atmosphere which opens frank discussion and promotes trust between the two generations.

Current national efforts also include Boypower '76, an intense long-range expansion program launched in 1969 which proposes to involve one-third of all American boys in scouting by 1976, the 200th anniversary of the birth of our Nation. As a part of its Boypower '76 plan, the BSA has included a number of programs that reflect their concern for the environment. Project SOAR—Save Our American Resources—is one of them. Boys participating in this project remove litter from our Nation's highways, parks, streambanks, vacant lots, and public lands. Instead of merely expressing criticism, scouts are assuming an active, constructive role in cleaning up their environment and restoring acres of land back to its original beauty.

It is my opinion that the scouting program has always been a relevant, sympathetic and meaningful organization responding to the needs of our youth. I recall with fond and cherished memories the adventures and experiences which I enjoyed as a Boy Scout, and feel confident that the lessons of citizenship and fellowship which come early in scouting provide a deeply personal experience for every Boy Scout.

The scouting movement has made significant expansion in Kentucky and I am pleased to note that BSA continues to be of great service to the State of Kentucky generally and the Second Congressional District in particular.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 63 years the Boy Scouts of America have definitely made an enormous contribution to the growth of this country both morally and spiritually, and on the eve of their anniversary, I want to wish each and every scout continued success in all of their future endeavors.

COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must marshal its resources if the great struggle to clean up America's environment and preserve our natural resources is ever to be won. Right now, our effort is fragmented and inefficient, thus preventing the Congress from taking leadership on one of the greatest problems of our time.

To bring unity to this effort, I have introduced House Resolution 41, to establish a Standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives.

While the administration with establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency recognized the need for a coordinated program to clean up America's air and water, the Congress has continued trying to solve the problems on a piecemeal basis.

The Nation's growing recognition of the need to improve the quality of life and deal with the growing environmental crisis has led to a proliferation of bills introduced in the Congress to this

end. These environmental bills continue to be assigned to a myriad of committees which are chiefly concerned with other areas of legislative activity.

The problems are simply too costly and complex to be handled in this manner. We need one standing committee to deal with air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution, herbicide and pesticide abuse, waste management and all of the other critical concerns involving our environment.

In both the 91st and 92d Congresses, a joint resolution was passed to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment. However, the committee failed to become operational, because no conference report was ever filed following the congressional approval. In any event, a joint committee would not have solved the problem since no bills would have been referred to it and the committee would not have had jurisdiction to report measures to the floor.

Much of my public life has been dedicated to preserving America's great natural assets for the use and enjoyment of this and future generations. Cleaning up our environment is certainly one of the most difficult and costly campaigns we have ever undertaken.

Therefore, it is essential we do so in an effective, coordinated manner. We owe it to the American people to get the job done.

NEW ADMINISTRATION BUDGET THREATENS CATASTROPHIC CUTS IN MEDICAL RESEARCH

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's fiscal budget for 1974, unveiled today, spells catastrophic slashes in Federal funding for many programs in the physical sciences and particularly in the training of medical sciences in the teaching hospitals across the Nation.

In Boston alone there will be a projected loss of more than \$18 million in Federal support. More than 850 training positions will be lost over the 18 months at the three medical schools and their affiliated hospitals in greater Boston.

To bring the forthcoming disasters to the attention of the Members of Congress and of the Nation, I attach herewith a well-researched article from the Boston Globe for January 29, 1973. The article follows:

HUB MEDICAL TRAINING CENTERS LOSE \$18 MILLION UNDER NIXON BUDGET

The Nixon Administration's fiscal 1974 budget, to be unveiled today, dooms Federal support for training new medical scientists, much to the amazement of medical schools and teaching hospitals across the nation.

Boston, a world medical center, stands to lose more than \$18 million in Federal support under the new Nixon budget. More than 850 training positions will be eliminated over the next 18 months at the three medical schools and their affiliated hospitals here.

Because of the concentration of medical research and teaching here, Boston will be

one of the two or three hardest hit centers in the country. Almost 15 percent of the \$134.5 million in Federal biomedical training and fellowship money allocated for the current fiscal year flowed into local academic medicine.

This money nourishes not only new medical research talent but also provides medical schools with \$2.8 million to help pay faculty salaries.

A third benefit, difficult to measure but clearly substantial, is the significant amount of patient care that the Federally supported trainees provide in their research and training—especially in the esoteric disease management for which Boston hospitals are famous.

The most striking example is the Massachusetts General Hospital, which stands to lose 145 trainees in specialties ranging from anesthesia to neurology and surgery. The fate of 40 trainees slated to come on board July 1, to whom the hospital had already given commitments, is very much in doubt according to MGH officials.

Based on rumors circulating during the past 10 days, medical schools and some of the nation's most prestigious hospitals are lobbying in Congress to save the program, but most observers see little chance of success.

Unknown to all but a few in the academic medical community, the debate over research traineeships between the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) was being waged over the past nine months. As the budget to be revealed today shows, the fiscal managers prevailed in that battle, which probably will be the determining one.

Whatever happens in Washington over the next few months, however, it is clear that there will be major and wrenching changes in the way medical school teaching, research and patient care have been conducted in academic medical centers for 20 years.

A rundown of Federal training grants and fellowships at the three Boston medical schools and their hospitals reveals that in each case the input is large. However, there is wide variance in the extent to which each is dependent on these Federal grants.

Boston University Medical School will be hardest hit by the Nixon Administration cuts, because it depends more heavily than Harvard or Tufts on training grants to help pay its faculty.

According to BU Medical Dean Ephraim Friedman, at least 140 of the school's 220 fulltime faculty are paid in part through these training grants. This amounts to \$1,175,000 of the \$6.2 million that BU receives under the program.

Thus, Federal training grants contribute about 12 percent of faculty salaries at BU Medical School. To make up that amount of income, the school would have to amass more than \$15 million in additional endowment.

Loss of these funds will inevitably mean that BU will lose fulltime faculty—"the faculty that does 90 percent of the teaching," Dean Friedman said in an interview.

"The most important impact," Friedman said, "is going to be a decrease in the quality of medical education at this institution as we return to part-time, volunteer faculty. This will thin the ranks of our faculty just at a time when we're being forced (by Washington) to increase our student body."

In sheer dollar volume, Harvard and its 10 affiliated teaching hospitals will forego the largest chunk of training funds—\$10.1 million, or well over half the Boston-area allocation.

The important difference in Harvard's case, however, is that faculty support consumes only 10 percent of this \$10.1 million, compared to almost 20 percent in BU's case. Whereas training grants supply about 12 percent of BU's total faculty budget, they make up only 2.5 percent of Harvard Medical School's faculty salaries.

Tufts Medical School and its New Eng-

land Medical Center Hospitals receive the third-largest share of training grant money—\$1.9 million—supporting 128 trainees at the medical school, New England Medical Center and the Tufts services at Boston City Hospital.

A higher proportion of the Tufts total, almost 40 percent, is devoted to faculty salaries. However, the actual amount of faculty support is so much smaller (\$587,000) that Tufts appears to be less dependent on the program to meet its academic payroll of 400 full-time and part-time faculty.

The three Boston schools are a microcosm of the degree to which the Federal commitment to train biomedical researchers and clinical faculty has served as a cornerstone in the development of academic medicine since the mid-1950s.

For instance in the current year half of the \$134.5 million spent on the program went to medical school faculty salaries. In fiscal 1971, 37.5 percent of all U.S. researchers-in-training in the basic medical sciences drew support from the program.

As already noted, the spinoff for patient care is more difficult to pin down. In most medical specialties and sub-specialties, the line between laboratory researcher and patient-care provider is virtually impossible to draw. The common thread is an orientation toward advancing medical knowledge and teaching new doctors rather than solely toward delivering medical care.

Yet in the course of research, the trainees have provided substantial patient care in the teaching hospitals where their laboratories are located, usually without charging a fee or being paid a salary by the hospital, as interns and residents are.

In some instances, local authorities believe it may be possible to keep some trainees in medical centers by exploiting third-party health insurers to pay for whatever care they render. However, BU's Dean Friedman points out that this is going to be difficult, due to the recent passage of a Federal law which prohibits Medicare and Medicaid funds from being paid to doctors salaried in part by medical schools and teaching hospitals.

Even this type of support where possible, will be no help to trainees in basic medical sciences where there is little or no patient-care component, points out Dr. Harry Sorooff, director of the Tufts Surgical Service at Boston City Hospital. This includes such areas as biochemistry, physiology, anatomy and bacteriology.

The Nixon Administration has not yet stated its rationale for scrapping the training program. In the immediate sense, of course, it is foremost a money-saving measure—a significant part of the half-billion dollar cutback in Federal expenditures through the National Institutes of Health, its biomedical research and development arm.

However, more fundamental philosophical arguments against a Federal role in training new medical researchers have been raised over the past five years. A sure indication of the general trend has been the attrition in the program since its all-time high of \$169 million in fiscal 1969.

The debate heated up last May 11, when Nixon budget officials sent a formal list of searching questions about the program to NIH. The then-director of NIH, Dr. Robert Q. Marston, responded last October with a 160 page rebuttal of the criticisms implied in OMB's questions. (Dr. Marston has since been "let go" as the agency's director.)

In that confidential document, which was obtained recently by The Globe, the NIH takes the strong position that the payoff of training new medical researchers is well worth the four-to-five percent of the total Federal health research and development that it has cost.

Stated the report: "The NIH training budget should be viewed as the annual

premium on a social insurance policy" purchased to ensure that the nation maintains its momentum in biomedical research and in the manpower needed to train new doctors.

From comments made recently to Boston scientists, it is known that Mr. Nixon's budget managers feel the government should not support advanced training for doctors who might later drop out of medical research and rake in large incomes enhanced by their Federally financed post-graduate training.

The NIH argued that most trainees stay in academic medicine where their earnings are well below what they could be making in private practice. It told OMB officials that a work-study alternative would hamper the training of high-quality researchers, and that many potentially creative people would be deterred from a career in research if they had to borrow the \$50,000-plus it would take to finance their medical education and post-graduate training.

PEYSER OPPOSES HEROIN MAINTENANCE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from New York (Mr. PEYSER) demonstrated in the last Congress his active and knowledgeable concern about the problem of drug abuse. One aspect of this concern has been his service as chairman of the House Ad Hoc Committee Against Heroin Maintenance and his authorship of legislation to prohibit the use of heroin in federally funded drug programs, a bill which I was proud to cosponsor and one which has received the endorsement of the administration.

I was pleased to read in the January 23 Washington Post a letter to the editor from Congressman PEYSER in response to an earlier letter which had touted the value of heroin maintenance as a solution to the problem of heroin addiction. In a most cogent and persuasive manner, Congressman PEYSER dismantles the arguments and explodes the myths which have been perpetrated by the proponents of heroin maintenance. To fight heroin addiction by dispensing heroin to addicts is like fighting a fire by pouring gasoline on it. In Congressman PEYSER's words:

"The term 'maintenance' is misleading, for the addict can never be 'maintained' on a level dosage of heroin, but rather, he needs ever increasing amounts of heroin to sustain his habit.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague on his efforts in this area and especially for bringing the true facts to the attention of the public. At this point in the Record, I insert the full text of Congressman PEYSER's letter and commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 23, 1973]
HEROIN AND CLINICS

On January 12, you printed a letter arguing for the maintenance of heroin clinics. On January 15, the Associated Press reported that Dr. Samuel Fox, the newly appointed director of the Maryland State Drug Abuse Authority, would like to see a system of distribution of heroin to hard-core registered

January 29, 1973

addicts, similar to the English system. Dr. Fox is quoted as saying, "I think there is hope the states will fight for the English system..." It is extremely distressing to me that this argument continues to surface periodically, for it represents a defeatist attitude toward the problem of heroin addiction and, if adopted, would condemn our country to a permanent drug addiction dilemma.

As Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee Against Heroin Maintenance in the House of Representatives, I have introduced a bill which would prohibit the use of heroin in any drug maintenance program. This bill has been co-sponsored by Congressman Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.), and many other members of the House. In addition, I have been fighting to forestall an application for an experimental heroin maintenance program by the Vera Institute in New York City.

There are no simple solutions to the scourge of heroin addiction. It is easy to see how the argument that giving addicts free heroin would at least stop the enormous drug-related crime rate. Yet this is a false argument, as has been demonstrated by its failure in Britain, and it puts the state in the posture of abdicating any moral responsibility not only to the addict, but to the community as a whole.

Heroin maintenance clinics, rather than relieving society of the criminality associated with heroin, would rather open new markets, subsidized by the state, for international traffickers in heroin. For in reality, what we are talking about is the free supplying of heroin to an addict. The term "maintenance" is misleading, for the addict can never be "maintained" on a level dosage of heroin, but rather he needs ever increasing amounts of heroin to sustain his habit.

It would be especially harmful if this occurred now, when we have finally begun to see some results in our long national battle against narcotics traffickers. Currently, we have a heroin shortage on the East Coast, a ban on opium growing in Turkey, some heartening predictions of the number of heroin addicts, and encouraging developments in the research for antagonist drugs to block the effects of heroin.

We have come a long way in our national attack against narcotics abuse, and while we are far from being completely successful, we have at least stemmed the epidemic of heroin addiction that our country experienced in the 1960s. There is now the need to take further constructive initiatives. This is not the time, nor should it ever be the time, to relinquish our role of responsibility and give in to the heroin trafficker, which is what heroin maintenance would be doing.

This is the time for continued positive national efforts on both the enforcement and treatment levels, to pursue the encouraging avenues which we already have opened, and to reject heroin maintenance as a retrogressive step which, in the words of President Nixon, "... would surely lead to the erosion of our most cherished values for the dignity of man."

PETER A. PEYSER,

Member of Congress, 26th District,
New York.
WASHINGTON.

LEGISLATION TO END THE PROCESS OF SECRET IMPOUNDING OF FUNDS BY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I introduced legislation which

would effectively end the process of secret impounding of funds by the executive branch. I said at that time that I felt this process had contributed greatly to the erosion of congressional power and had led to the constitutional crisis in which this body finds itself today.

I am today reintroducing that legislation cosponsored by 27 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. I understand that several other similar bills have the support of over 80 Members. I sincerely hope that every Member who cares about restoring power and prestige to the Congress will support this bipartisan endeavor.

It is also appropriate that this legislation be reintroduced on the day that the President has sent his 1974 budget to Congress for approval. He is asking us to appropriate billions of dollars more when he is, at the same time, thwarting the will of Congress on moneys appropriated last year. I find this position by the executive branch indefensible, and I urge that no action be taken on the new budget until we have dealt firmly with the issue of impounding funds.

I have no official figures on the extent of the funds impounded during the current fiscal year; however, the Congressional Research Service has supplied me with an interim report which lists a total of \$10 billion in impounded funds for programs ranging from housing, pollution control, and sewage treatment to transportation and rural electrification.

I am looking forward to reviewing the list of impounded funds which will be submitted to the Congress by the Office of Management and Budget early next month. I feel certain that it will contain even more disappointments for the American people.

But the biggest disappointment to me would be if we allow moneys which we have authorized and appropriated to be withheld without explanation by the White House. To paraphrase an election slogan, "Now more than ever" we need a strong, independent, and coequal branch of our Government—the Congress.

If the Congress loses its vaunted "power of the purse," what else has it left to lose?

A list of cosponsors follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Adams, Wash.; Mr. Addabbo, N.Y.; Mr. Brasco, N.Y.; Ms. Chisholm, N.Y.; Mr. Clark, Pa.; Mr. Clay, Mo.; Mr. Conyers, Mich.; Mr. Davis, Ga.; Mr. Donohue, Mass.; Mr. Flood, Pa.; Ms. Green, Oreg.; Mr. Hechler, W. Va.; Mr. Henderson, N.C.; Mr. Howard, N.J.; Mr. Leggett, Calif.; Mr. Matsunaga, Hawaii; Mr. Moorhead, Pa.; Mr. Murphy, N.Y.; Mr. Podel, N.Y.; Mr. Price, Ill.; Mr. Rooney, Pa.; Mr. Rosenthal, N.Y.; Mr. Slack, W. Va.; Mr. James V. Stanton, Ohio; Mr. Van Derlin, Calif.; Mr. Waldie, Calif.; Mr. Won Pat, Guam.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,925 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

U.S. TRADE DEBACLE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech by the well-known authority of international trade, O. R. Strackbein, president of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export, before the National Wool Growers Association on January 24:

SPEECH OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, PRESIDENT, THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 24, 1973

U.S. TRADE DEBACLE

The American position in world trade has deteriorated so far and so rapidly that no early correction need be expected. The making of this debacle is not difficult to trace and yet wholly insufficient attention is being given to it.

According to official statistics our 1972 trade deficit was more than \$6 billion, compared with \$2.8 billion in 1971. In other words, despite the tariff surcharge of August 1971 and the subsequent upward valuation of some currencies, such as the Japanese yen and the West German mark, together with devaluation of the dollar, our trade deficit more than doubled in 1972.

In reality, as a measure of our weak competitive position in world trade, the official statistics do not tell the whole story. The deficit was much larger than \$6 billion, for two reasons. One lies in the official practice of treating shipments under AID, Food for Peace, and highly subsidized farm products as real exports, as if they represented our competitive standing in foreign markets. Actually these shipments do not reflect a strong competitive position because in the absence of the grants and subsidies we would be shipping few of these goods.

The amount involved annually is close to \$3 billion. Therefore our exports are overvalued by about that much. In the second place our imports are recorded on their foreign value instead of their cost landed at our ports. This practice leaves out ocean freight, marine insurance and other shipping charges. Thus our imports are undervalued by some 10%, as estimated by the U.S. Tariff Commission.

With imports running at more than \$50 billion, the undervaluation amounts to some \$5 billion. If this is added to the excessive valuation of \$3 billion on our exports, the total deficit for 1972 comes to some \$14 billion instead of merely \$6 billion, or over twice the officially reported level.

Unless further measures are taken no turnabout need be expected for some time.

Even the alarming state of our trade deficit does not fully reflect the really weak competitive position in which we find ourselves. What is not widely known is that our astonishing weakness in exports is further hidden by the favorable balance that we still had in 1971 in the exportation of machinery, computers, aircraft and chemicals. This surplus was over \$5 billion and concealed in great part the gaping deficit of some \$8 billion we incurred in our trade in

nearly all other manufactured products. 45% of our total 1971 exports consisted of machinery and transport equipment.

Even the export surplus in machinery (\$5.5 billion in 1971) is not safe for the future. In recent years imports of machinery have been moving up rapidly. Already we have moved from handsome export surplus in automobiles and parts into a broad deficit. The same has happened in textiles where we are now in a deficit position while we enjoyed a comfortable surplus until a few years ago. The same is true of petroleum, steel, footwear, rubber manufactures, radio and television sets, cameras, watches, and a wide range of hardware, office machinery, etc.

Unmistakably we are on the run. If we lose our lead in machinery we will be routed on the whole front. The sale of wheat to Russia, really big deal that it was, will probably be a one-shot windfall. The outlook is that our petroleum imports will rise to new heights in the next few years, and more than offset the gain in grain exports.

For a while we had a quota on the imports of meat, including mutton, but this has been set aside. We have import quotas on textiles and for the first time wool goods were included when the long-term agreement was extended a year ago. This has been of some help, but, as of now, is still a temporary arrangement subject to the uncertainties of national and international politics. While it is better than nothing, for without it, ruin would have been visited on the textile industry, it does not represent a solid foundation for the basing of an industry's future.

The concentration of our exports in a narrow sector as noted just now is also not a healthy economic development, especially since machinery imports are closing in on our one bright spot. Moreover, the heavy exports of industrial machinery helps to build up the productive powers of our competitors. The lead we still have in computers may also be expected to fade in a few years.

That our foreign trade is in a state of disarray goes without saying. The efforts that have been made to reverse the situation have so far failed because dollar devaluation and up-valuation of foreign currencies represent an unsatisfactory approach. Currency realignment is no more than a makeshift. From its very nature, uncontrolled as it is, it cannot meet the problem.

If our present trade trend continues we will be driven more and more from a producing to a service economy. That is not a prospect to be lightly contemplated. Production of goods underlies the strength of any economy and is indispensable to independence. Those who contemplate such a trend with equanimity should reflect on the discomfiture we face as a nation in a single example of dependence, namely, in the energy crisis. Our growing dependence on foreign sources for products so essential to our whole process of industrial production, and no less so to transportation, home heating and lighting, and therefore to our health and welfare, should give us a pause. Before accepting the trend toward greater dependence on services and less on production of goods, we should examine the meaning of such dependence for a wide variety of goods.

There are instances, of course, of such dependence even now, and it will grow in any case; but to hold to a trade policy that will add to and accelerate such dependence is pure folly or worse.

Quite aside from the weakening of our national security base if we become dependent on imports of textiles, scientific apparatus, electronics, office equipment, yes, even automobiles, footwear, and much else, there is the loss of economic independence and weakening of economic and political bargaining power, that goes with reliance on foreign sources for our supply. Yet, if we do not control imports, preferably by import quotas,

we will continue to be exposed to loss of market to foreign goods.

What is needed is a set of controls that will hold imports to a specified share of our market, and then let them grow in proportion to the growth of our market. Today, any notion of further tariff cuts gives evidence of a complete failure to diagnose our troubles. Our foreign trade policy is bankrupt and we are adrift on a raft that is moving rapidly downstream.

A MUSICAL ENDING TO A HAPPY STORY

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear so much about the strife that separates the citizens of some communities, I am proud and honored to share with my colleagues the story of the twin cities of Helena-West Helena, Ark., and a successful drive to raise the matching funds necessary to erect the \$1.5 million Phillips County Community Center. An integral part of the story is Miss Lily Peter, Miss Lily, as she is known to her friends—and everyone she meets is her friend. With Miss Lily leading the way, the people of this community raised \$300,000 in 6 months for the center.

Miss Lily is the same remarkable woman who mortgaged one of her farms to foot the bill for bringing the Philadelphia Orchestra under Eugene Ormandy's direction to Little Rock to help celebrate Arkansas' 150th anniversary as a territory. And she commissioned the writing of a special work which the orchestra played.

And Helena will not lack for artists to play in the new cultural center. Van Cliburn is scheduled there next month. Others will be brought in because of a half million dollar legacy left the town by a farmer named Samuel Drake Warfield who directed that this money be spent for free music.

I include at this point two articles which more fully tell the story of this community's accomplishment:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Dec. 5, 1972]

ADVANCEMENT IN PHILLIPS COUNTY

(By Richard Allin)

During the steamboat and early railroad days—before automobile traffic became respectable—Helena, Arkansas, my home town, possessed an imposing opera house. Jenny Lind sang there, and some say Caruso did, although documentation of the latter's appearance is unavailable.

John Philip Sousa brought his band there and residents who care to remember that far back report that the dress circle glittered with Helena's finest for these concerts. Whether grand opera was ever produced—at least in a grand scale—is doubtful. Nevertheless, the boards of the opera house were trodden by the great and small in Helena's burgeoning days.

A road show of "Hamlet" played there once and a youngish rake of one family caused a minor disgrace by arriving at the performance after a session of joyous tipping and flabbergasted the audience by stepping through the curtain as Hamlet was emoting and, standing behind his back, following each and every movement in a superb pantomime.

He was taken to the jail house. Mercifully, the Helena World—while reporting the event misspelled his last name with such imagination that the news was not widely spread. One likes to think that the misspelling was purposeful.

One long-time Helena resident said in the final days of the opera house that the most popular form of entertainment were the minstrel shows. Well, they had their day, too. Whatever happened to Silas Green from New Orleans and the Rabbit Foot Shows.

The opera house burned to the ground in 1926. The plot it was on was used for various purposes, mostly as a used car lot. The only thing that lingered was the memory, and that faded—or became grander—as the case may be. It was apparently to be the last opera house in Helena. There was no serious thought for replacing it.

When I was growing up, all entertainments—local and professional concerts, local and professional theater—were held in the third floor auditorium of what was then called the Helena High School. It was a long climb to the big barny room with wooden theater seats; but Helena audiences were always pretty good when professionals came, and students could blackmail their parents to come to the band concerts, of which I participated in many in that auditorium.

Last Sunday night, the residents of Phillips County dedicated the new Phillips County Fine Arts Center, and specifically the Lily Peter Auditorium. The Arkansas Symphony Orchestra played the dedicatory concert and I frankly felt elated and quite at home to take Elizabeth (my tuba) on stage.

It is a beautifully designed auditorium with excellent acoustics and of a perfect size. I wish we had one like it in Little Rock. It seats between 1,200 and 1,300 on a well pitched floor providing perfect visibility, and there's a balcony.

The driving force in raising funds for the auditorium was Miss Lily Peter, for whom it was named. She is the remarkable lady from near Marvell who is a poet, cotton gin-ner, farmer, musician, raconteur, and generous benefactor. Miss Lily, it will be clearly remembered throughout the state (and nation) "gave" Arkansas two performances by the Philadelphia Orchestra under Eugene Ormandy to help celebrate Arkansas' 150th anniversary as a territory. And she commissioned a special work which the orchestra played. Robinson Auditorium was packed for both concerts and all the proceeds went to scholarships.

Now Miss Lily and a driving committee of Phillips Countians have built themselves a fine functional cultural institution that many other cities can covet.

And doubly fortunate for Phillips County is the Warfield Trust, set up by the late S. D. Warfield of Helena, to provide high quality musical concerts—free of charge—to Phillips County residents. The Arkansas Symphony, selected to play the inaugural concert of the auditorium, was paid for by the Warfield Trust. Van Cliburn is the next on the list.

Work and generosity has produced enormous results in Phillips County. The way they did it is worth studying. And maybe Pulaski County could borrow Lily Peter to get started.

[From the Twin City (Ark.) Tribune, Nov. 29, 1972]

NEW COMMUNITY CENTER TO BE DEDICATED SUNDAY

The magnificent new \$1.5 million Phillips County Community Center, scheduled to be formally dedicated Sunday, stands as a remarkable example of what can be done when a community or area bands together on a project for the common good.

Moreover, it stands as a monument to the determination of one woman—Miss Lily Peter of Marvell—who refused to include the word "failure" in her vocabulary.

It was "Miss Lily," as she is affectionately known to Phillips Countians, got started the ball rolling almost three years ago. And it was she who undertook the gigantic task of heading up the drive for \$300,000 in local funds to be used for matching purposes.

Although a large portion of the money for construction of the center came from the federal government, it was necessary that \$300,000 be raised from private contributions. Miss Lily and a host of co-workers accomplished that task in about six months.

Her work toward the construction of the facility will be recognized Sunday night when the center's auditorium officially becomes known as the "Lily Peter Auditorium."

Miss Lily, although she made hundreds of requests for donations and wrote more letters than she cares to remember, refuses to take only the smallest credit.

"There was a great number of persons who was," she says. "And they all worked terribly just as interested in this project as I bly hard on it."

Among those who became involved at an early date was Dr. John Easley, president of Phillips College.

Dr. Easley, while he aided in some of the fund solicitation, was primarily involved with paperwork, seeing that all federal requirements were met so that the federal funds would be available.

"He did a wonderful job," Miss Lily said. "Without his work, the center would have never been started."

The college, of course, will benefit greatly from the construction of the community center, since it figures prominently into its operation.

Not only will the facility be used as a community center, available for all sorts of activities within the county, it will also be used by the college.

Under present plans, the center will house the college's fine arts department and its student center.

"We plan to move into the student union and open it officially next Wednesday," Dr. Easley said recently. When not being used as a student center, it will be available for other affairs.

The building, constructed by M&M Construction Company of Jonesboro, includes music and art classrooms, an exhibition hall, and, of course, the 1,200 seat auditorium.

"The building is extremely adaptable," said Bill Stiles, executive director of the center. "For instance, most of the facilities, such as the student center, can be transformed, with little or no work, into banquet areas." The classrooms can be used for conference or meeting rooms for various organizations and conventions.

The auditorium, of course, is the showplace of the community center, containing 1,200 seats and featuring the most modern lighting and sound system available.

"It's just ideal for any type of production," says Stiles. "I don't believe there's another facility in the Mid-South that has it beat."

"Until now, there was really no place available that was adequate to conduct the high quality concerts which the Warfield Foundation brings to the Twin Cities," Stiles said. "Now, we've got a facility second to none."

Stiles added that other appearances have been booked into the auditorium and there is a possibility that the college will sponsor several big name performers for appearances.

"We're just extremely proud of the entire complex," Stiles added. "And we want people of Phillips County to be proud also—that's why we'd like to invite them to come by the center and let us show them around—we'd like to let them see just how their money was spent."

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON—A TRIBUTE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today the flags over the Capitol are flying at half-mast in memory of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States.

We have all participated in ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol and at the National City Christian Church here in Washington, and have heard the beautiful and eloquent eulogies of our colleague, Congressman J. J. PICKLE, from Texas; the Honorable Dean Rusk, who served with President Johnson as Secretary of State; Mr. Marvin Watson, the President's close associate and assistant in the White House; and the Rev. Dr. George R. Davis, pastor of the National City Christian Church, which President Johnson attended while in Washington.

These and other tributes and editorials on his passing were moving and beautiful. I should like to take this opportunity of adding my own tribute to this great man and close friend who served the Nation so faithfully and well—both in the Congress and in the White House.

Certainly I was shocked and saddened by the news of the passing of Lyndon B. Johnson. He was my personal friend and I felt extremely close to him.

Lyndon Johnson had the greatest legislative record of any President I have known—legislation passed during his administration has been compared to the famous "90 days" of President Franklin Roosevelt's administration as he responded to the challenge of the depression.

Lyndon Johnson more than any man I have known understood the legislative processes of the Congress. He understood the committee system and the intricacies of congressional interaction—the work of Congress.

His legislative success was a compound of this knowledge, his awareness of the Nation's problems, and his determination to attack these problems with all the force he could muster with the aid of Congress.

Although it may appear fashionable in some quarters to cast aspersions on the Federal career service, President Johnson was a Federal career man and he worked with the departments and agencies of Government to achieve his goals and objectives.

He believed in education—and much landmark education legislation was enacted during his administration.

He believed in assuring the elderly of adequate medical care—and the medicare legislation he sponsored has provided this assurance as a matter of right to the poor and needy.

He believed in helping the "little man" directly—rather than in the "trickle-down theory"—and legislation which he

championed has increased the incomes of the working people throughout America.

He believed in assisting rural and urban areas in coping with their problems—and legislation to assist small towns, rural areas and metropolitan areas has provided much assistance throughout America.

President Johnson's list of legislative accomplishments defies definition and comparison.

He thought big—like the man he was and the State of Texas, the State of his origin. And he was a dynamo as he translated his thoughts and dreams into action and reality.

As the first southern President since the Civil War, he accomplished more to assure equal rights for all Americans than any President since Abraham Lincoln.

Lyndon Johnson had the common touch—a sensitivity for people. He loved people and identified with them. He wanted all Americans to share in the good life.

As he once remarked:

I believe every American has something to say and, under our system, a right to an audience.

I believe achievement of the full potential of our resources—physical and human—is the highest purpose of governmental policies next to the protection of those rights we regard as inalienable.

I recall that on one occasion during a campaign swing through Tennessee in 1964, on leaving the airport at Nashville, the President, rather than heading directly for the city, chose to detour to greet people who were crowded behind a fence, hoping to catch a glimpse of him.

I also recall that as we were returning to the airport after a hard day of campaigning, I pointed out an important constituent among the throngs along the highway. I suggested that he wave to this friend, but instead he ordered the driver to stop the car, then bounced out and went over to this constituent, shaking his hand and giving him a warm and enthusiastic greeting.

This was the personal style of campaigning that President Johnson loved and that was his trademark—and he made a lifelong friend and supporter of the man he stopped to greet.

While President Johnson was in office, I was invited to the White House frequently to participate in bill-signing ceremonies or for receptions, dinners and briefings.

Following his retirement from the Presidency, we corresponded on occasion and he obviously enjoyed maintaining his contacts with old friends in Congress.

Upon leaving the White House in January of 1969, he wrote to me a warm personal letter in which he said:

In this, my last week in office, I am stirred by memories of old battles—and old friends who stood at my side throughout them all.

You are one of those friends.

My admiration and affection for you will never diminish.

I thank you and I salute you.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I value and treasure this letter among my most prized mementos.

Although President Johnson, when he left the Presidency, had had a number of heart attacks—the first when he was majority leader of the Senate—we, his friends, had hoped that, with the burdens of the Presidency off his shoulders, he would live a long life in retirement.

He lived a full, rewarding life and his work had been completed. His achievements and accomplishments are now history. The Vietnam conflict which he worked to end is drawing to a close.

His administration will stand in history as a monument to social and domestic progress at home and to a strong defense of freedom abroad.

I was deeply saddened by the passing of this great friend, and my wife Ann joins me in expressing our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Johnson—Lady Bird—and other members of the family in their loss and bereavement.

Because of the high regard and respect of my colleagues and the American people for this great President, I place in the RECORD herewith copies of editorial eulogies from the Washington Post and Washington Star-News.

The editorial eulogies follow:

[From the Evening Star and the Washington Daily News, Jan. 23, 1973]

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

He was six-foot-three and everything about him—his ability, his high sense of national purpose, his towering rages—seemed somehow slightly larger than life. Now he is gone at the age of 64, the second former President to die within a month.

The very memory of Lyndon Baines Johnson, thrust into the presidency by an assassin's bullet, is so freighted with partisan feeling that it must remain for another generation of Americans, immunized by time from the contagion of emotion, to assess fairly the man and to judge impartially his presidency.

When that day comes, when the Vietnam conflict—like the Spanish Civil War which stirred the conscience of another generation—has become an issue to bring the flush of passion only to the cheeks of old men, we believe that the man from the Pedernales will be counted among this country's near-great presidents.

Historians will record that the first Southern president since Reconstruction engineered the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 (the first in more than 80 years), outlawing racial discrimination in public facilities, employment and union membership, and giving the attorney general new powers to enforce Negro voting rights and to step up the pace of school desegregation. They will remember that, while he committed large numbers of U.S. troops to a conflict on the Asian mainland, he kept us out of nuclear war. This and much else in the fields of civil rights, housing and health did Johnson, who was perhaps the most consummate politician in modern American history, make part and parcel of our children's heritage.

And yet, at the last, he failed—or believed himself to have failed—withdrawing himself from contention in the 1968 election, leaving the country and his party weary and divided.

The roots of that failure are manifold and difficult to trace. Was it, as he insisted, too close to Appomattox for the country as a whole to accept and appreciate a Southern president, to believe in his vision of "the

Great Society"? Was it inevitable, in a rising tide of bitterness and disaffection, that John F. Kennedy's successor should be struck down by the tumbling ruins of Camelot? Did he simply fail to gauge correctly the mood of the country when he vowed to nail that Vietnam coonskin to the wall? Was there some fatal and concealed flaw in his character which prevented him from dealing effectively with the burgeoning crisis of the races?

A little of each of these factors, perhaps, contributed to the downfall and bitterness of a man whose personality so vividly reflected the brashness, drive, optimism and acquisitiveness of his native state. Those good qualities and those defects which he brought to the presidency, in fact, may well have been the inevitable outgrowth of his state and regional heritage.

When time cools the passions of the moment, it will be remembered that he served his state and country, as congressman, senator, vice president and President for 31 consecutive years, and that if he did well by Lyndon Johnson, dying a multimillionaire, he also tried to do well (and often succeeded) by Texas and the United States.

To a certain extent, the measure of statesmen can be calculated by the passions they arouse among their contemporaries. Churchill and De Gaulle, for instance, were nothing if not controversial. In this respect, the hostility of his foes makes the big Texan look like tall timber indeed among the scrub growth which forested much of the political hills of America in our times.

Lyndon Johnson was a big man and a big President.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1973]

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

The public lifetime of Lyndon Baines Johnson spanned almost four decades. It was a period marked not just by the development of certain powerful currents in American thought, but also by an eventful reappraisal of where those currents had led. Thus, much which had been considered desirable, necessary and even holy in Mr. Johnson's political youth had fallen into disrepute by the time that he left office. "Internationalism" had come to be known as "interventionism" by many, its painful and costly effects haunting the nation in a seemingly unendable war. And the vital and generous impulses that had animated Mr. Johnson's commitment to domestic legislation from the New Deal through the Great Society had come to be seen by many as obsolete and outworn habits of mind which caused as many troubles as they cured. At the airport sendoff that January day in 1969, when Lyndon Johnson's somebound plane vanished into the clouds, his longtime friends and colleagues were left with more than an eerie feeling of the suddenness and totality with which power is relinquished in this country. The summary departure of this man who had been the larger-than-life center of ambition and authority in government for five years, also seemed symbolically to end a self-contained chapter in the nation's political development.

It was an era characterized both domestically and in foreign policy terms by an assumption of responsibility—national responsibility—for the welfare of the poor, the rights of the mistreated, the fairness of the way in which we distribute our wealth and the general well-being and stability of countries all over the world. Of Mr. Johnson's participation in all this—as a Congressman, Senator, Vice President and President—it must be said that his impact was so profound that there is hardly a case in which the nation was either blessed or victimized

by this particular 20th century passion for responsibility for which Lyndon Johnson himself was not largely responsible. Like indifferent lovers for fractious offspring, a nation can often take things for granted or seem only to notice when it has been wronged. The death of Mr. Johnson may serve momentarily to pull us back from these perspectives, to remind us that much which we now expect from our government and our society as a matter of course—black voting rights, care for our elderly and our ill—came to us very recently and largely by courtesy of Lyndon Johnson.

The simple, inescapable fact is that he cared—and that it showed. Being in all ways larger than life-sized, he cared about a lot of things: his own political fortunes, his image, and his place in history, for of course he was vain. But he was consistent; all of his appetites were kingsized. So he cared about people with the same enormous intensity. In fact, a fair case can be made that one set of appetites fed on the other; he struggled and wheedled and hammered and cajoled for political power because he yearned powerfully to do great and good things and that is what he wanted the power for.

This was at once the strength and the weakness of Lyndon Johnson, for while this tremendous force was more often than not irresistible over the years, both as Senate Majority Leader and President, it was, like everything about the man, very often excessive. It could bend the political process to his will, and to good effect. But it could also bear down too hard, so that the system cracked under his weight. A master at the instrumentality of events, he could use a Selma or an assassination 40 lever a civil rights law or a gun control bill through Congress. But he could also use a minor gunboat skirmish in the Gulf of Tonkin to produce a resolution from Congress giving overwhelming support to a war effort whose true nature was never revealed in terms which could be expected to prepare either the Congress or the public for the sacrifice that both would later be expected to accept.

Neither Lyndon Johnson's memory nor his place in history, we would hope, is going to turn entirely, or even primarily on the war that grew out of that resolution; for Vietnam there is blame enough for all concerned, over four administrations and a good number of Congresses. Confined and carried along by earlier commitments, counseled by the men recruited by his predecessors, unchecked by Congress, Mr. Johnson plunged on, oversteering, over-promising, over-hoping, over-reaching. But if his time in office marked the big Vietnam escalation, it also will be remembered for the fact that he, by implication and by painfully difficult decision, moved toward the end of his term to acknowledge a great miscalculation—widely shared in, let it be said—which is not something incumbent Presidents are given to doing. Reluctantly, grudgingly, but effectively, he turned the war effort around, abandoning "graduated response" as the method of choice, and bequeathed to his successor a greater opportunity than he himself inherited to move toward disengagement and a re-definition of the mission in realistic terms.

When Harry Truman died a few weeks ago at the age of 88, he died the beneficiary of a gift Lyndon Johnson was not to receive; 20 years had passed since the embattled and much maligned Mr. Truman had held office so that time and change and hindsight vastly altered the view people had of him. Mr. Johnson was never lucky in this regard. His each and every achievement from his Senate years on seemed to be followed or accompanied by some series of events that spoiled

the glory of the moment. Still, we do not share the notion, now being advanced (sometimes with bitterness) of how unfair it was that he rarely received the recognition he deserved in his lifetime for the good and also great things he did—or that the criticism of his handling of the war unfairly overshadowed all the rest. He would, we suspect, have a wryly humorous view of all this—much as he craved to be well-loved and well-remembered—because he was too shrewd, not to say cynical a student of human and political nature not to have been amused by these efforts by those who served him badly from time to time to revise the record in his (and their) favor. Lyndon Johnson must have known that he did not need to be helped into history.

A SLAP AT AGRICULTURE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the abiding frustrations of the American rural community rarely find voice, but in the face of continuing neglect by the administration more and more people are speaking out. The *Chariton Herald-Patriot* in its issue of January 11, reprinted an editorial from the *Davis County Republican* which gives an excellent digest of the situation confronting agriculture.

The article illustrates how drastically the American farmer is affected by anonymous high-level decisions. The average citizen is only indirectly touched through the general economic equilibrium. But because of the Government's ponderous power over market forces, the farmer is entirely dependent on the stroke of a Washington bureaucrat's pen.

This editorial deserves wider circulation than it has yet received, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

A SLAP AT AGRICULTURE

"Those rural people who supported President Richard Nixon in the November election must have at least a small sour taste in their mouth after the announcements of the last week."

"President Nixon, determined to cut \$250 million from the federal budget, has cut hard into federal programs that are designed to be of aid to rural areas."

"The first was the announcement that the 1973 Feed Grain program will be so designed that payments to farmers will be less than last year."

"Then came the announcement, four days after the action had been taken, that the Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP) had been dropped."

"This was followed shortly by the dropping of disaster loans to farmers in areas that have been declared disaster areas."

"And as the government shut down for the weekend, there came the announcement that the two percent REA loans to electric cooperatives and rural telephone systems had been dropped."

"The dropping of the REAP program and the REA loans in particular are damaging to Davis County. No disaster loan funds could also be damaging although they have not been necessary here in recent years. The change in the Feed Grain program may have mixed effects."

"Davis County farmers have used the REAP program and its forerunner, ACP, to good advantage over the years to build ponds, terraces and other conservation work that has been of benefit not only to farmers, but also urban residents. In recent years, there has been some activity and interest in using REAP funds to install pollution abatement practices—a major worry of our time."

"The damage of dropping REA loan funds is self-evident. Without them, electric cooperatives such as the Southern Iowa Electric Cooperative and rural telephone companies such as the Citizens Mutual Telephone Co. will have to turn to other financing or delay improvements. It's going to mean that rural area residents will have to settle for lesser service or higher rates."

"The reasoning in Washington seems to be that the farm economy has improved so much that rural people can now afford to do everything themselves. While the rural economy has improved, it's doubtful that it has much more than caught up with remaining portions of the economy and only after being depressed for some 20 years."

"Farmers deserve to have a better farm economy and deserve to reap the fruits of this better economy without having the federal government attempting to pull the rug out from under it."

"It's not that rural areas are against cutting the federal budget by \$250 million and holding down inflation, but it's a question of where our priorities lie."

"The federal budget is a massive document with thousands of areas that could be cut. There are undoubtedly areas where there is more waste and areas where less good is done than the farm oriented programs cut by the Nixon Administration."

"A rural resident can't help but question Nixon's priorities when such beneficial farm programs have been dropped as we continue to spend millions of dollars blasting North Vietnam or providing tax loopholes for millionaires or providing millions of dollars for special interests."

"President Nixon, who has glibly talked about improving the lot of the rural areas, has slapped us in the face. Let's hope Congress can muster the energy to slap him back."

ROB "BIG BROTHER"; HELP THE MINORITY

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the Committee on Internal Security has been subject to much abuse from Members of Congress and others who believe it ought to be abolished.

I do not intend to add to that abuse already suffered by the distinguished members of that committee, and its dedicated staff.

However, I do have a proposal to make.

I would like to suggest, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that the House should consider eliminating the Committee on Internal Security and using the funds allocated to it for more fruitful purposes.

Now, we are all aware that the committee likes to collect the names of people and compile files on them.

We all know that this has been a subject of great controversy, and is a major

reason that some opponents of the committee believe it should be abolished.

I do not like the idea of having spies right here in the House of Representatives, either. Not that I have anything to hide—I just think it is un-American.

According to a study made by a group seeking the abolishment of the Internal Security Committee, there were more than 50 employees of the committee as of last June 30.

The appropriation for operations and staff for the present fiscal year was \$1,095,000.

Of 17,230 bills introduced during the 92d Congress, 13 were referred to the House Internal Security Committee. Five of these were duplicate bills. Of the eight that remained, four were reported by the committee, and none cleared the House.

On the basis of the four reported bills, however, it would seem that, based on the total appropriation to the committee, some \$273,750 was spent by the taxpayers for the processing of each measure.

It seems to me that this is a rather high cost for such legislative endeavors—especially in view of the highly complex and comprehensive legislation that is processed by other legislative committees at far less cost per bill.

Therefore, I would like to propose that the committee be abolished and that the funds usually allocated to its functions be appropriated for the use of the minority staffs of other standing committees.

From my point of view, this would be a much more desirable situation, and would certainly add balance and efficiency to other committee staffs.

JAX STATERS "LIVE" COMMERCIAL

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected institutions of higher learning in the State of Alabama is Jacksonville State University, located in Jacksonville, Ala., a city with a population of some 7,000. From an institution with slightly over 100 students during World War II, Jacksonville State has grown by leaps and bounds and is now the third largest university in our State.

Until quite recently, fraternities and sororities were not allowed at the school, but since their introduction in 1968, they have taken an active part in promoting not only Jacksonville State University, but the city of Jacksonville.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, one of the fraternities—Delta Tau Delta—carried out an unusual activity which I feel should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. It shows, in my opinion, that Jacksonville State University does not have the stereotype image that many individuals have of our institutions of higher learning. These young people are not interested in the radical causes, drug abuse, and the takeover and destruction of buildings on campus.

I submit this article, written by Mr. Jack Hopper in the January 22 edition of the Birmingham News, for my colleagues' reading:

JAX STATERS "LIVE" COMMERCIAL
(By Jack Hopper)

JACKSONVILLE.—No doubt everyone has seen the television commercial about a group of young men and women grabbing paint brushes and helping the elderly lady facelift her house.

The idea struck home some young men who belong to Delta Tau Delta Fraternity at Jacksonville State University as being a great way to help some person unable to help himself and today Mrs. Bama Bryant, 78, of Jacksonville likes her home a lot better.

At first, the students and their "little sisters" just planned on painting Mrs. Bryant's home but they found more than they bargained for in the 64-year-old home.

The students found many rotten beams which almost fell apart at the movement of a paint scraper. Then they found a sunken front porch, full of rotten planks, plus one entire side of the house carpeted with black and green fungus.

DRAMATIC MOMENTS

So they went to work and found several business firms to donate the materials and "face-lifted" the house.

It wasn't without its dramatic moments. The largest problem—in addition to the work—was staying away from a colony of bees which they found on the premises. No one knows how many bees were around but they gathered nearly 50 gallons of honey from their hive.

In two days the students repainted the house, reworked the windows, rebuilt the porch, repaired portions of the roof and sealed off the screen back porch.

AWAY, IN HOSPITAL

All this work was done while Mrs. Bryant was in the hospital recovering from a broken arm and dislocated shoulder.

You can imagine the feeling when she returned home.

"There are not enough words in the English language to express my appreciation," she told the students. "So I'll just thank you from the bottom of my heart."

One of the students working on the home was Mike McMurry, who was a carpenter in the Navy before returning to Jax State as a student. "The house had to be repaired. In its former condition, it probably would have fallen down in a few years."

Mrs. Bryant is happy, the students are happy they contributed something worthwhile to someone in need and everyone in Jacksonville is proud of the project undertaken by the college students.

RETRACTION OF COSPONSORSHIP

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the possibility of cosponsoring legislation creating a standing committee on the environment I had indicated to my legislative assistant that I would prefer to be on a select committee for this purpose. Through error, Congressman DON BROTMAN's office was apprised that I would cosponsor his bill creating the standing committee. I, therefore, would like to state that I withdraw

my name from cosponsorship of House Resolution 140.

While I feel that the study of the environment is one of the major issues confronting Congress today, I do not want to take away the jurisdiction of the various committees which create legislation pertaining to the subject. This is, of course, what a standing committee would do.

A select committee would be preferable, in that it could conduct continuing and comprehensive review of the interrelationship between environmental and technological changes and effects on population, communities and industries. The select committee could also study methods of using all practicable means to foster, promote and maintain harmony between man and nature and fulfill the future and present economic, social and other needs of man; but, the select committee would not receive or report legislative measures. And in so doing, would not take away environmental jurisdiction from the various committees.

BID FOR ALL-AMERICA

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have previously commented on the fact that Pensacola, in Florida's First District, is among the finalists for All-America City award. The Pensacola Journal of Saturday, December 16, commented at length on its editorial page about the quality and importance of work being done in Pensacola by citizen groups. This newspaper has been a leader in promoting sound programs and constructive issues for Pensacola and for northwest Florida. I take pleasure in submitting the Journal's fine summation for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

**BID FOR ALL-AMERICA FROM PENSACOLA,
HOPE FOR THE FUTURE**

It is the spirit of our community which prompted our citizens to take action at a crucial time to save our most precious natural resource—43 miles of snow-white beaches. We have now dedicated these beaches to America for all posterity.

It is the spirit of our community which has provided a centralized welfare referral service for our needy citizens and devised a unique method of funding needed programs.

It is the spirit of our community which has helped our citizens to capture the real meaning of the 200th birthday of our country. We have resolved to commemorate the American Revolution Bicentennial in 1976 by achieving goals in a program set for ourselves after thousands of hours of citizen effort involving a complete cross-section of the entire community.

These three projects have brought us to Minneapolis. They are representative of a community spirit and attitude stemming at least in part from our heritage.

First settled in 1559 by the Spaniards, Pensacolians have also served under the colors of France, England and the Confederacy. The United States flag was first raised over Florida in Pensacola by Andrew Jackson in 1821. From those early days we have grown to become northwest Florida's center for commerce, manufacturing, agriculture, and

education. We are blessed with an outstanding junior college and an innovative upper level university. Originally we were the birthplace of naval aviation; now we serve as headquarters for all naval training—land, sea and air.

Our heritage has prompted the citizens to preserve the historic treasures in the community. The same spirit has sent an 80-bed hospital to Ecuador, has helped rebuild Pensacola's sister city, Chimbote, Peru, after an earthquake, has dispatched a group of young people to the Dominican Republic to immunize against disease, has financed a student delegation to Paris to petition the North Vietnamese for release of America's war prisoners. It is the same spirit exemplified when fifty thousand citizens gather annually for a historic "Evening in Old Seville Square."

But let there be no misunderstanding about this. When you visit us, you will not find Utopia. You will find some poor housing; you will read of drug arrests in the newspaper; you will hear of pollution which has invaded some of our air and water. We are neither perfect nor immune to problems. But you will also find that we are working hard to overcome these problems through active citizen participation.

Let me describe to you briefly our three chief projects: The Gulf Islands National Seashore, Community Central Services and Action '76.

First, the seashore. What could we as citizens do to save the beaches? We sensed the possibility that the virgin beaches might not always be there. The natural shorelines of America are disappearing in concrete and neon, amidst tin cans and paper bags, under shacks and bulldozers. We needed action to convince elected officials to preserve the beach.

A committee of far-sighted citizens and the newspaper rallied us to action. A small band of hardy citizens walked the streets with petitions in hand. Twenty-three thousand citizens signed these petitions to obtain from the County Commissioners a vote as to the future destiny of the beaches. By a margin of two to one we voted to commit forever a major share of our beaches to the new Gulf Islands National Seashore. In May of this year the Seashore became a reality, and the beaches will remain much as they were when the Spaniards waded ashore four hundred years ago.

What is most important is that because of citizens intervention forty-three miles of the world's whitest beaches have been spared for all America to enjoy forever.

Second, Community Central Services. In addition to taking action to save the beaches, we also wanted to take citizen action to help people in distress or need; and so task forces of private individuals were formed to review the entire Welfare Program.

You might ask what is unique about these efforts to help the poor and the sick and the elderly? For one thing, we have now cut out much of the red tape. We have made it easier for people with problems to get help and to get help from the right people at the right time and the right place. Through the Community Planning Division of United Way, we have established an Information and Referral Service so that people in need can receive accurate information from just one central office about the proper place to go for help. There is no more passing the buck or begging from agency to agency.

We have also established a nonprofit private corporation, The Community Central Services Corporation, to receive federal funds which have helped to establish active day care centers as well as to fund the Central Information and Referral Services Office. In addition to federal funds, this corporation also gathers local, state and private funds for the benefit of the deprived.

The Citizens Action Task Forces and the

non-profit corporation have also provided funds for transportation services for the poor and the elderly and assisted in programs for the young in depressed areas of our community.

Finally, Action '76. We have been suffering from growing pains. The city has burst into the county. Good plans have been lying dormant. At the polls we defeated annexation, government reorganization, school bonds, zoning and a juvenile detention facility. The time had come to take stock of ourselves and regroup for action. How could we harness the good will, but conflicting aims, of our people into a consensus blueprint for progress? What did we, as citizens, really want for the community?

Heartened by the success of our citizen action to save the beaches and to aid the poor and less fortunate, we rolled up our sleeves and went to work. Beginning with a small committee of our fellow citizens, we launched a massive community goals program which we call Action '76 and which has become the model for all Florida. Ten task forces composed of more than 250 people from all walks of life sat down together and wrote the community goals; they also assigned specific responsibilities to the proper public or private agencies. Fifteen thousand copies of the tentative goals were distributed throughout the community and reviewed and revised by fifty civic and community organizations. The newspaper published the goals in their entirety. We explained them in detail in public hearings and invited discussions and suggestions and criticisms from everyone. In May of this year the revised goals were published, and we put the community stamp of approval on Action '76.

We have only begun to see the results, but already we have our first mini-park for children built by the Jaycees under the leadership of a young Navy lieutenant. We are planning for the new Government Complex, including a cultural center; and we are again working for a new juvenile detention facility.

We have started a county-wide recreation program, and we are mobilizing citizens' advisory councils in our public schools. Many political candidates ran for office supporting the goals of Action '76. Because the goals program has been successful, we have been chosen as the pilot community for the American Revolution Bicentennial Celebration in Florida.

In summary, we believe that these three programs, the National Seashore, Community Central Services, and Action '76, demonstrate the action spirit of the community. We are making visible progress. Private capital is joining with public capital. The young people are participating. Elected officials are working together in harness as never before, and we are very much excited and encouraged. We are told that Mahatma Gandhi once said, "There go the people; and I must follow, for I am their leader." Our elected officials need citizen leadership and citizen support, and they shall have it because we have a new spirit of '76 which will lead us on an enlightened path into the third century of American history.

A NATIONAL YOUTH ART MONTH

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1961, a very exciting and worthy annual project began in my State of Wyoming. It was called Children's Art Month and its purpose

was to "gain understanding of the true importance of art education and public support for quality school art programs by way of emphasizing the value of participating art for the development of all children."

After a decade of sustained interest and success, the program was extended to include teenagers, and was renamed "Youth Art Month."

Youth Art Month is still continuing in Wyoming. It has been an ideal way to recognize the work of our children, and to instill a sense of pride in their creations. Youth Art Month has also been successful in creating a cooperative community spirit with children, families, schools, clubs, business, and government officials all lending a hand in the organization, display, and publicity of the event.

I now propose a National Youth Art Month to be designated annually by the President. This legislation has the support of the National Art Education Association and the Crayon, Watercolor, and Craft Institute, Inc.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that Congress will see fit to pass this joint resolution with haste, so that we may begin a national recognition of school art programs in 1973.

EARTHQUAKE IN NICARAGUA

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent terrible tragedy caused by the earthquake in Managua, Nicaragua, raised great concern in this country, as in all nations of the world, for the victims of that tragedy. This concern was demonstrated, as always in such cases, to aid those made homeless and hungry by the disaster.

While concern for the present plight of the citizens of Nicaragua was uppermost in the minds of most Americans, concern for the future was also felt by some knowledgeable individuals who are perturbed over rebuilding plans made known by the Nicaraguan Government. This concern is heightened by the fact that external financial assistance, much of it provided by U.S. taxpayers, will be necessary for such rebuilding. To the extent of this financial involvement, therefore, the citizens of this country have an interest in rebuilding plans.

I would like to call to the attention of the House the views of Mr. Greer W. Ferver, an engineer who has just returned from Nicaragua. Mr. Ferver's letter is as follows:

FERVER ENGINEERING CO.,
San Diego, Calif., January 16, 1973.
Congressman LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VAN: I have just returned from an eight day stay in Managua, Nicaragua, where I was a member of an investigating team for the American Iron and Steel Institute. On my way home, and after returning, I was dismayed to read reports that General Somoza plans to rebuild the city on the same site.

This city has been already destroyed three times—in 1885, 1931 and now in 1972. It has three active faults running directly through it and a major active fault a few kilometers away to the west. It will suffer from more earthquakes in the future. More lives will be lost and more economic loss sustained.

I believe that Nicaragua's economy will not support the cost of reconstruction without external financial assistance, much of it provided by U.S. taxpayers. This should give the U.S. some say as to where and how Managua is to be rebuilt.

In my opinion, it would be most unwise to rebuild on the same site, even though that action may present short range cost savings. Also, in the age of automobiles, it would be foolish to follow the old pattern of narrow streets, small blocks, and 100% lot coverage.

Another problem that exists in Managua is that there is no building code, no prequalification of architects and engineers, and no prequalification of contractors. The very few architects and engineers we met who would be considered competent in the U.S. unfortunately have no special training in seismic design. Without assistance from properly qualified foreign professionals, there is no assurance that a reasonably safe city will be built.

I don't know what can be done to influence Somoza's thinking, but if Congress can take any action, I certainly hope they do so.

Sincerely,

GREER W. FERVER.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL TENNIS FEDERATION

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to offer my congratulations and recognition to the Women's International Tennis Federation. This organization is composed of the world's leading women tennis professionals.

Among the members are Billie Jean King, the 1972 winner of Wimbledon, Forest Hills, and the French championships; Margaret Court of Australia, a three-time winner of Wimbledon and a five-time winner of Forest Hills; Francoise Durr, the No. 1 in France; Betty Stove, the No. 1 in the Netherlands; Nancy Richey Gunter of Texas, four times ranked No. 1 in the United States; U.S. Wightman Cup players Val Ziegenfuss and Wendy Overton; Australian Federation Club players Kerry Melville, Helen Gourlay, Karen Krantzcke, and Leslie Hunt; June M. Heldman of Texas, twice No. 2 in the United States; British Wightman Club player Corinne Molesworth; Rosie Casals of California, four times winner of the Wimbledon doubles and twice winner of the U.S. doubles; Rhodesia's Salli Hudson-Beck, South Africa's Brenda Kirk and Laura Rossouw, Brazil's Lee Connelly, Canada's Vicki Berner, Sweden's Madeleine Pegal and a total of 18 women who currently hold U.S. national rankings.

The Women's International Tennis Federation incorporates all the members of the World Tennis magazine women's pro tour. This latter organization was formed in Houston in September of 1970

by World Tennis Publisher and Editor, Gladys M. Heldman. The first tournament had prize money of \$7,500. At that time, it was the largest prize money ever offered to an all-women's group of tennis players. Since then it has developed an 18-tournament women's circuit, and in October of 1972 staged the \$100,000 Virginia Slims championships at Boca Raton, Fla. Because the women pros stuck together, it became relatively easy to establish large prize money events. As a result, in 1971 Billie Jean King became the first woman athlete to earn more than \$100,000 in prize money in the course of a year. In 1972 she again duplicated this achievement.

The aim of the World Tennis women's pro tour and its successor, the Women's International Tennis Federation, has not only been to establish a good prize money circuit for outstanding tennis champions but also to develop the future champs. It has helped a dozen young players financially so that they could afford to play tournaments, and many of the young qualifiers are now in the championship group. WITF is also assisting the American Tennis Association—an organization of black tennis players—by adding a minimum of three more black youngsters felt to have great potential.

The Women's International Tennis Federation is open to all qualified women tennis players regardless of nationality, race, color, or creed. In addition to the outstanding group of champions in WITF, there are 28 young qualifiers who will be given the opportunity to compete in tournaments and who are also eligible to receive financial help.

WITF is a self-supporting group that does not seek contributions. It provides a women's pro circuit that has been outstandingly successful, and tournaments regularly play to sell-out crowds. Each of the members receive the benefits of a rich prize money circuit but also contribute by giving free clinics to children at least once a week during the tournament season. WITF has also eliminated appearance money and guarantees, and so every member of the group plays for prize money only.

Dr. Clyde Freeman, president of the American Tennis Association, has credited WITF with doing more for tennis players in general and ATA players in particular than any other tennis group in the world.

A REMEMBRANCE OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation moves toward the bicentennial celebration of its freedom and self-government, we may easily be distracted from the continuing, centuries-long struggle of another nation to determine its own future. As painful as our own fight for nationhood was, the right to individual expression and self-

government has not come as easily to the people of the Ukraine. The Ukrainian nation has waged several such campaigns for independence through the centuries, yet dedicated and visionary Ukrainians still work for the day when their country will be free from outside domination.

Congress' tribute to the last great patriotic struggle of the Ukrainian people, culminating in the proclamation of national independence on January 22, 1918, is, as well, a tribute to the sturdiness and bravery of those of Ukrainian descent who will not give up the fight. We also gather to appreciate the example of those freedom fighters, which has uplifted our own citizens; and to extol the good fortune which has brought Americans of Ukrainian descent to our shores.

Americans of Ukrainian descent were among the revered builders of our own republic, because they best understood the meaning and the practice of freedoms so long sought by the Ukrainian nation. We pray during this remembrance of Ukrainian independence day that the people of the Ukraine will soon be able to build their own independent government.

REQUIRE CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET AND HIS DEPUTY

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that would require confirmation by the Senate of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and his Deputy. These two positions are far too important not to require congressional confirmation of their appointments.

OMB has become possibly the most powerful office in the executive branch of the Government. The Director of Office of Management and Budget wields far greater power than the secretaries of Cabinet-level departments. Yet, he is appointed by and accountable to the President alone.

OMB is no longer a bookkeeping agency as it was when its predecessor, the Bureau of the Budget, was created in 1921. Under the present administration, it has become a principal policymaking agency of the Federal Government. OMB determines what programs will be funded, what programs will be cut, and what programs will be abolished.

Furthermore, no agency in the Government is permitted to give its recommendations on legislation to the Congress without first clearing them with the Office of Management and Budget. This procedure undoubtedly makes OMB one of the most powerful policymaking agencies in Washington. It is absolutely essential that Congress have some participation in the selection of the OMB Director and Deputy Director.

My bill is cosponsored by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the House Government Operations Committee and

is identical to a bill (S. 518) sponsored by Senator SAM ERVIN and all standing committee chairmen in the Senate. Senator ERVIN's bill passed the Senate Government Operations Committee on Friday, January 26, and is expected to come before the Senate soon.

My proposal and Senator ERVIN's bill would require confirmation of the present OMB Director, Roy Ash, and his Deputy, Frederick V. Malek.

If our constitutional form of government is to survive, we must restore some balance of power to the three branches of the Government. One of the first moves that should be taken is to require congressional participation in the appointment and confirmation of high-level Government executives.

The language of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective on the day after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Deputy Director of that Office (originally established by section 207 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and redesignated by section 102 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1970) shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and no individual shall hold either such position thirty days after that date unless he has been so appointed.

IMPOUNDMENT

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds or authorizes the impounding of appropriated funds and to provide that the President shall cease such impounding at the expiration of 60 calendar days unless the Congress shall approve his action by concurrent resolution.

Impoundment, the withholding of congressionally appropriated funds by the President, is not a new development. Presidents have impounded funds since the beginning of the Republic, but they have done so for reasons sanctioned by the Congress. For example, title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act empowers the President to withhold funds from federally assisted programs where he finds that the recipient of Federal money discriminates in employment on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Further, Congress has recognized the need for Executive discretion for the sound management of public funds and required by statute that the President set aside or "reserve" money "to provide for contingencies or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available."

Such a limited and circumscribed right of impoundment is far different in both quality and quantity than President

Nixon's recent use of impoundment to reject congressionally designated spending priorities for his own. Senator SAM ERVIN's Judiciary Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers conducted hearings in 1971 which revealed that President Nixon had impounded some \$12.7 billion simply because he disagreed with the purpose for which these funds were appropriated. Casper Weinberger, the former Director of the Office of Management and Budget estimated the present figure at \$11.5 to \$12 billion in recent testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

By substituting his judgment on spending priorities for that of the Congress, the President has violated the separation of powers principle and posed a serious threat to our system of government. Perhaps the most egregious effect of such impounding has been to give the President a power clearly denied him by the Constitution: an item veto. The Constitution does not permit the President to veto the portions of a bill that he dislikes; instead it limits his veto power to entire bills, with the Congress having the opportunity to override a veto by a two-thirds vote of both Houses. Moreover, such an exercise of Presidential impoundment is tantamount to usurping the Congress' clearly defined constitutional authority to determine spending priorities through the power of the purse.

The bill I am introducing today would not affect the discretion granted to the President by the Congress to effect economies in administering public funds. It would simply put an end to the unconstitutional and dangerous practice of permitting the President to be both Executive and legislator. It would require the President to notify each House of Congress by special message of every instance where he impounds funds or authorizes such impoundment by any officer of the United States. Such a special message would have to specify the amount of the impounded funds, the specific projects or governmental functions affected by the impoundment, and the reason for such impoundment.

The bill further provides that the President shall cease impounding the funds designated in each special message within 60 calendar days after the message is received by the Congress unless the specific impoundment shall have been ratified by Congress in accordance with a procedure set forth in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to take speedy action to restore its rightful role in this vital area.

AMNESTY MYTH

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that even before our POW/MIA's are returned support of Members of the body is being solicited for amnesty for

persons who fled their country rather than serve it during the Vietnam war, I think the following extract from a recent factsheet issued by POW-MIA International, Inc., is highly pertinent:

Myth: Granting amnesty to draft evaders and deserters after a war is a routine practice in the United States.

Fact: Granting a general amnesty has never been the practice or policy of the United States! No general amnesty, or pardon, was granted after WW I. Nearly all draft violators were put in jail. In 1924, President Coolidge granted partial amnesty to 100 men who had deserted after the Armistice. In 1933, President Roosevelt ordered pardon for 1,500 convicted draft dodgers and violators of the Espionage Act. After WW II, the idea of granting general amnesty to 15,000 convicted draft dodgers was turned down—instead, each case got an individual review and only about 1 in 10 subsequently won a pardon, NOT AMNESTY!! Amnesty and Pardon are two entirely different things:

Amnesty: Blot out one's offenses, wipe the slate clean, acquit, excuse, absolve, free from blame, the offense removed from the record.

Pardon: Forgiving an offense, but offense remains on the record.

Amnesty is granted to those who have committed an offense but are later found to be not guilty. Pardon is given to those who have committed an offense and later are forgiven for the offense they are guilty of having committed.

CAN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION WORK?

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, from the U.S. point of view we believe that the effectiveness of the Commission of Control and Supervision provided in the peace agreement is most important and at the same time most questionable. Questions arise as to the ability of the Commission to coordinate and cooperate in their joint efforts. It would seem to this observer that such cooperation and coordination rests on the pressure exerted by Russia to get the two eastern bloc participants to be serious and evenhanded in their assignment. The fact that each of the four teams can give separate reports will no doubt give us an early measure of the Commission's performance.

A second question arises on the ability of the originally constituted force, some 1,200, to adequately cover the complex of territory involved in a two-tier conflict in which part of the war was defined by a line of opposing military forces and a part was impossible of definition as it was an internal paramilitary operation involving most of the hamlets and villages spread across the entire country of South Vietnam.

A third question arises from the need for flexibility for adequate response and full mobility for a presence of the Commission in the many places where an activity in violation of the agreement might take place. Given the makeup of the Commission there is good reason to question whether in the first 60 days they could arrive at a cooperative and ener-

getic posture for the best utilization of the available resource agreeable to all four participants.

Finally, there is the question of responsibility of the Commission. In the early stage the Commission is to report to and be responsible to the four separate powers signatory to the agreement. To effectively work in consort for such divided interests is a challenge the size of which is mind boggling. Minister Mitchell Sharp, head of the Canadian contingency, stated last week that Canada felt the forces of the Commission should be responsible to and report to an international conference from the outset. He warned that Canadian participation continuance would depend "on whether we are effective."

President Thieu has questioned the effectiveness of the Commission in the harshest terms, calling it a "useless and helpless organization." We can only hope the fears of the Canadians and the charges of President Thieu are proven wrong.

Behind the machinery of the agreement what else enforces the pledges for Peace? The good will of the parties as stated by Kissinger or the threat of U.S. retaliation as suggested by President Thieu? May I respectfully suggest that one of the most significant parts of the peace and one area that should have our close attention is the action of the International Commission. I would predict it will need further attention and revision before it can accomplish the mission described for it in the peace agreement. As we have waited so long and paid so dearly for this peace agreement, I would hope it shall not fail for our refusing to acknowledge its weaknesses and the need to continue our efforts to resolve those weaknesses.

COMMUNISTS AND CAPITALISTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Field Marshall Tito and the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York met last week in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

This meeting came 8 days after Chief Justice Warren Earl Burger accepted the Order of the Yugoslav Flag, in Washington, D.C. Most Americans would accept this as sheer coincidence; however, the pattern is clear.

Meantime, Stokely Carmichael has reformed to nonviolence, urging his followers to "Build, baby, build" instead of "burn, baby, burn."

Communists the world over are "cooling it"—so long as they can get capitalist support. Who is fooling whom and for how long?

I include related newsclippings in the RECORD, as follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1973]

TITO, ROCKEFELLER MEET

BELGRADE, January 21.—President Tito and his wife received David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New

York, and his wife today and spent some time in "prolonged, friendly conversation," Tanjug, the official Yugoslav news agency reported from the island of Brioni.

VIOLENCE OUTDATED, CARMICHAEL SAYS
OAKLAND, CALIF., January 27.—Black activist Stokely Carmichael says the time for violent revolution has passed and now "we must be preoccupied with building, not destroying."

"In 1966, 1967, 1968, Stokely was yelling 'Go out and kill them,'" the former head of the Student NonViolent Coordinating Committee told a community college audience here. "In 1973, such a speech would be a waste of time and we would have missed the boat," Carmichael said.

**ALLIED VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF
McKEESPORT, PA., SELECTS
"WOMAN OF THE YEAR"**

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it has become traditional for the Allied Veterans Association of McKeesport, Pa., to annually select a "Woman of the Year" and publicly recognize her contributions to the community and its citizens.

This year, as in past years, the veterans chose a truly distinguished and gracious lady to receive the award—Mrs. Martha Mack Lewis.

Mrs. Lewis has been active in civic, social, and church endeavors all her life. Her interests and accomplishments appear endless; her dedication and involvement almost unbelievable. It is astounding how a single individual can devote so much time, energy, and talent to so many people, so many things.

Early in her career, Mrs. Lewis took an interest in McKeesport Hospital. She worked there for several years as a volunteer and her association with the institution has not waned with the passing of time. Today Mrs. Lewis serves the hospital as a member of its board of trustees.

She also was one of the original directors of the McKeesport Symphony Society when the organization was formed in 1959 and still holds that position today. In addition, Mrs. Lewis is chairman of the Americanization Committee for the Queen Alquippa chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution; a member of the McKeesport College Club, the McKeesport 20th Century Club, and once served 5 years as an associate chairman for the United Fund.

However, this remarkable woman does not confine her desire and talent to enrich the lives of people solely to the city of McKeesport. She devotes a great deal of time serving organizations in Allegheny County and the city of Pittsburgh. Among the groups she works with are the Visiting Nurses Association, the Pittsburgh Opera and Symphony Societies, and the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy and Humane Society.

At one time, Mrs. Lewis organized a Brownie Scout troop and served as its

leader. During World War II, she worked as a staff assistant for the Red Cross and as a substitute high school teacher. She sings with the choir at the First United Methodist Church but also doubles as its director and soprano soloist. And yet, despite her extensive interests and activities, she still manages to find time for her husband, Thomas J. Lewis, Jr., her family, and her home.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the McKeesport Allied Veterans Association, its president, Mr. Arthur Maund, its officers and men upon their selection of Mrs. Lewis as their 1972 "Woman of the Year." She is, in truth, an inspiration to those who know her and I am proud to serve as her Representative in the Congress of the United States.

**LEE HAMILTON'S JANUARY 29, 1973,
WASHINGTON REPORT ENTITLED
"INAUGURATION 1973"**

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my January 29, 1973, Washington Report entitled "Inauguration 1973."

INAUGURATION 1973

Inauguration day in the Nation's Capital is a strange mixture of solemn ceremony and exuberant celebration. It is a festival of democracy, a celebration of unity, and a time of national renewal. For those who take part, it is also a time of hectic personal schedules, massive crowds, and frustrating traffic jams.

While a number of my colleagues in the Congress boycotted the ceremonies, I did not. In the rhythm of our national life, a new administration marks a resurgence of hope and a renewal of energy. So many divisions and differences exist in the nation, forces which pull us apart, that these inaugural observances are needed. An inauguration is a time to begin fresh and to strengthen our confidence in our institutions. We need to be reminded that, although our problems are mountainous, so are the talents and resources we can bring to bear to meet them.

Although the President is chosen through a party system, and stands pledged to the principles of that party, he nevertheless is President of all Americans. The inauguration ceremony symbolizes the essential, underlying unity the nation requires to endure.

The swearing-in ceremonies and the President's inaugural address are the most important events of inauguration day. President Nixon took only a minute to recite the 35-word oath of office, making him the 37th President of the United States, and at that time he became one of only 12 men in our history who have more than once been elected President.

His second inaugural address stressed reliance on self-help, the disengagement of government, and a limited American involvement abroad. His address, which was thoroughly conservative in philosophy and orientation, made no bows to the liberals, and was clearly directed to the constituency which had elected him.

The festivities surrounding this brief ceremony include about four days of parties, ex-

hibits, entertainment extravaganzas, receptions and dances preceding the inaugural, a parade, inaugural balls with as many as 25 musical groups, and a Sunday worship service following the event.

Those who come to Washington for the festivities find them to be expensive affairs. Tickets for all of the events easily total \$500. Boxes (and breathing room) at the inaugural balls cost \$1,000. Tickets to the inaugural parade range from \$5 to \$50. A souvenir of the occasion can range from \$1.25 for a gold plate, to a dollar or so for a pennant or a lapel button.

There is, however, surprisingly little grumbling, either about the cost or the crush at the affairs. The five inaugural balls staged this year were not so much dances as wall-to-wall humanity—stifling, confusing and loud. At one reception, arranged to accommodate 1,500 persons comfortably, 15,000 showed up.

Celebrities are everywhere to be seen. Forty of the nation's governors were on hand, entertainers Bob Hope and Frank Sinatra, Miss America, prominent Members of Congress, Cabinet members, and, of course, the super-celebrities, an ebullient President and his family.

The inaugural parade was a "super-parade", with entries from practically every state marching by in a two-hour procession which included the largest-ever marching band—nearly 2,000 musicians in a single unit. About 300,000 persons lined Pennsylvania Avenue to watch, enduring 30-degree temperatures and a biting, 25-mile-an-hour wind.

There were protestors, too, and they staged their own inaugural concert, which was attended by some 3,000 who could fit in the stately National Cathedral, and 12,000 who listened outside to a program of music directed by Leonard Bernstein. About 75,000 marched in their own anti-war inaugural parade from the Lincoln Memorial to the Washington Monument on inauguration day.

In all, the city handled the celebration with apparent ease. The police restrained the rambunctious crowds and the swearing-in ceremony and the parade came off on schedule. Within five minutes after the inaugural parade was over, street cleaners were hard at work. By Sunday morning, Pennsylvania Avenue was all cleaned up. The celebration was over and the hard tasks of running the government lay ahead.

**CONGRESSIONAL REFORM AND
MINORITY STAFFING**

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the winds of reform are blowing through the halls of Congress and I am pleased that due to a change in wind direction the other side of the aisle is now getting some ventilation. I am referring, of course, to the fact that the House Democratic caucus last week adopted the House Republican conference procedure for electing top committee members—a procedure House Republicans have followed for two Congresses now. I am delighted that our Democratic brethren have belatedly recognized the wisdom in following our lead in breaking the rigid seniority system. At the same time it is regrettable that another attempt to further follow our lead by electing the whip

failed in the Democratic caucus. In our own Republican conference we have been electing our whip for as long as I can remember. It is most unfortunate, I think that many press accounts of the great seniority breakthrough in the Democratic caucus make no mention of the fact that this is a 2-year-old House Republican reform, or that we have been electing our whip for 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, while the reform breezes are still stirring across the aisle, I think it would be a most appropriate time for the Democratic caucus to reverse itself on an anti-reform action it took 2 years ago last week. I am referring to the caucus decision requiring all its members to support deletion of the minority staffing provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 when the House rules were adopted in the 92d Congress on January 22, 1971.

Despite the fact that the provision for adequate minority staffing was offered as a bipartisan amendment on July 15, 1970, by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGLER), and despite the fact that it was adopted by the House on July 16 by a 105 to 63 teller vote, the Democrats came back 6 months later in the new 92d Congress, invoked the unit rule in caucus and thus bound their entire membership to an anti-reform position—striking the one-third minority staffing provision of the 1970 Reorganization Act. The crucial vote on that January day in 1971 was 226 to 156, adopting the rules without that provision—a vote that was strictly along party lines despite the bipartisan support that provision had received in the previous Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to restore that bipartisan reform spirit which was so evident during the adoption of amendments to the 1970 Reorganization Act, and a good place to start is on that minority staffing provision. Probably the most eminent authority in the Congress on the history of this body and the most eloquent spokesmen for reform is my good friend and Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING). In his 1964 book, "House Out of Order," he says the following about the need for adequate minority staffing:

Today, Members of the minority party properly complain that their party does not have an adequate staff on certain committees to develop sound legislative alternatives to the proposals of the majority party Members. Without the staff to frame alternative proposals, the minority cannot make its position clear on bills sponsored by the majority. Surely the discussion of alternatives is an important part of the democratic process, because it informs the public, compels a more careful and penetrating consideration of bills, and in my experience nearly always results in sounder legislation.

And again, in his 1968 book, "Power in the House," the gentleman from Missouri has this to say:

The imbalance in the staffing of committees impairs the ability of the minority to make proper policy choices. There should be adequate staff on the legislative committees for the use of members of the minority party, usually the Republicans. This is not generally now the situation. . . . The minority party is slighted. Its busy members do not

have available, at the committee level, adequate numbers of professionally trained people who share the same angle of political vision. Policy is made, in large part, on political differences. Real policy differences require sound information.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not think a member of my own minority party could have made a more persuasive case for adequate minority committee staffing, and I hope my friend from Missouri and his Democratic colleagues will join us on this side of the aisle in reinstating the one-third provision of the 1970 Reorganization Act.

This minority staffing provision has the strong support of Common Cause Chairman John Gardner. In his testimony of December 5, 1972, before the Senate ad hoc hearings on congressional reorganization, he had this to say about minority staffing:

The ability of the Congress to hear and consider both sides of controversial issues is limited by insufficient staff resources for the minority party. Admittedly this appears to be more of a problem in the House than the Senate. It would be fair and prudent to implement the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and assure adequate minority party staffing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Common Cause will push this reform as vigorously as it is other reforms, for it is just as important, in my mind, if we are genuinely interested in making the Congress a co-equal branch of Government.

For these reasons I am today joining with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) in reintroducing our amendment to rule XI of the House. This new clause 32(c) reads as follows:

The minority on any such standing committee is entitled, upon request of a majority of such minority, to up to one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to each primary or additional expenditure resolution.

EDITORIALS ON THE LIFE AND TIMES OF PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the period proclaimed by President Nixon as a time of mourning for our 33d President has just expired. Notwithstanding I take this occasion to remind Members that the other body of the Congress will eulogize President Truman on or about February 6.

I mention the foregoing simply to remind my colleagues in the House that there will be a joint resolution introduced in both the House and the Senate which will authorize the preparation of a bound volume to contain all of the remarks on the passing of Mr. Truman made on the floor and all extraneous matter, including editorials, which have been or will be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. All of these will be included as a part of the bound volume contemplated by the provisions of the joint resolution

directed to the Joint Committee on Printing.

It is my understanding that under present expectations this volume will not be assembled prior to May 1. Those Members desiring to do so many revise and extend their own remarks and with unanimous consent include extraneous matter pertaining to the life of former President Truman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three editorials from three great newspapers which have not been included in the RECORD. These three deserve to be included along with the collection of eulogies and tributes paid to our great 33d President. I refer to the editorial from the Washington Post of December 27, 1972; the editorial from the Evening Star & Daily News under date of December 27, 1972, and then to the editorial in the New York Times of December 31, 1972, by Cabell Phillips, who for 20 years was the head of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times during the Truman years. You may recall Mr. Phillips was the author of the book, "The Truman Presidency," which he described as "the history of a triumphant succession."

Mr. Speaker, I would feel remiss if by my negligence these three editorials should be omitted from the record of comments on the life of President Truman. They are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 27, 1972]

HARRY S. TRUMAN

A few minutes after Harry S. Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States—when, as he put it, he "felt like the moon, the stars, and all the planets had fallen on me"—he was asked if the San Francisco Conference on the United Nations would meet, as had been planned. "I did not hesitate a second," he recalled in his memoirs. "There was no question in my mind that the conference had to take place." Within hours, he was dealing as an equal with Winston Churchill and Josef Stalin.

There were not many who were prepared to say in that dark hour that Harry Truman was equal to the appalling burden put upon him. The members of the Roosevelt Cabinet tended to feel that they would have to take him under their tutelage; they were considerate but patronizing. He very quickly replaced them. He had no very exalted opinion of himself; but he had great self-respect. Acknowledging that no one was "big enough" to be President of the United States in the crucial years of a great world war, he nevertheless felt himself to be about as big as the next fellow. What he had to do, he would do to the best of his ability.

Diffidence and doughtiness, humility and self-confidence, vulgarity and grandeur were mingled in this solid, unpretentious man, a seemingly typical product of small-town politics in middle America. He was an able and conscientious senator, although by no means one of the towering figures of Congress. He was a man for whom—and probably to whom—the Vice Presidency seemed the very summit of legitimate aspiration. Yet when immeasurable responsibility was suddenly thrust upon him against his honest wish and will, he found within himself the resources to meet the task honorably and, indeed, greatly.

"Some scholars of American history with whom I talk from time to time are of the opinion," he wrote years later, "that it is history that makes the man. I am inclined to differ. I think that it is the man who makes history. I find that throughout our own history the greatest strides occur when courageous and gifted leaders either seize the opportunity or create it."

It may well be that both views are true. In any case, Harry Truman lacked neither opportunities nor the courage to seize them. Perhaps the greatest single decision of modern times was made by him very early in his Presidency—the decision to use the atomic bomb in the war against Japan. “The final decision of where and when to use the atomic bomb was up to me,” Mr. Truman recalled with characteristic simplicity. “Let there be no mistake about it. I regarded the bomb as a military weapon and never had any doubt that it should be used. The top military advisers to the President recommended its use, and when I talked to Churchill he unhesitatingly told me that he favored the use of the atomic bomb if it might aid to end the war.”

For good or for evil, a new dimension was added to the world. For the salvation or the destruction of mankind, a new force was created. Years of experience with the ineradicable threat of atomic war, years of reflection on the moral implications of employing so terrible a weapon, may lead to a judgment that Harry Truman was wrong. But let those who make that judgment ponder his straightforward justification for what he did: “General Marshall told me that it might cost half a million American lives to force the enemy's surrender on his home grounds.” And, conversely, let those who applaud his decision ponder what foreshadows for any future war.

Harry Truman made another decision inexpressibly more life-giving and perhaps almost as momentous in its way—the decision to commit the immense resources, strength and skill of the American people to the reconstruction of Europe at the end of the war. The Marshall Plan, formulated and implemented under his leadership, represented what may well be considered the most enlightened piece of national generosity in all history. Indeed, American aid went generously to the vanquished as well as to the victories. In Mr. Truman's own estimation, “The Marshall Plan will go down in history as one of America's greatest contributions to the peace of the world. I think the world now realizes that without the Marshall Plan it would have been difficult for Western Europe to remain free from the tyranny of communism.”

To arrest “the tyranny of communism,” President Truman took the country into a considerable and troublesome war of his own—the war in Korea. The swift American response to the North Korean invasion of South Korea afforded a fresh illustration of the President's decisiveness and toughness in the conduct of his office. And in the course of the war he gave a democratic demonstration that as President he was also indubitably Commander in Chief of the nation's armed forces when he summarily removed Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his post in the Pacific.

Harry Truman was a pragmatist and a politician. He preferred the specific gain to the idealistic goal. And he understood with unblurred realism that specific gains in American political affairs are achieved by leadership which embraces not only an imaginative appeal to the aspirations of a free people but also the crasser arts of political influence, pressure and manipulation. He was in constant conflict with Congress. “When a President does not have a fight or two with Congress, you know there is something wrong,” he wrote. “A man with thin skin has no business being President.”

His fiercest political controversy centered in the cult of loyalty that developed in the late 1940s and reached its culmination in obsessive attacks upon Government employees, especially in the State Department, by Senators McCarthy, McCarran and Jenner. There was a passionate commitment in Harry Truman to the principles of the Bill of Rights

and to the concept of individual liberty. The tactics of what came to be called McCarthyism were abhorrent to him, and he was unreserved in his condemnation of them. Unfortunately, however, in his zeal to protect Government employees from the brutal assaults of McCarthyism, he established the Federal Employee Loyalty-Security Program—a pernicious process, still in full effect, which bases the determination of an employee's trustworthiness on accusations made by informers unknown either to the accused employee or to his judges.

Despite this grievous lapse into the fundamental error of McCarthyism, Harry Truman was otherwise a stalwart champion of principle he enunciated in simple terms: “In a free country, we punish men for the crimes they commit, but never for the opinions they have.” Nothing in his official career rounded more greatly to his glory than his veto in 1950 of the Internal Security Act which established the Subversive Activities Control Board. In the hysteria of the time, the bill was passed over his veto within 24 hours. But he gave assertion, nevertheless, to a reassuring faith in his fellow Americans and in their fealty to the principles of political liberty.

His faith in the American people found reciprocity. In 1948, he sought election to the Presidency in his own right. Although it was not widely supposed that he could win, he campaigned with a verve, ebullience and indomitable determination that led him to victory. It may be that the American people saw in him an embodiment of their image of themselves—an exemplification of their own rooted virtues and values. There were qualities about Harry Truman now often referred to as old-fashioned—his rather simple morality, his devotion to his family, his uncritical loyalty to his country, to his party, to past political associates who had been loyal to him, his capacity, on occasion, for intemperate and injudicious indignation, his earthiness—qualities that stamped him a common man yet a man capable, as other common men are capable, of ascent to the heights of heroism. Harry Truman showed his countrymen what they were made of and what they could become.

[From the Evening Star and The Washington Daily News, Dec. 27, 1972]

THE MAN FROM INDEPENDENCE

Harry S. Truman may not have been much shucks as a Kansas City haberdasher but he was a mighty fine President. When he came to the presidency through the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1945, the world was engulfed in World War II. Mr. Truman, whose ten years in the Senate had been unremarkable, showed no signs of being a man of destiny.

But Harry Truman grew into the job, handling the big and difficult decisions with determination and tenacity. He made the decision to drop two atomic bombs on Japan, a move which he always maintained, perhaps correctly, saved many thousands of lives—American and Japanese—by making an invasion unnecessary.

He launched with his secretary of state the Marshall Plan to rebuild a prostrate Europe. He played a leading role in the formation of both the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He promulgated the Truman Doctrine, which certainly saved Greece from communism and helped other nations to maintain their independence.

When the North Koreans invaded South Korea, he did not hesitate to commit American troops to the defense of that small nation. When the Russians sought to starve the Allies out of West Berlin, he ordered the airlift which resulted in a stunning diplomatic defeat for the Kremlin, reasserting the U.S. commitment to defend Europe.

Harry Truman's greatest quality, and the one which so well served his nation, was his courage in the face of adversity. Once he had decided on a course of action, he stuck to it, fighting doggedly, openly and persistently until he achieved his goal. Even his intense personal loyalty, which sometimes degenerated into cronyism, had about it an epic quality.

President Truman never lost the common touch, whether he was belting out a few bars of the Missouri Waltz or writing to a music critic so indiscreet as to cast aspersions on his daughter's virtues as a vocalist. It was easy for other Americans to identify with him, to believe in him, because he always seemed to know exactly what he wanted to do and how he wanted to do it. And that wasn't just the way he acted; that was the way he was.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 31, 1972]

A MAN WHO “DONE HIS DAMNEDST” (1884-1972)

(By Cabell Phillips)

On the day after Franklin Roosevelt's death in April 1945, the shaken new President, Harry Truman, said to a group of reporters, “If you fellows know how to pray, pray for me now.” The plea was typical of the plainspoken, essentially modest man who occupied the White House during eight tumultuous years in the nation's history, and who died last week in Kansas City at the age of 88.

Harry Truman worked less to ingratiate himself with people but succeeded better at it than any important public figure I have ever known. He did it, I think, because he was so utterly honest with and about himself, so free of what we call “side” or “put on.”

He wasn't above cutting a corner or trimming the truth to gain a political or policy objective. He would go to almost any lengths to save the face of a friend. But neither as a public nor a private figure did he ever pretend to be anything but what he was, and it mattered precious little to him whether anyone liked what he was or not.

What he was grated unpleasantly on some sensitive nerves—his brashness, his minor crudities of speech and manner, the fact that he did not adorn the great office of President with what they considered the requisite style and grace. He was the sort who synthesized the awesome responsibilities of his office not in resonant phrases that would look good in bronze, but with a simple homespun aphorism: Tapping his desk and looking solemn as a preacher he would say, “The buck stops here.”

There was eloquence and deep sincerity in the way he said it that made anything you might add redundant.

I once wrote a book about Mr. Truman, and something I said then is relevant in this context: “Harry Truman was and remains an ordinary man . . . who must make do without any special endowments of genius, intellect or charm. His strength lay in his ability to do the best he could with what he had and not despair over what he did not have. . . . He never suffered the illusion that he was another Roosevelt or Churchill, neither did he agonize over whether he was their inferior. Destiny linked his life to theirs in an apocalyptic enterprise and each rode it out to greatness according to his own fashion.”

The most cynical and skeptical audience a President has to face is the Washington press corps. There is a congenital distrust between them, a built-in competitiveness that more often than not degenerates into mutual hostility.

No President of the last 50 years was so widely and warmly liked by the reporters as Mr. Truman. He “used” the press occasionally as most Presidents have done to test the

wind. But he never tried to "con" them with flattery and devious favoritism. He was reasonably accessible to reporters, enjoyed having them along on trips and liked to play practical jokes on them or take them for their expense accounts in after-hours poker sessions.

They felt that he leveled with them. On his frequent visits to Washington after 1952, as many reporters as politicians dropped into his suite at the Mayflower on an afternoon for a friendly chat and a toast of "bourbon and branch."

Since Mr. Truman never constructed any false images of himself, he enjoyed a large dividend of self-confidence. Call it cockiness: that was its outer manifestation much of the time. Whatever it was, it gave him an immense capacity for making up his mind to do what had to be done and then putting it behind him—whether it was a bit of legislative strategy, or the dropping of the atom bomb. Many people think this was one of his strongest attributes as President.

I ran into an example of this quality in 1959. I went to Independence to write an article about him on the approach of his 75th birthday. Routinely, I asked him to recall the half dozen most difficult decisions he had had to make as President. When he finished, I remarked that he had failed to mention the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur during the Korean war. "That must have taken a bit of courage," I said.

Courage had nothing to do with it," he snapped, his eyes flashing through the thick glasses. "He was insubordinate and I fired him, and that's all there was to it. Sure, I knew there would be a lot of stink about it. But it was the right thing to do and I did it, and I've never lost any sleep over it since."

Did those qualities add up to greatness? Was Harry Truman a "great" President? There is no firm definition of the term, but many competent scholars have given him that accolade. The late Prof. Clinton Rossiter, of Cornell, said of him some years ago: "I am ready to hazard an opinion, to which I did not come easily or lightly, that Harry Truman will eventually win a place as President, if not as a hero, alongside Jefferson and Theodore Roosevelt."

One measure of greatness, certainly, is the extent to which a President uses the great potentialities of his office to advance the national interest. By this yardstick, Mr. Truman must be rated among the best. True, his tenure was turbulent and bedeviled by partisan strife, he would never be certain that his own party might not desert him in a showdown. But few Presidents have fought harder, or against greater odds, than Mr. Truman for the programs and the values he believed in.

His net gains on the domestic front were, in the end, relatively modest, but in the area of foreign policy they were monumental. His was the era of the Cold War and of the atom. His two terms in office were overshadowed by a danger no other President has ever had to face: the grinding rebalancing of world power between two hostile and incompatible forces, each capable of destroying the other.

President Truman met that danger with bold and imaginative—albeit to some persons, controversial—countermeasures. The Truman Doctrine, the European recovery program, NATO, the Berlin airlift, the Korean intervention—these were landmarks along the road to national maturity. They have profoundly affected the destiny of the American people and of the world.

Some revisionist historians now hold these measures to have been ill-chosen and wrongly conceived; that they advanced rather than retarded the Cold War. They may be right. It is hard to argue with 20/20 hindsight. But these events ought to be judged in the context of their time; in terms of the stresses felt and the wisdom at hand when they oc-

curred. Those years from 1947 to 1952 were full of anxiety and uncertainty. Most people at the time thought Mr. Truman's decisions were the right ones. Some, myself included, still think so.

One day in April, 1952, at his 300th press conference as President (to explain his decision not to seek renomination), Mr. Truman said to many of the same reporters whom he had asked eight years previously to pray for him: "I have tried my best to give the nation everything I have in me. There are a great many people—I suppose a million in this country—who could have done the job better than I did. But I had the job and I had to do it."

"I always remember an epitaph which is in the cemetery at Tombstone, Arizona. It says: 'Here lies Jack Williams. He done his damndest.' I think that is the greatest epitaph a man can have—when he gives everything that is in him to do the job he has before him. That is all you can ask of him and that is what I have tried to do."

MR. McCORMACK ON THE PRESIDENCY OF HARRY S TRUMAN

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, the day of the memorial services for Mr. Truman at the National Cathedral here in Washington, I brought some of the folks from Independence, Mo., who had journeyed here to attend this service to the Capitol after the services. We were seated in the House Restaurant for lunch where it was my privilege as their Congressman to introduce my guests to former Speaker John W. McCormack. He came to our table and for some 5 or 10 minutes, recalled some pleasant moments of his long association with Mr. Truman and particularly during the years when Mr. Truman was President and he served as Majority Leader in the House. Before he left, he suggested that if I had anything to do with the preparation of a memorial book to be printed as a joint House-Senate publication that he would appreciate the inclusion of some excerpts from his comments entitled "Former Speaker Salutes Great Friend" which appeared in the *Herald-Traveler* and the *Boston Record-American* for December 27 and also his comments and observations headed, "Presidency Brought Out His Greatness—McCormack," as these remarks appeared in the *Boston Globe* for December 27, 1972.

For my part I so clearly recall over the past 14 years, on Mr. Truman's birthday, either on May 8 or the nearest day that the House was in session, John McCormack, either as Majority Leader or Speaker of the House would always make it a point to be on the floor to pay tribute to the man he admired so much—Harry S Truman. Accordingly, it came to me as no surprise that he would request his comments in the *Boston papers* be made a part of the Truman eulogy because, as a former member, he was not present to join with the large number who participated in the special order on the floor of the House on Tuesday, January 9.

Perhaps Mr. McCormack's affection for Mr. Truman is expressed when he points out:

There is in the Office of the Presidency an influence where, if a man has a reserve of weakness, that comes out. Truman had a tremendous reserve of strength and the awesomeness of the Office was such that he evidenced his strength while he was President. In Truman's case, the Office certainly did bring out the greatness of the occupant.

Excerpts from the editorials follow:

[Excerpts from "Former Speaker Salutes Great Friend" by Bill Dunccliffe, *Herald Traveler* and *Boston Record American*, Dec. 27, 1972 and "Presidency Brought Out His Greatness—McCormack" by Gloria Negri, the *Boston Globe* Dec. 27, 1972]

EXCERPTS

Retired House Speaker John W. McCormack, sorrowed by the loss of an old and cherished friend, saluted the memory of former President Harry Truman by declaring: "He lived as he believed and he died as he lived—a fighter to the very end."

McCormack, drawing on the reminiscences of more than 40 climatic years in Congress, eulogized Truman as a man with the wisdom to realize that some of his decisions must be unpopular—and the courage to make them because he knew they were right.

"He will," McCormack said, "go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents we had. He will be remembered long after others have been forgotten."

"When he became President it may have been true that the country as a whole was little aware of the great qualities he possessed, but when he left office he did so as one of the most illustrious leaders this nation ever possessed."

"He was a very direct man, very courageous, very intuitive: he had a mind for making decisions. . . ."

Summing Truman up, McCormack said: "There is in the office of the Presidency, an influence where, if a man has a reserve of weakness, that comes out."

"Truman had a tremendous reserve of strength, and the awesomeness of the office was such that he evidenced the strength while he was President. In Truman's case, the office certainly did bring out the greatness of its occupant."

THE NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY

HON. THAD COCHRAN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide for the completion of a large portion of the historic and beautiful Natchez Trace Parkway.

It seem incredible that this project, which was originally introduced to this body in 1934 by Congressman Thomas Jefferson Busby, of Mississippi, has not yet been completed.

The first funds for construction were authorized in 1935. The sum of \$1,286,686 committed that year indicates that nearly 40 years ago, as today, the need for construction of a roadway along this scenic and historic trace was apparent.

In 1937, the year of my birth, the first contracts were awarded, and it appeared that the famous Indian and pioneer trail would gain new life. This beginning, however, was a prelude to many years of frus-

trating disappointments as progress with further construction was painfully slow. Due to the determination and hard work of many good people, much of the parkway has now been completed.

But, the history and native beauty so abundant along the ancient pathway is still today only available in a hodgepodge fashion to the thousands of travelers who seek it.

I strongly urge the early completion of this national roadway which spans the distance from the Hermitage beyond Nashville to the beautiful old mansions and scenic bluffs in Natchez.

GOVERNMENT IN THE SUNSHINE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America's freedoms thrive in direct relationship to the participation of the people in their Nation's business; a well-formed citizenry is essential to the survival of our democracy.

Too often, however, for reasons of efficiency or simple expediency, we see the public's business being conducted under the cloak of secrecy in so-called executive session. This trend serves to undermine public confidence in government and ultimately poses a serious threat to the health of our Nation.

For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 1303, a Federal Government in the Sunshine bill aimed at bringing the full light of public disclosure into our Government and its agencies. The legislation is similar to a Florida law which I helped pass in 1967 as minority leader of the Florida Senate, a model law which has time and again proved its worth and effectiveness.

My bill will guarantee the public's right to know while in no way infringing upon the Government's equal right to protect our national security.

The Government in the Sunshine bill requires that all meetings of Government agencies at which official action is taken, considered, or discussed will be open to the public. The only exceptions would be in matters relating to national defense and security; items required by statute to be kept confidential; matters relating to the internal management of an agency or committee; or disciplinary proceedings affecting the reputation of an individual.

The measure also would require that most meetings of congressional committees be open to the public, that a transcript of all meetings be made available, and for court enforcement of the open meetings requirement for Federal agencies.

The Government in the Sunshine bill will be an invaluable companion to my H.R. 1291, which would require public disclosure where public funds are involved. The people are entitled to know how their Government operates, and how their taxes are spent.

Except for obvious areas, secrecy simply has no place in our Government. Tyranny thrives in darkness; democracy flourishes in the bright sunlight of open, forthright government. Government in the Sunshine demands prompt, bipartisan support from the Congress.

FIRE SAFETY

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this morning's news contained yet another story of tragedy involving the Nation's elderly who reside in nursing homes.

Early this morning, fire swept through a two-story wooden frame nursing home in Pleasantville, N.J., killing at least 10 people and perhaps injuring several more.

The initial report indicated that firemen fighting the blaze lost precious time stringing hoses together to reach the nearest fire hydrant nearly three-quarters of a mile away.

Since a similar tragedy struck in my own congressional district nearly 1 year ago, in which 10 persons also lost their lives, a sustained effort has been made in the Congress to enact legislation designed to insure that Federal responsibilities are being met.

Almost 1 week ago, on January 23, I reintroduced legislation aimed at requiring that tough Federal fire safety regulations be extended to all nursing homes, including intermediate care facilities, which receive Federal funds.

Dr. Marie Callendar, Director of Nursing Home Programs for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 4 days ago announced that the administration will require that these intermediate care facilities comply with the Life Safety Code. This action represents a substantial move in the right direction, although other parts of my legislative program still require the attention of Congress.

This legislation would also require that any facility for the aged which is constructed in whole or in part with Federal funds be in compliance with the National Fire Protection Association's Life Safety Code.

Finally, this legislation would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make loans to nursing homes in order that they may purchase adequate fire safety equipment.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's tragic fire serves as another grim reminder of the fire safety problems in this Nation's nursing homes. Since 1961, there have been more than 34 multiple fire deaths in nursing homes in which three or more lives were lost, with an overall total now exceeding 283 deaths.

I call upon the Congress to take prompt action on this legislation, which is designed to promote fire safety in our country's nursing homes, and prevent as much as possible the needless loss of additional lives.

THE PRESIDENT'S FAMILY BACKGROUND

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a lot is known about Richard M. Nixon as a statesman and a politician, but too little is known about his family background, a background that had a tremendous influence on our 36th President of the United States.

I am proud to say that Richard Nixon's parents once resided in the congressional district I represent in the U.S. House of Representatives, and Mr. Nixon was a frequent visitor to his parents' residence.

Mr. Harry McLaughlin, a star reporter for the Sunday Patriot-News befriended Richard Nixon's parents when they lived in Pennsylvania's 19th Congressional District. Mr. McLaughlin wrote two very interesting and enlightening articles for the January 21, 1973, issue of the Sunday Patriot-News, and because these articles shed some light on what has, up to this time, been only shadowed revelations of Dick Nixon's background, I insert these articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON'S "YORK ERA" RECALLED

(By Harry McLaughlin)

To understand the personality of President Nixon one should have known his late parents, Hannah Milhous Nixon and Francis (Frank) Anthony Nixon.

By way of introduction to this reporter's private interpretation of Richard Milhous Nixon, the man, citizen, politician and world leader, it was our good fortune to be a special friend of Hannah Milhous Nixon.

Our personal relationship with the President, Pat Nixon, and a brother, Edward Nixon resulted from a spring, 1952, meeting with Hannah, whom we affectionately addressed as "Mother Nixon."

Professionally, U.S. Rep. Richard M. Nixon and, later, as a United States senator, was covered by those of us of the news media whose beat in the late 1940s and early 1950s stretched to York area schools and the Foremen's Club of York.

Nixon, in 1948, addressed the commencement of the West York High graduating class, which included his brother, Edward. Earlier, congressman Nixon addressed a meeting of the Foremen's Club. Mostly, his visits to York County were to his parents' farm home at Menges Mills, where he closed himself off from the political noise and activities of Washington.

As Nixon often did in the Menges Mills weekend jaunts, or his holiday vacations to the farm, he enjoyed the peaceful atmosphere of the countryside, or merely sitting down on a piano bench and for his own amusement striking the piano keys for music that to him proved relaxing. He favored reading books on a comfortable loveseat in the farmhouse front living room.

His current sojourns to Camp David, where he can relax, meditate in the quiet of the fields and forests, obviously still reflects a way of life that he finds enjoyable and comfortable.

The President bears strong traits of both his mother and father. And, surprising, they were opposites.

Mrs. Hannah Nixon was a deeply religious

woman and nurtured her sons in the Quaker faith. The sons went to Sunday School as children. The President has strong religious convictions—a personal faith in his God—but, without leaning especially to the Quaker commands or any particular form. He draws from beliefs of numerous denominations, but still has never forgotten his mother's Quaker teachings.

His Quaker background aggravates many Society of Friends members who are peace activists.

The President's mother was a gentle but firm individual. She was understanding, considerate, and thoughtful of others, but never could be described as an extrovert even though her presence was always felt in a crowd.

Her loyalty to friends and relatives was unwavering.

In 1952, for example, Mrs. Nixon urged the then Vice President Nixon's staff to arrange for inaugural ceremony invitations for her neighbor and companion, Mrs. Florence Sterner; Menges Mills Postmaster and Mrs. Carl Stambaugh, and her new friends, the McLaughlins and the late York news photographer, Bob Motter.

And four years later, Mother Nixon repeated her desires to the inaugural committee.

In both instances, the president's mother suggested her wishes to the vice presidential staff, and, prefaced with a "can it be done." She never was a demanding person.

The mother showed the same parental interest in her other sons. She didn't have a favorite. Always, she described her sons by their proper first names: Richard, Donald, Edward, etc. Never as Dick, Don or Ed.

In later correspondence with this reporter (from California) Mother Nixon would say that Richard did this or that, or he telephoned me, or he was coming to California for a visit, etc.

Her happiest moment apparently came at the 1960 Republican Presidential Convention, when her "Richard was nominated today and it was an exciting event." That's what she wrote to my daughter, on a postcard from Chicago to my daughter, Donna, then 13, (now Mrs. S. Richard Bieda, of Red Lion).

Her biggest disappointment showed after the John Kennedy defeat when she paid a surprise visit to the Menges Mills farm "just to sip some of the spring water."

She told this reporter then: "Richard sometime will be elected president. I just know it." So positive was Mrs. Nixon that Richard would be president that when she sold the York County farm in 1954, she made the buyers promise to donate the Nixon piano and love seat (allowed to remain at the farmhouse) to a Nixon presidential museum. Less than six months after the 1968 inauguration, the two pieces of furniture were dispatched to California for a proposed museum.

The President recognizes personal loyalty and friendship. He is thoughtful and considerate, but refuses publicity about such actions.

At the Feb. 7, 1971, White House Worship Service, the President introduced this writer to the morning service clergyman with the comment "Harry and my mother were great friends." Then, after shaking hands with my wife, and daughter and son-in-law, he learned that my son, Douglas, and his wife, Suzanne, were momentarily expecting a baby and didn't want to risk the White House trip.

Without prompting, the President reached to the seat of a chair directly behind him and picked up copies of the service's printed programs—autographed by him earlier—and gave them to my daughter. He designated that one should be given later to "the unborn baby." And the other was to go to her daughter, Kelly.

The president's wife smiled and suggested that the young Mr. McLaughlin should have

come to the service. "We could have provided a doctor and facilities here if the baby arrived while at the White House."

The President—mostly through his personal executive secretary, Miss Rose Mary Woods—over the past two decades often sent notes of sympathy or congratulations to friends at our suggestion. Only last summer, in response to an autographed photo of one of our favorite clowns, Carlos Campa, of Sells-Gray Circus, which we relayed from Campa and his family to Mr. Nixon, the President sent his own signed and inscribed official White House picture to the Campas.

Nixon also reflects the traits of his Irish father, but mostly as the statesman and politician. Both men never backed away from battle, and if they decided "right is right" they moved ahead. Francis Nixon worked hard as a farmer, a chore he enjoyed until he fractured a shoulder in a fall from a tractor at Menges Mills. He was a critic of federal government action (in private, and usually in sideporch discussions prior to the inauguration of the Eisenhower-Nixon team).

President and Mrs. Nixon jealously guard their rights to private life and family enjoyment. His love and devotion to his mother and father—and to their memory—is obvious.

Yesterday the President took his oath of office while laying his left hand on his mother's favorite Bible. It marked the fourth—and last time—that her Bible will be used by him. It will go to the presidential library and museum in California.

And, yesterday, among his personal family guests (on a non-political and non-professional basis) at the inaugural ceremony and festivities were his friends of 20 years, the Stambaughs and McLaughlins, who attended all four Nixon inaugurations.

When the President writes his autobiography, or factual biographies are written about him, the readers will learn that only two persons can accurately describe his personality: Mrs. Pat Nixon and Miss Woods, his faithful secretary of a quarter-century. Third in line would be his brother, Edward, who graduated from West York High in 1948 while his parents lived in Menges Mills.

FROM 1947 TO 1954: MENGES MILLS HOME LESSER KNOWN FACT ABOUT NIXON FAMILY (By Harry McLaughlin)

York.—Adams County is known internationally as the home of the late president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and his widow, Mamie. They resided on a farm adjacent to the Gettysburg Battlefield.

Their grandson, David, is a voting resident of Gettysburg, and so is his wife, Julie Nixon Eisenhower.

A lesser known historic fact, however, is that President Nixon's parents, the late Frank and Hannah Nixon, and brother, Edward, resided only 15 miles away at Menges Mills, near Hanover, in York County.

Julie Nixon Eisenhower and her sister, Triela Nixon Cox, for a time spent many weekends and most summers at Menges Mills with their grandparents, who came to York County from California in 1947. They left in 1954.

President Nixon, who caps a dramatic political career with four more years in the White House, still recalls about his weekends and summer and winter holidays at the York County farm. It was at the inauguration of his political career as a United States representative, and later as U.S. senator, that he came to Menges Mills.

In "Pennsylvania Sampler," a book narrated by Paul B. Beers, Patriot-News associate editor, and published by Stackpole Publishing Co., of Harrisburg, there appears an article about the Nixons and their family associations in Menges Mills, Gettysburg, and State College.

The president's great-grandfather, George Nixon III, is buried in the National Cemetery

at Gettysburg, a stone's throw from Julie Eisenhower's voting residence.

His late uncle, Dr. Ernest L. Nixon, was known in York and Adams County and throughout the East as "The Potato King." Dr. Nixon promoted the food product and wrote a book, "The Principles of Potato Production."

Ernest was the first Nixon to get a college education, and the president credits him as the inspiration for his own college career. The president's cousin, Leland W. Nixon, still operates his late father's potato farm, and another, Mrs. C. J. Noll, is a librarian at Pennsylvania State University.

Until his election in 1968, Nixon also was an attorney for Harco, an international corporation based in Harrisburg.

Mrs. Hannah Nixon, the president's mother, had an ancestry that goes back to York County in 1769. The president's great-great-great-great-grandfather, William Griffith Jr., owned land in Warrington Twp., York County, although the township then was still part of Lancaster County.

Griffith's father came to this country from Wales in 1690, and settled first in Delaware. He moved to York County in 1735. He married a second time, after his first wife died, and in all he fathered 22 children. One son was named Jacob, who married Lydia Hussey, also born and reared in York County. In 1790, they moved to Washington County.

Their offspring and descendants began the westward trek that ended in Whittier, Calif. In 1908, Hannah Milhous, one of the descendants, married Francis Anthony Nixon, and they had five sons, including Richard.

Another son, Edward, graduated from West York High School in 1948, and his class commencement speaker was Rep. Richard M. Nixon.

Nixon's father was the second son of Samuel Brady Nixon, who had been the second of George, the Nixon killed at Gettysburg.

A main reason the Nixons returned to California—after a short stay in Florida—was the continuing pain Frank Nixon suffered from a farm tractor accident at Menges Mills. The cold winters and his injured shoulder kept him in pain, and he was instructed to reside in warmer climate.

The 86-acre Nixon farm is now owned by Mr. and Mrs. Sterling Myers, who also operate a community store in Menges Mills.

The Nixons were always remembered in York County.

Their son, Richard, carried the county in all of his national elections by large majorities, including his recent 36,000 margin victory. Also, a 152-acre county park was named in his honor.

VETERANS DAY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 126, to return America's official commemoration of Veterans Day to November 11.

Patriotic organizations such as the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars have pledged their full support for this legislation. They feel, as I do, that this great national commemoration was downgraded with the Monday Holiday Act which moved the celebration to the latter part of October to allow for an additional 3-day weekend.

Veterans Day is an important national holiday; a time to pause and honor those

who have sacrificed so much to preserve the precious freedoms we all enjoy.

On November 11, 1918, the armistice was signed ending hostilities on the western front during World War I. November 11 was chosen by the Congress as an appropriate date upon which to honor all the men and women who have fought in various wars against the forces of oppression and tyranny.

Veterans Day stands for more than an excuse for a 3-day weekend; it stands for patriotism, heroism, and the other concepts which have made America the greatest nation in the history of the world.

The Congress should return to Veterans Day the dignity and importance it deserves, and this can best be done by returning the commemoration to November 11, a day that means something in our history, something much more than an excuse for a long weekend.

COUNTERADVERTISING IN THE BROADCAST MEDIA

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate to be present recently at the annual newsmaker luncheon to hear Judge Lee Loevinger, of the International Radio and TV Society, formerly a Federal Communications Commission Commissioner, deliver what I thought to be an interesting and bold speech on the subject of counteradvertising in the broadcast media.

Although the entirety of the speech was too long for complete insertion in the RECORD, I did want to bring important excerpts of it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Loevinger begins with the background of the counter-advertising proposal, and I quote:

The genealogy at least of the counter advertising proposal is fairly clear. The roots go back to the FCC decision in 1949 that broadcasters could express editorial opinions on licensed facilities but that they must also provide a fair opportunity for the expression of opposing or contrasting views on controversial issues of public importance. (13 FCC 1246) This principle came to be known as the "Fairness Doctrine" and was applied only to the discussion of major political and social issues until 1967. In that year, FCC declared that the Fairness Doctrine applied to cigarette advertising to the extent of requiring public service announcements warning of the dangers of cigarette smoking. (8 FCC 2d 381; 9 FCC 2d 921) The Commission opinion quite explicitly and emphatically declared that the situation with respect to cigarettes was "unique."

In 1965 there had been a report by a Surgeon General's Advisory Committee warning that cigarette smoking was hazardous to health, and in 1965 Congress had enacted a statute requiring warning of such a hazard to be carried on all cigarette packages. The FCC brushed aside the argument that application of the Fairness Doctrine to commercial advertising was an unwarranted and dangerous extension by saying that it did not know of any other advertised product to

which the ruling would be applicable, that the ruling did not imply that "any appeal to the Commission by a vocal minority will suffice to classify advertising of a product as controversial and of public importance."

The cigarette ruling of the FCC was sustained by the Court of Appeals on the basis urged by the FCC that the situation was unique. . . .

In January 1972 the FTC filed a statement in the FCC Fairness Doctrine inquiry advocating that the FCC require all broadcasters to provide substantial amounts of time, both free and paid, for regularly scheduled "counter-advertising" on a broad scale. This proposal is still being debated and considered.

The FTC counter-advertising proposal echoes similar schemes urged by other business critics and has engendered support from most of the militant anti-establishment camps. Of all the attacks on advertising, this proposal is the most basic, the most bold, and the most patently political. But whether it promises benefits or threatens dangers is not so obvious, and an appraisal requires a rather detailed analysis. On first impression there is plausibility to the argument that since the public is exposed to a vast amount of advertising, all urging the purchase of some products or services, there should be some comparable opportunity provided for those who wish to urge contrary views. However, when this proposal is reduced to specifics and examined closely, then this plausibility disappears, virtually all the valid considerations argue against the proposal, and implications are disclosed reaching far beyond broadcasting and advertising and deep into our political life. Let's take the arguments and elements one by one.

Mr. Loevinger then proceeds in detail on the arguments against counter-advertising. I summarize briefly:

First. The reasons urged for counter-advertising are "logically fallacious."

Second. "Counter advertising would destroy the economic foundation of broadcasting," not only by imposing a cost by encroaching on commercial and broadcasting time, but also by causing a loss to the extent that it drives advertisers out of broadcasting into other medias.

Third. "Counter advertising would cause a deterioration of broadcast programming and journalism," in part due to the loss of revenues.

Fourth. "Counter advertising is unreasonably discriminatory against broadcasting," since the right of counter advertising has not been claimed with respect to any of the printed media.

Fifth. He said:

Counter advertising would not be informative and would result in diatribe rather than dialogue.

Loveinger asserts that it would more often than not be the "fanatics" who exercised the right to counter-advertising.

Sixth. He said further:

The counter advertising proposal is based on the false premise that the consumer doesn't have diverse information sources:

Seventh. He added:

Counter advertising would diminish the amount of useful information now available to the consumer. . . . Substituting a substantial amount of counter advertising for either programming or advertising is far more likely to irritate than to inform the audience. The result is likely to be that the average consumer is less, rather than more, informed.

Eighth. "Counter advertising is unfair to honest advertisers," with no charges, hearing or finding of fault or guilt.

Ninth. He said:

Counter advertising would create bars to innovation, improvement and the entry of new products into the market.

Tenth. "The purpose and effect of counter-advertising proposals is to increase Government power" and specifically that of the FTC.

Eleventh. He said further:

Counter advertising would increase the power of small militant groups.

Twelfth. "Counter advertising would meet no real need and solve no important problem," in that, although there are now advertising abuses, including false and misleading advertising, the FTC has "ample power to deal with such abuses and there are more industry agencies at work rooting out the abuses than ever before."

Thirteenth. "Counter advertising would create a host of new problems, including a test of free speech under the first amendment," inasmuch as if the Government decides what must be said and when it will be heard, it will be the Government which decides what speech is "right and what speech is 'wrong'" which is far from the principles meant by the first amendment.

Fourteenth. "Counter advertising is the antithesis of free speech," in that it is Government mandated and controlled speech, not free speech.

Fifteenth. "The counter-advertising proposal can be explained only as a political power play" inasmuch as it would drive away revenues from broadcasters and "ultimately drive all broadcasting to a dependence on Government subsidy or support."

Thus Mr. Loevinger concludes that counter advertising is not only a dangerous constitutional precedent, but also would be a hindrance to the consumer. While I am not necessarily in agreement with every point that Judge Loevinger raises against counter advertising, and while I have applauded several instances of voluntary counter advertising that I have noticed over the broadcast media, I do believe that he raises serious questions that we must all consider.

HARRY TRUMAN AS A MAN OF FAITH

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, when the sad news of the passing of Mr. Truman flashed across America on that Tuesday morning, December 26, 1972, it went out to reach every segment and every strata of American life. It saddened the man on the street, the great industrial leaders, those who held the highest offices in our land; but it also brought grief to what we can describe as the intellectual community, as well as those churchmen who we collectively call the clergy of our country.

As one who has had a small measure of experience in examining some of the literature on the life and times of Mr. Truman, I am indebted to Mr. Bertil L. Hanson, associate professor, Department of Political Science, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla., for a worthwhile contribution. He was good enough to furnish our office with a copy of an article by Prof. Merlin Gustafson, entitled "Harry Truman as a Man of Faith," which appeared in the magazine entitled *Christian Century* on January 17, 1973.

Professor Hanson points out that the article not only describes Mr. Truman's character faithfully but also conveys the timely lesson that religion can be a source of great private strength without a big public display being made of one's religion.

The article and letters follow:

[From the periodical *Christian Century*, Jan. 17, 1973]

HARRY TRUMAN AS A MAN OF FAITH
(By Merlin Gustafson)

Even after the passage of more than two decades, the decisions made by Harry S. Truman during his presidency still influence international and domestic affairs. His foreign aid programs and military alliances remain in force, and a number of his recommendations for domestic legislation have now been enacted.

How did he arrive at his momentous decisions? We know that a President is often a captive of events beyond his control and that decision-making in the executive branch of our government is frequently only a bureaucratic process. Hence a simple pragmatic course of action may be the only alternative left open to the President. Sometimes, however, he has the opportunity to lead, to choose which fork in the road the nation will take. At such times he will be forced back upon his personal philosophy; it is then that his personal and religious values become important.

I

Did President Truman's religious values in fact influence his decisions during his White House years? It should be remembered that Truman was never an idealist with a rigid set of religious principles to be applied automatically to the important problems he faced. On the other hand, he did take some religious doctrines seriously, and they undoubtedly affected his political decision-making. When we think of his religious beliefs we should bear in mind the two roles any President has to play: that of an individual with personal preferences and that of the nation's leader.

As an individual, President Truman was a sincerely religious man—in fact, one of our more "religious" Presidents. He was also a politician, and he believed that his role as politician need not conflict with his religious principles. He believed the profession of politics to be, as he said, the "highest and most important business in the world." During his years in the Senate and the presidency his political opponents often brought up his earlier Fendegast associations and the taint of Kansas City "machine" politics of that era. Careful studies of his early political career, however, have cleared him of any involvement in shady politics; no solid facts have ever been uncovered to implicate him in dishonest political acts, unless he is held guilty by association. This clean bill of health applies as well to the so-called "scandals" that occurred during his last years as President.

Throughout his life he retained his membership in the Grandview, Missouri, Baptist Church, while his wife and daughter were

active Episcopalians. Although a 33rd-degree Mason, he liked his religious liturgy simple and informal; he was not attracted by the more ceremonial forms of worship. After he became President he attended church only occasionally because, as he explained, his attendance attracted so much attention that the other worshippers were distracted from the service.

Truman had little interest in theological issues, although he had an almost fundamentalist reverence for the Bible. He liked to read and quote the Scriptures, often reciting verses from memory to fit political situations. On many a formal and informal occasion he quoted from the Sermon on the Mount, and he would frequently say: "Every problem in the world would be solved if only men would follow the Beatitudes." Another verse he liked to recall was Luke 6:26: "Woe unto you, when all men speak well of you, for so their fathers did to the false prophets"—which no doubt gave him comfort and reassurance when under attack during his White House years.

The nation experienced a religious revival during the Truman administration, and the President's occasional religious statements to the press matched the national mood of the '50; e.g., his reference to the "Christian mission" of the United States in world affairs. However, a number of religious leaders and journals (notably *The Christian Century*) criticized his simple religious exhortations on complex questions.

II

On the other side, Truman, as President of the United States, had become an "institution," and he could no longer act simply as an individual. He had become less Truman the person and more Truman the executive department. He once explained: "In the White House I never allowed myself to think that Harry Truman from Independence, Missouri, was personally deciding the fate of the world. I was deciding as President and not as an individual thinking in terms of what he would prefer as an individual."

No President can manage his complicated and enormous work load without a loyal staff to help handle the innumerable details that come with the institutional aspects of his office. Truman's closest aides included members of the major U.S. religious faiths—Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish. Many of the President's announcements and proclamations for the commemoration of religious observances were composed by his correspondence secretary, William Hassett, a Roman Catholic.

Some of his speeches and public statements (for which he took full responsibility, even though they may have been written by staff members or department heads) exhibited distinct theological attitudes—reverence for the Holy Scriptures, belief in a Supreme Being, support for a spirit of toleration among the various religious faiths, and support for the ecumenical movement. Occasionally his thinking revealed a note of Calvinistic determinism or moralism. Most significant was his deep concern for the social implications of the Scriptures, as shown in his first major religious address after becoming President—to the Federal Council of Churches in March 1945 in Columbus, Ohio. (Interestingly, it was Jewish presidential aide Samuel Rosenman who composed most of the President's address to that Protestant organization.) His speech emphasized the need for a new moral and spiritual awakening among the people—one which would help bring solutions to such problems as poor housing, juvenile delinquency, racial and religious intolerance. He took note of "selfish interests so greedy for gold" that they sought to induce Congress to hold down minimum wages and allow the further concentration of economic power. A truly religious fervor

among the people, he declared, would foster needed legislation such as national programs for health insurance, housing, education, and an improved social security system. He said he believed that the very essence of religion could be found in the United Nations Charter, and he called on the nation to aid the starving millions in Europe, Asia and Africa. All these proposals, he maintained, were supported by the precepts of the ancient prophets and the Sermon on the Mount.

When militant anticommunism and McCarthyism gained popular support during his second term in office, Truman argued that the social gospel held the answer: "The menace of communism lies in the areas of American life where the promise of democracy remains unfulfilled." Referring to such problems as slums, low wages, lack of education, lack of medical care, poverty in old age, unemployment, and inflated prices, he pointed out that they all involved basic human rights which, when neglected, led to extreme movements such as communism.

III

President Truman supported a spirit of religious tolerance. Perhaps because of the wide variety of friendships he had in Kansas City and because of his experience in the army, he had never been dogmatic about his religious faith. After he became President he sought to encourage toleration in a number of ways: by issuing an executive order to end racial and religious discrimination in the armed forces; by championing, against strong congressional opposition, the cause of displaced persons who sought to be admitted to the United States after World War II; and by extending diplomatic recognition to the state of Israel in 1948. He favored diplomatic recognition of the Vatican as well, and he attributed to religious bigotry the powerful opposition that that proposal aroused. Perhaps there was political motivation in his support of the interests of Catholics and Jews, but there was certainly warmth in his relationships with members of these religious groups as well.

President Truman supported the ecumenical movement among the churches. During his second term he sponsored a movement to bring religious leaders of the world together in what he called "a common affirmation of faith and a common supplication to the one God that all profess," but that effort, as he later admitted, ended in failure.

Occasionally a note of Calvinist determinism was apparent in Truman's public statements. In 1945, at the beginning of his presidential years, he declared: "I believe honestly that Almighty God intends now that we shall assume the leadership which he intended us to assume in 1920, and which we refused. And I believe that if we do that, our problems will almost solve themselves." Again, at the end of his second term, he expressed the same thought:

Divine Providence has played a great part in our history. I have the feeling that God has created us and brought us to our present position of power and strength for some great purpose.

It is not given to us now to know fully what that purpose is, but I think we may be sure of one thing. And that is that our country is intended to do all it can, in cooperating with other nations to help create peace and preserve peace in the world. It is given to us to defend the spiritual values—the moral code—against the vast forces of evil that seek to destroy them.

This is a hard task. It is not one that we have asked for. At times we would like to lay it down. And, as we go on with it, we see it is full of uncertainties and sacrifices. But we need not be afraid, if we have faith.

Like many of his contemporaries, Truman perceived a divine mission in the Amer-

ican historical experience. Perhaps for this reason he accepted the rhetoric of the cold war against "atheistic communism" and the turn to militarism that accompanied it. No pacifist, he favored a large peacetime military system and universal military training for all men of draft age. And, of course, it was his decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Peace was his goal, but he believed it could be achieved only through military strength.

Shortly after the end of World War II he gave up all hope of cooperation with the Soviet Union and advocated a program of coexistence and containment of communism. He believed a strong military force and a system of military alliances that would balance the Russian military power to be the best way to maintain peace. To John Foster Dulles he wrote in 1945: "We often hear it said that spiritual values are indestructible, but I think it should be said that they are indestructible only as long as men are ready and willing to take action to preserve them." However, he did not favor a "holy war" against the communist nations, or think that war was inevitable. Despite great pressures he kept the Korean conflict a "limited war," even though that decision meant firing a popular war hero, General Douglas MacArthur.

President Truman will be remembered in history for initiating the postwar foreign aid program. Although there undoubtedly were a number of motives operating—not all of them altruistic, to say the least—Truman personally found a basis in religious principles for helping the less-developed nations. His 1946 speech to the Federal Council of Churches made that stance clear.

IV

Perhaps President Truman left with us the most illuminating summary of his religious philosophy in a short speech he delivered in 1951 at a cornerstone-laying ceremony:

"The essential mission of the church is to teach the moral law. Religion is not an easy thing. It is not simply a comfort to those in trouble or a means of escape from present difficulties, as some people today would have us believe. Moreover, religion is not a negative thing. It is not merely a series of prohibitions against certain actions because they are wicked. Our religion includes those elements. But it also includes more. It is a positive force that impels us to affirmative action . . . Selfishness and greed can tear this nation apart. . . . Our religious faith gives us the answer to the false beliefs of communism. We are defending freedom of worship and conscience. . . ."

These, then, were the highlights of Truman's religious philosophy. As President he could not afford to be too far ahead or too far behind the thinking of his constituency. His perspective was slightly more liberal than that of his times, but he was not extreme. Leadership in the mainline Protestant churches, in Judaism and in the Roman Catholic Church generally supported his goals. His public policies reflected a compromise between the individualistic and pietistic religious attitudes of many Americans and the more socially conscious theology of many Americans and the more socially conscious theology of many religious leaders. Public opinion surveys of the time showed that most Americans saw little relationship between theology and political matters, but President Truman recognized such a relationship intuitively. Aided by his advisers, he demonstrated that recognition in his speeches, his public statements, and his public programs. Hence, like the Old Testament prophets, his concern for social justice sometimes placed him at odds with a significant section of what is now called "middle America."

nificant section of what is now called "middle America."

Truman was not simply an opportunist, a pragmatic politician or a public opinion poll-watcher who reacted to each situation as it arose. He took his religious values too seriously for such characterizations to be valid, and he relied on those values as he made the leadership decisions that so greatly influenced the United States and the entire Western world.

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Stillwater, Okla., January 19, 1973.
The Honorable WILLIAM J. RANDALL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RANDALL: I would like to suggest that an article by Professor Merlin Gustafson entitled "Harry Truman as a Man of Faith" appearing in this week's "Christian Century" merits inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article not only describes Mr. Truman's character faithfully, but also conveys a timely lesson. It shows how religion can be a source of great private strength without a big public display being made over it.

Sincerely,

BERTH L. HANSON,
Associate Professor.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE.
The attached information is forwarded in response to your recent inquiry. We hope it meets your needs in this matter.
Please do not hesitate to call on us for further assistance.

Sincerely,

LESTER S. JAYSON, Director.

"THESE COLORS DON'T RUN"—
SIXTH GRADERS AT APISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, APISON, TENN.,
SHOW THEIR PATRIOTISM BY
PAINTING THE SCHOOL'S WINDOWS
IN THE FORM AND COLORS
OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

MR. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the students of Apison Elementary School in Apison, Tenn., have been engaged in a schoolwide program to promote patriotism during the current school year. One of the appealing and satisfying projects to be developed under the program is the one undertaken by the sixth graders of the school who painted the school windows in the form and colors of the American flag. The result was a gigantic reproduction of Old Glory.

The class has adopted as its motto, "These colors don't run," and are using the flag and the motto to boost the school's chances of winning an award in the Freedoms Foundation Award program.

I commend the principal of the school, William P. Elsea; the sixth grade teacher, Mr. R. P. Hudlow, and the following students who served as "artists" in painting the flag on the school windows: Danny Hullender, Kitty Bush, Yvonne

Crowden, Delinda Duggan, Vicki Presley, Jess Watkins, Tina Longwith, Debbie Cox, Dora Jenkins, Kenny Lee, Donnie Smith, Hal Smedley, Mark Edwards, Randy Barefield, Gail Bloom, Yvonne Hullender, Barbara Creasman, Joanna Sheffield, Terry Drew, Ramona McCoy, Gloria Bryson, Mona Millard, Robin Lowery, David Goforth and Linda Gray.

WHAT ABOUT PAKISTANI POW'S?

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

MR. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, American prisoners of war are on their way home, now that the Vietnam peace has been signed. However, the world has another POW situation—much larger—as a result of the India-Pakistan war. The following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of January 17, 1973, discusses the matter:

INDIA SHOWS FREE POW'S

India, the great hair splitter, should release forthwith the 93,000 Pakistani soldiers still held as prisoners of war a year after the two nations stopped fighting each other. The Geneva Convention of 1949 states that prisoners shall be released and repatriated after the cessation of active hostilities.

India itself proclaimed a cease-fire after the fighting a year ago. A resolution voted by the United Nations Security Council stated that not only a cease-fire but a cessation of hostilities "prevailed."

In the face of both this record and the Geneva Convention, how can India justify holding Pakistani soldiers at all—let alone under the deplorable conditions existing?

The reason, an Indian spokesman told The Tribune's Joseph Zullo at the U.N., is that a cease-fire is "not the same as a cessation of hostilities." With respect to the new nation of Bangladesh, Pakistan is in an attitude of hostilities in suspension.

To find a semantic difference between "cease-fire" and "cessation of hostilities" requires hair splitting of a high order of skill. To go a step farther and find a difference between a "cessation of hostilities" and a "suspension of hostilities" calls for a virtuosity in word twisting that borders on the dazzling.

It is obvious that India is holding the 93,000—along with 16,000 civilians—as diplomatic hostages. A spokesman for the New Delhi delegation told Mr. Zullo that the Pakistani forces surrendered to the "joint command" of Indian and Bangladesh forces and that their release depends on the acquiescence of Bangladesh. In other words, Pakistan must recognize this breakaway state which has proclaimed independence with India's backing—or it can't have the POW's.

The Geneva Convention says nothing about the recognition of anyone by anyone; it says that prisoners shall be released after the shooting stops. Its intention is clear. Send the soldiers home as quickly as possible.

India is not in compliance with this convention. The stalling would be wrong no matter who engaged in it. It seems especially deplorable when a rule of international conflict is flouted by this self-appointed moral adviser to the world, which has pointed accusing fingers at so many other nations for many fancied wrongs. Here is a real wrong, and the perpetrator has turned strangely blind to the outrage of it.

TV GOES EDUCATIONAL FOR PROF- IT TO SELL BUSING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, January 29 is a day of infamy in nearby Prince Georges County, Md. At mid-term, 35,000 schoolchildren are to be uprooted in a massive social experiment to be bused to another school to fulfill some pseudo liberals' false theory of racial mixing by the numbers.

Selling busing by TV ads must be an historic first. Not only do the taxpayers need supply an additional 57 buses, but now they will be called on to pay the public relations bill to sell them such slogans as "busing worked in Harrisburg, Pa., Pontiac, Mich., and Dade County, Fla." But the TV ad that "laws are made in Congress, not in schools" is a most appropriate statement. Congress has continually passed laws such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964—which forbids busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance.

An honest ad would have said that laws are made in Congress, but that the busing "law" was made by unelected ambitious Federal judges who have actually violated the law. For the law of the land is described in article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution which reads:

This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof . . . shall be the Supreme Law of the Land.

The judge in the Prince Georges case called it "routine."

Time was when our communications media used the power of the press to champion the rights of the people against the excesses, the tyranny of an all powerful central government. The role of the free press to sell suppression—child-napping of schoolchildren—can only be regarded as a further deterioration of the role of our Nation's right-to-know machinery to keep up people free by keeping them informed.

When the time for full control and the nationalization of the right-to-know machinery comes—who will lament their failures caused by absence of credibility? When a man destroys the liberties and birthrights of others, he cannot expect support in defense of the loss of his freedoms.

I include the following newsclippings:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Jan. 27, 1973]

TV ADS URGE P.G. TO COOL IT
(By Lorenzo Middleton)

A 10-second advertisement appearing on several local television stations this week depicts a drawing of an empty public school classroom followed by one filled with children.

"The choice is yours," proclaimed the announcer above background music taken from "Black and White," a popular "brotherhood" song by the rock group Three Dog Night.

It is one of four short public service announcements from the Prince Georges County public school system, urging compliance with court orders for further desegregation of the schools on Monday.

Another announcement lists the names of veteran desegregated school districts such as Harrisburg, Pa., Pontiac, Mich., and Dade County, Fla., while the speaker says: "It worked there . . . Let's make it work here." Still another shows a picture of the U.S. Capitol, while the announcer says: "Laws are made in Congress . . . not in schools."

The announcements were written and produced by the Prince Georges Board of Education's information office and audiovisual department at a cost of \$500 to \$600, according to Robert M. Litman, school board information officer.

The announcements were made as the school administration continues its efforts to calm reactions to the orders calling for a transfer of 33,000 students, 12,000 of them to be bused for the first time.

As the date for implementing the orders draws nearer, increasing numbers of white parents have indicated to the school board and to the press that they will boycott classrooms on Monday, both in protest against the forced busing and in fear that violence will erupt at the newly integrated schools.

Production costs of the announcements will be paid out of funds set aside by the school board for implementing the integration orders. At a board meeting earlier this week, it was revealed that \$110,000 has been spent thus far on "project desegregation."

Litman said the announcements are being aired through next week by WMAL-7, WTOP-9, Metromedia Inc.-5 and WDCA-20.

One area station—WRC-4—declined to show the messages because, as a matter of station policy, public service announcements are reserved for "noncontroversial areas," according to James Truelove, a spokesman for the station. He said yesterday the busing issue has been "well covered" by WRC in editorials, news shows and panel programs.

The Prince Georges Regional Association of Student Governments has sponsored a 30-second public service announcement to be aired this weekend on several local radio stations.

The message asks that students: "Don't rock that boat . . . Come Jan. 29 be cool. . . . Make desegregation work. . . . It's up to you!"

[From the Washington Star-News, Jan. 28,
1973]

BUSING ANXIETY: PRINCE GEORGES REALTY
AGENTS COOLING IT
(By Donald Hirtzel)

Some Prince Georges real estate operators have stopped soliciting homes-for-sale listings in the county because they fear their calls might add to anxiety over increased school desegregation which begins tomorrow.

Individual operators have taken the action after receiving reports of "block-busting" tactics in New Carrollton and Greenbelt, two areas greatly affected by the court-ordered school desegregation plan which requires pupil busing.

The request to stop house-for-sale solicitations came from the county's Board of Realtors, and a number of operators said they had complied with the plea.

County Councilwoman Gladys N. Spellman this past week made a plea to real estate operators "to keep the lid on" after she heard reports of the block-busting tactics.

Block-busting is illegal, under federal, state and county laws. But, as Mrs. Spellman explained, an unscrupulous operator can get around the use of racial terms in soliciting a house for sale by mentioning the desegregation order.

In block-busting, a neighborhood is selected for a concentrated telephone, mail and in-person solicitation campaign in which homeowners are urged to sell their property because of the changing racial balance of the neighborhood.

In New Carrollton and Greenbelt, some real

estate operators reportedly have been using the desegregation issue to drum up business.

While reports of solicitations in these two communities have focused attention on the potential problem, a survey of real estate dealers indicated that there has been no panic selling as yet.

Charles Grammer, whose real estate firm handles a lot of sales in Prince Georges and Southern Maryland, said he has seen no panic. But he has been getting inquiries about available homes south of Prince Georges.

"I am getting five or six people a week inquiring about property in Charles County or Southern Maryland," he noted, adding that this is "higher than normal."

He said his firm is not soliciting homes now because "it's too hot an issue." Those looking for homes, according to Grammer, "make it clear they want to move out because of desegregation."

He said he believes that with the area's housing shortage "it is conceivable that anyone would lose money on a home sale because of busing."

Grammer believes "things will settle down in time." He said that his firm has helped integrate communities in the past where good relations exist today.

Miss Beverly Isemann, who did not want her firm identified, was not optimistic. "People want to move out of the county," she said flatly.

She said that even people who have already entered contracts for the purchase of new homes "are now trying to get out of them."

She believes that if a housing panic develops "middle and upper income families would move out" and the Prince Georges market would deflate.

She said her firm, which has dealt primarily in Prince Georges properties, now is requiring its salesmen to join the Montgomery Board of Realtors so the firm can step up its activities there.

Councilman Winfield M. Kelly also has voiced fear at a time when the county is trying to attract upper-income families to create a stronger tax base.

Mrs. Irma Yurek, another real estate dealer, while not feeling any pressure yet, believes housing "will be affected."

She said when a family buys a home it is interested in the quality and proximity of schools.

Frank Halley, who operates Carrollton Realty, said it is "too early to tell" if problems are being created but that the "school issue is very much in people's minds."

[From the Washington Star-News,
Jan. 11, 1973]

FIFTY-SEVEN BUSES SOUGHT FOR P.G.
COMPLIANCE

At least 57 additional buses will be needed by the Prince Georges County school system to implement a Jan. 29 court-ordered desegregation plan.

Anthony Miller, supervisor of transportation for the county's schools, said yesterday the exact number of buses will not be determined until the final figure on the number of students to be transferred is settled. The county school system now has a fleet of 500 school buses.

The desegregation plan accepted by federal Judge Frank A. Kaufman calls for the transfer of 32,000 students, and the busing of 12,000 new bus riders. Miller estimates that the desegregation plan will cost the county at least an additional \$1 million a year.

The county is now making arrangements to get buses from the state or to lease them from parochial schools or private bus operators. This procedure would be temporary until the county can buy new buses which once ordered take six months or more to deliver.

Any buses used by the school system, according to Miller, must meet standards prescribed by state law for school vehicles.

He said the school system will have to hire additional drivers who will undergo a training program and then will have to be approved by the State Motor Vehicle Administration.

He discounted a rumor that numerous bus drivers are resigning, commenting that no more than "a dozen of our 500 regular drivers have resigned." However, he admitted that many drivers are waiting to see what kind of work hours they will have under the new busing schedules. He said 70 percent of the drivers are women and that some may resign once scheduling is completed because they will not be able to work full-time as will be required by many of the drivers under the new system.—DONALD HIRZEL.

HOPES FOR THE NEW YEAR

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, an article written by one of my constituents, Mrs. Vlasta Broz, appeared in the Tampa Tribune. Since I feel Mrs. Broz' wishes for the New Year reflect the wishes of many, I submit a copy of this newspaper article, so that it might be brought to the attention of my colleagues:

FOR 1973: PEACE WITH HONOR

St. PETERSBURG.—As 1972 drew to a close, everyone longed for changes in 1973. Each wish will have its own distinguishing quality, depending if the individual is seeking changes solely to satisfy his own desires, or if they will benefit the nation as a whole.

I too, have wishes, hopes and prayers. Most fervently I hope and pray for a peace with honor; that our prisoners are still alive and will be reunited with their families and most emphatically I hope there will be no amnesty for deserters! Amnesty would mean the desecration of all that men have fought, suffered and died for.

I wish, parents would again begin at home to teach their children respect for our flag and instead of considering it a major undertaking, old and young alike would stand at attention and men doff their hats as the flag is passing by.

I wish, everyone would remember the Constitution guarantees equal rights for all, providing we do not interpret these rights only to suit ourselves, I wish too, that people would learn not to infringe on the rights of others!

I wish, women had never started the Liberation Movement, because their arguments have been ridiculous. I, for one, cannot see any glamour in gaining the right to be a ditch digger, if I lose my femininity. But the Libbers are more to be pitied than censured; they, no doubt, have a deep seated feeling of inferiority; have probably never known a man who put them on a pedestal and treated them with courtesy, nor have they met a man they could honor and admire. Whatever they hoped to attain, no law can gain for them respect if their movement destroys marriages and come hell or high water, neither can the law change nature and biological processes for the lot of them.

I wish, employers would treat all employees alike, i.e., if they reprimand or discharge a white, they should deal with a black in the same manner for the same misdemeanor instead of fearing retaliation. Fear and/or discrimination of any variety is a basis for dis-

content among factory and office workers alike and does nothing for integration. Perhaps if equality would return, the average worker would again take pride in his work and in return, the employer would receive a day's work for a day's wages.

I wish, employers, parents and our lawmakers, would make an effort to see for themselves the complete cooperation and friendliness among blacks, whites and children of all races and creed in some of our private schools. They were not forced to integrate.

FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOHN S. WOLD

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, John S. Wold distinguished himself in the 91st Congress as being the only geologist to ever serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. As the only Member from Wyoming, Congressman Wold served on the House Interior Committee and was the original House sponsor of the National Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970.

I am sure a good many of our colleagues remember John, and would like to know that since leaving the House, he has specialized in the assembling of coal reserves for synthetic fuel plants and research programs, placing western coal properties with major energy companies.

In the following article from Coal Age magazine, "Federal Freeze Threatens America's Energy Supply," John Wold is quite critical of Department of the Interior coal leasing policies. While I am not ready to confirm or deny his statements, many will find an interest in either the author or the subject matter.

THE FEDERAL COAL FREEZE

	North Dakota	Montana	Wyoming	Colorado	Utah	New Mexico
Last Federal lease-date of issue...	May 1, 1971	Apr. 1, 1971	Feb. 2, 1971	Apr. 1, 1970	Sept. 1, 1970	Jan. 1, 1970
Last Federal prospecting permit...	None issued	July 1, 1970	Jan. 12, 1971	Nov. 1, 1970	Feb. 1, 1971	Jan. 1, 1971

Reasons given by the BLM for this freezing action which bars entry to the public coal lands have ranged from lack of a national energy policy to uncertainty on environmental requirements and lease terms. During the period of this freeze, practically every top-level energy expert in the Dept. of Interior has "pointed with alarm" at the impending energy crisis and the need for developing new domestic energy supplies. These words contrast with Department action, but are only one facet of the great paradox.

Many potential preferential-right lessees of federal coal lands have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in exploration under permit. Their work in many cases has been approved by the USGS, but their leases are stymied by the BLM, presumably while new leasing policies are determined.

Permittees maintain that Interior has a contract with them to issue a preferential coal lease. Regulations, however, do not specify the terms of the lease, nor the time interval for issuing a lease. Applicants, who in good faith have made their investments, are hamstrung—not for weeks or months, but for years—as the Department rests on the crutch that it must internally formulate policies or wait for Congress to give direction.

An example of this operation is a coal

The article follows:

AN OPINION FROM THE WEST—FEDERAL FREEZE THREATENS AMERICA'S ENERGY SUPPLY

(By John S. Wold, Geologist)

If you asked the average American coal man what are the foremost problems of his industry he would doubtless reply the environment and coal mine safety legislation. These are immediate dollars-and-cents problems which have brought a coal-rich nation to the brink of a critical shortage.

From the long-range point of view, however, it is possible that little-publicized decisions blossoming from within the U.S. Dept. of Interior may have a far greater impact on the future contributions coal will make toward solving our national energy crisis.

Few coal men, much less John Q. Public, realize that over one half of the vast US reserves (and most of the low-sulfur coal) underlie our public domain. As federal property, they are managed by the Dept. of Interior. How and when these resources are developed will influence the future national standard of living.

The dominant fact of life for public domain coal the last 2 years has been a freeze on leasing, cutting off availability of new supplies. The chart (not shown) shows the timetable of the "freeze" on coal leases and permits in six western states holding 64% of the nation's coal reserves.¹

There are two procedures for acquiring a coal lease on federal lands. If the Department's US Geological Survey classifies lands as having "known workable coal," they must be put up for competitive cash bonus bidding. If the survey classifies them as not having known coal, a qualified applicant may obtain a 2-yr extendable prospecting permit. After exploration under permit and upon proving to the Geological Survey that there is workable coal, the applicant is entitled to a preferential lease, issued by Interior's Bureau of Land Management (BLM), without a competitive bonus bid.

¹ Averitt, Paul—Coal Resources of the United States, Jan. 1, 1967: USGS Bulletin 1275.

prospecting permit block in the Powder River Basin of Wyoming. The original application to the BLM in 1967 cited the area as a locale for research by private industry in techniques of remote-controlled underground coal energy extraction (in situ gasification, etc.). After a quarter-million-dollar exploration investment to qualify for a preferential lease, the Dept. of Interior has delayed lease issuance for a year and a half. Private industry research—at no cost to the taxpayer—cannot be started because there is no lease on which to work.

In the meantime, the Bureau of Mines announced a few weeks ago an in situ underground coal gasification research program. It will be conducted with taxpayers' money in the Hanna Basin of Wyoming where the federal government owns approximately 50% of the coal lands. But the Bureau of Land Management of the Dept. of Interior has a "freeze" on. Where does the Bureau of Mines of the Dept. of Interior go? They will conduct their experiments on privately owned Union Pacific Railroad properties which are surrounded by federal coal lands. Only a Bureau knows how to deal with another Bureau. The answer is "don't."

The final frustration for hopeful coal energy developers was realized in a BLM deci-

sion of August 11, 1972 rejecting, out of hand, 119 applications for coal prospecting permits in the Dakotas and Montana, on the premise: "After consideration of all available information, it is concluded that there is no compelling need, at this time, to encourage further prospecting for a resource, when there is already a known supply under lease that is waiting to be developed. Your application is, therefore, denied."

There are some who regard this decision as the latest surfacing of a "long submerged, but still alive" philosophy that minerals on the public domain should be developed only by the government itself. The decision flies in the face of President Nixon's stressing the importance of finding new sources of low-sulfur coal.

It appears to contradict the historic national mineral policy on several counts:

First, it denies the 50-year-old philosophy spelled out in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, which is designed to promote the mining of coal deposits located on public lands.

Second, it violates the intent of the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970, because rather than "encouraging private enterprise in the development of an economically sound and stable domestic mining industry," it stifles development.

Third, it is discriminatory because it shuts out developers who do not have a coal position. It restrains trade. It restricts competition by preventing investors who wish to participate in future coal energy development from acquiring a resource base.

Fourth, the synthetic fuel and electric utility industries of the future, based on coal, require the commitment of huge reserves on a long-term basis before the capital investments in plants can be made. The lead time from the acquisition of coal lease positions to plant operations may run from 5 to 15 years or more. These projects do not lend themselves to the immediate production requirement implied in the BLM decision.

Fifth, the technology of the coal industry is changing from day to day. The chemical, physical, geologic and geographic requirements of coal needed to supply future power and synthetic fuel plants are uncertain. No living person in government or private industry can say authoritatively and properly what coal is best suited to supply the future national needs.

Coal must play an important part in the future US energy picture. If it satisfies the expected demands of 1985, it should double its production capacity. With such a large percentage of low-sulfur coals underlying the public domain of the West, the challenge is obvious. Industry cannot serve the nation's needs properly without support and cooperation from the federal government. In the case of western coals, it needs the support of the Dept. of Interior.

Sometimes it seems that instead of working in concert for the good of the nation as a whole, government takes the role of adversary. Too many governmental decisions indicate a lack of understanding or internal cooperation between the branches of that government—even within a single department. If we are to solve the energy problems facing America, we cannot on the one hand embrace the competitive free enterprise system and at the same time reject it with the other.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this week we pause again to commemorate

the proclamation of independence and sovereignty of the Ukraine. It was on January 22, 1918, and after 2½ centuries of Polish and Russian domination, that the people of the Ukraine threw off the shackles of oppression and declared themselves at last a free and independent nation. Since the outset of its independence, the new republic was faced with serious threats and difficulties, the most severe of these being the Communist government in the Kremlin. Freedom for the millions of Ukrainians was shortlived, and a few years later they were taken over by the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainian people have never accepted Soviet rule and have never lost their desire for new independence and freedom. All Americans who believe in self-determination share with the Ukrainians the hope that they will one day live in liberty.

Today, we join with Ukrainians in America and throughout the world in celebrating the 55th anniversary of the Ukrainian declaration of independence. I am proud to join my colleagues in saluting a valiant people.

THE RETURNING POW'S

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, just before Congress adjourned last October, I introduced legislation aimed at partially compensating those Americans who have served their country as prisoners of war. Today, I am renewing this call on the Congress.

In the next 60 days, over 550 Americans will be returning home following as much as 9 years of confinement in North Vietnam. If the pattern of the last two wars in Asia holds true, these men will have suffered any host of diseases, malnutrition, and abuse. In short, they will have gone through tremendous amounts of physical and emotional stress.

Such treatment, combined with the shock of release into the hurried pace of our own society, may produce extremely serious problems. Many of the men will be beating the odds simply to stay alive. In a followup study of those repatriated Americans held by the Japanese during World War II, it was concluded that among prisoners held for such an extended period of time, the death rate following liberation was four times that of the public at large for the first 2 years. Even by the end of the sixth year following liberation, this rate remained an intolerable 50 percent above the norm.

One of the most serious of the problems to be faced by returning prisoners will be accidental injury. Apparently prisoners held out of touch for extended periods must relearn even very simple procedures which the rest of us take for granted, such as crossing a busy street. More complicated matters such as driving an automobile must be approached with extreme caution.

The experience of years in prison in a hostile camp has thus been shown to have a marked relationship to the life expectancy of those released. Despite the intense efforts being made by Defense Department officials to counteract this pattern, military medical experts are reported to expect problems.

The conclusion we can draw is that, unless something is done to compensate these men for a shortened life expectancy, they will be asked to sacrifice even more for their country. Reintegration into American society will be slow. Thus, former prisoners will be unable to start careers outside of the military and gain retirement credits until several years after other persons their same age. This means fewer credits and a smaller retirement check.

Even if the prisoner decides to stay in the military until retirement, he still must face the problem of a shorter life expectancy: Less time to enjoy retirement.

I believe that America already owes these men more than it can repay. We cannot sit on the sidelines and let them sacrifice even more for the freedom we all share.

Therefore, I am today reintroducing legislation to deal with this situation. Specifically, my bills will provide credit for all time spent as a POW toward retirement either in the military or with the civil service. For each day spent as a prisoner of war, my bill would grant an additional day of service credit toward retirement. This, of course, is in addition to any credits for which the POW may already be entitled to by existing law.

To give a brief example of how these additional benefits would be computed, let us consider the case of a man who, during his 17 years in the armed services, had spent 3 years as a prisoner. These years need not be in Vietnam. They would apply just as well for prisoners repatriated from either World War or Korea. Upon retirement, our example would receive a total of 20 years service—17 years for his regular duty and 3 additional years for the time spent as a prisoner of war. Of course, my intention is that this legislation not force early military retirement on those who do not wish it. I intend to make this point particularly clear in any hearings that may be held on these bills.

The Vietnam war officially ended at 7 p.m. Washington time, January 27. Within the next 2 months we hope to have all Americans home who are held prisoner by Communist forces. Let us dedicate ourselves to the task of seeing that their sacrifice not grow larger than it has already become.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the full endorsement of the National League of Families of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, the largest such group in the United States. Furthermore, knowledgeable sources have told me that this very idea has been discussed by the prisoners themselves within North Vietnam and that it has very widespread support there.

I, therefore, ask the Armed Forces Committee and the Post Office and Civil

Service Committee, respectively, to give these bills the most expeditious treatment so that we might help end the suffering of these brave men.

THE PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT ACT

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the need for pension reform. We all have heard about the many difficulties that workers are experiencing with regard to their pension benefits. Too many employees work too long and have nothing to show for it in terms of a retirement benefit. We all have heard too many stories of plants closing down and workers losing their jobs as well as their earned pensions. Many of these workers are too old to start over again and earn enough pension credits with another employer.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must pass legislation to correct the weaknesses that exist in the private pension system. The inequities and hardships of the present system must be eliminated so that our workers can have faith in it. I believe in the private pension system. But, I also believe that it ought to play a far more vital role in assuring that workers will have a retirement income that they can live on. For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 366, the Pension and Employee Benefit Act, which contains several provisions that my colleagues in the House and Senate should be alert to when they finally decide on the course of action which they consider to be most desirable.

My bill would deal with all the areas which are of such great concern to our working men and women. Specifically, I am talking about vesting, funding, insurance, portability, and fiduciary standards. Now let me briefly discuss each one of these subjects.

First of all, my bill would require pension credit to start vesting after 5 years of covered service. I stress "covered service" because many of us may fail to recognize the significance of this term. However, I recognize that vesting may increase the costs some employers will experience. That is why I start vesting gradually—after 5 years of covered service. A worker would have a 10-percent vested right at that time. Vesting would then increase 10 percent for each year thereafter until the worker has a 100-percent vested right after 14 years. He would be able to take this right with him if he loses or changes his job.

Our Government saw fit to use 5 years as the minimum number of years a Federal employee would have to work in order to qualify for a pension. Why not use this same standard in the legislation that we will pass? Also, by having graded vesting along the line that I propose, vesting is not an all-or-nothing proposi-

tion. It is also equitable to the employer because he would not be required to provide a full vested right to an employee who left before completing 14 years of service.

Other proposals before this body call for full vesting after 10 years of service. Others start with graded vesting after 8 years of service. But I ask you, is not that rather long to ask an employee to wait? Are we really doing anything for him if we make him wait that long?

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I want to point out. That is the term "covered service" which I previously referred to. My bill would require that employers start counting employees' service toward vesting after a period of service of no longer than 6 months. On the other hand, this provision would permit employers to exclude short service and seasonal workers from the pension plan. I think that this is only fair.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, other bills being considered by this body would permit employers to exclude time worked by employees before they reach age 25. Some bills would permit employers to exclude time worked by employees before they reach age 30. This is really an exercise in deceit. Are we going to tell our workingmen and women that we have passed legislation to protect their interests by saying to employers that they must provide for vesting after their workers have completed say 5 or 10 years of service, but then turn around and add that if the employers want, they can exclude all time worked before the worker reached his 30th birthday. What you are saying to an 18-year-old worker is that "we have passed a bill to help assure that you get a pension, but your employer can disregard the next 12 years of your working life."

Let me briefly outline the rest of my pension proposal. H.R. 366 would call for the systematic funding of unfunded liabilities incurred before enactment over a 40-year period. Liabilities created after enactment would have to be funded more quickly—over a 30-year rather than a 40-year period. Too many plans have big IOU's—big promises but insufficient assets to pay off in case of business or plan failure. It is time to ask these employers to systematically fund their plans.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, that is not enough. As you can see, even with a funding requirement, many plans will never quite catch up. It is for this reason that we need to insure pension plans in cases of plan termination. I propose in H.R. 366 that a pension reinsurance program be set up to insure against the contingency of plan failure. I would do this by charging all pension plans a modest premium on the amount that they owe under the plan. This is what ultimately will provide our workers with the protection that they need. After all, if we only ask that plans make bigger promises—without funding and insurance—pension expectations will be even more disillusioning.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will also serve to protect the retirement expectations of 30 million current plan participants by setting certain standards of fiduciary conduct governing those individuals charged

with administering pension plans. It is hard to imagine that with about \$150 billion in pension assets, pension plans are now virtually unregulated. My bill would also call for increased and improved reporting and disclosure of pension plan activities.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 366 would set up a system for the voluntary transfer of vested pension credits between plans. This scheme—which is referred to as portability—would serve to increase the mobility of our workers, while also providing benefits to both workers and employers alike.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to pass an effective pension reform measure. This great body can no longer ignore the legitimate pension needs of our workers. Let the 93d Congress go down as the Congress which provided for the protection and preservation of the retirement rights of our Nation's workers.

GOOD SAMARITAN AWARD

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 22, 1972, I had the distinct pleasure of attending the Saint Rose Hospital's third Annual Good Samaritan Award presentation in Hayward, Calif.

It was most refreshing to be present at a gathering where the criteria for the nominees is based on the principle of one human being caring for and giving time to another. Seventeen men and women were nominated for the award for demonstrating compassion for another individual.

This year's winner of the Good Samaritan Award was Mrs. Lucille Davies of Hayward for her unselfish example of love for her fellow man. Mrs. Davies, a mother of 10, found time in her busy days to visit daily for 9 months a friend who was hospitalized and dying of multiple sclerosis.

A special award was given to Mrs. Grace Draper and Mrs. Rosan Wilson for their joint efforts in helping people of the Fremont Community through the Tri-City Volunteer Mini Center.

Among the other nominees were: Mrs. Gladys Keller for her volunteer work with charitable organizations and assistance to Spanish speaking persons. Mrs. Sotera Brown who single-handedly organized the Family Tutorial Program in Hayward which provides tutors to assist foreign born individuals to learn to read and write English; Mrs. Mildred Lackey for her acts of mercy toward a woman suffering from inoperable cancer; Mrs. Rose Stewart for her work with youth groups in the community; Miss Judy Feight for her volunteered time by counseling troubled youth through Project Eden.

From Fremont Miss Eileen Tommie for her work during the recent Muscular Dystrophy Fund raising campaign and

volunteer work at Oakland Naval Hospital.

Two Castro Valley couples were among the Good Samaritan nominees. The first is Mr. and Mrs. Herschal Vineyard who drive a bus for their church and pick up 100 young members each Sunday. The second is Mr. and Mrs. Russ Scothorn who have collected, repaired, and distributed clothing and household articles to various charitable agencies.

Mrs. Sylvia Sefic of Dublin was nominated for giving emergency first aid which saved the life of a victim of an airplane crash.

A nominee from Union City, Mrs. Mary Sanchez has tutored schoolchildren for the past 2 years and helped needy Mexican-American families in her city.

Nominee Robert Smyth, an Oakland fireman who resides in San Leandro, spends his free time maintaining and remodeling Saint Felicitas School in San Leandro.

PMG'S ANNUAL REPORT LETTER TO BOARD

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record the Postmaster General's annual report letter to the Board, which appeared in the "Postal Leader," January 1973. The report letter is as follows:

PMG'S ANNUAL REPORT LETTER TO BOARD

Dear Governors: I am pleased to submit the first Annual Report of the U.S. Postal Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

On July 1, 1971, one of the oldest departments of Government became an independent agency with authority to provide mail services to all Americans—our customers.

During this first year, we tackled problems that were decades in the making. We have pursued two major goals: improve the quality and reliability of mail services, and reduce costs.

The first goal was service improvement. While our service performance is still uneven—our tests indicate the mail service overall continues to improve.

Most of the mail is first-class—49 billion pieces out of the 87 billion mail pieces that were delivered last year. 94 percent of the first-class mail deposited by 5:00 p.m. and destined for local delivery is being delivered next day. In smaller communities, this percentage is usually higher.

Another indicator of improved service was a reduction in the average time for delivery. Without regard to the time of day when the letter was deposited or to the distance sent, the average time for delivering each of the 49 billion first-class letters decreased from 1.7 to 1.6 days. In another important category, parcel post, the average time for delivery decreased from 4.9 days during the final quarter of 1971 to 4.3 days in the final quarter of this year.

Management is directing priority attention to improving the consistency of postal service. Service standards, first introduced for airmail, were extended last year to first-class mail. Additional service standards, covering all other mail categories, were being tested as the fiscal year ended.

Transportation services were vastly

strengthened by the expansion and increased reliability of an air taxi network linking hundreds of cities in order to meet the demanding airmail service standards. Jet aircraft were used for the first time. We also introduced some high-speed, long-haul railroad runs for the bulk mail which are proving highly effective.

The success of several new postal products was illustrated by the growing demand for Express Mail, a premium service for documents with a high time value, and the Mailgram, a message which combines the speed of electronic communications with the Postal Service's unrivaled delivery network.

A fundamental change is being made in our view of our customers. We are treating them as customers and are undertaking a series of actions to be more responsive to their needs. An intensive effort to improve existing postal facilities so as to better serve customers and provide a modern working environment for postal employees is now under way.

Our second goal was cost reduction. Strong measures have been taken to reduce operating costs. On March 29, 1972, restrictions were placed on the hiring of additional employees. The effect of these restrictions was significant, since 85 percent of the Postal Service costs are labor costs. In a four-month period, the employment level was reduced, through attrition, by more than 33,000 persons.

The commitment by postal managers, especially in the field, to hold costs in line enabled us to announce in the summer of 1972 that the Service would avoid the previously budgeted \$450 million postage rate increase scheduled for January 1973.

We achieved as significant 2.4 percent productivity gain in the fiscal year ending June 30. This productivity figure contrasts sharply with gains averaging less than one percent annually through most of the 1960s.

In part, this reflected increased mechanization in mail processing. A larger share of the productivity gain, however, must be attributed to our managers in the field. This year, they had the authority to make more effective use of manpower and other resources.

Despite the productivity gains achieved last year and those projected for fiscal year 1973, postal wage costs are rising significantly. In addition to wage increases amounting to 10 percent for rank and file postal employees in fiscal year 1972, we are committed in fiscal year 1973 to an additional annualized salary increase of 8 percent for these employees. The average postal employee today makes more than \$12,000 annually in salary and benefits.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, we also embarked on programs that will make the Postal Service more competitive in the decades ahead. A \$950 million network of bulk mail facilities was approved. This is expected to bring large economies in the handling of non-letter mail and significant improvements in the consistency of service.

Still under development and testing is a preferential mail processing concept which could eliminate much of the manual processing concept which could eliminate much of the manual processing of letter mail.

Inevitably, these changes will bring broader career opportunities and greater self-satisfaction for employees and local managers who are willing to be judged by actual accomplishments. Our customers—the American people—will receive better, more consistent service at reasonable prices.

The process of turning around an organization as vast and geographically dispersed as the Postal Service will require time. Given the patience and understanding of our customers, our employees, the news media and the Congress, I am confident that the Postal Service will become a productive and creative force in the coming decade.

E. T. KLASSEN.

FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION BILL

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with 85 of my colleagues—almost equally divided between Republicans and Democrats—in cosponsorship of legislation which I believe is as important as any which will be introduced in the Congress this year, because of its protection of the right of our citizens to have a free flow of information about events in public life.

The bill, in essence, would protect the anonymity of a newsman's source of information which is procured for publication or broadcast. Three criteria must be met before a district court could order disclosure: First, there is probable cause to believe that the person from whom the information is sought has information which is clearly relevant to a specific probable violation of law; second, has demonstrated that the information sought cannot be obtained by alternative means; and third, has demonstrated a compelling and overriding national interest in the information. The use of these criteria will make it difficult to force such disclosure, I am assured. The text of the bill is given at the end of my statement.

I understand that a Judiciary subcommittee will begin hearings early next month. I have read the committee hearings on the bill—which I cosponsored last fall—and have been impressed with the arguments of witnesses who claim that Congress has a duty and a responsibility under the first amendment to the Constitution to protect the freedom of the press by such a "shield" law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is well known that the press depends for a good bit of its information upon anonymous news sources who tip them off to the wrongdoing on the part of public officials and private citizens. Insiders within the Federal bureaucracy, for instance, provide valuable information which the public—and Congress—needs to know. If these news sources were forced to reveal themselves, it is doubtful that we would ever learn whether the laws that we pass are functioning as they should. It is also my belief that protecting the anonymity of a newsman's sources also serves to keep men and women in public office much more honest, responsive and sensitive to the needs of the voters of this country. I quote at length from one witness, Mr. Irwin Karp, counsel, Authors League of America, Inc., because I feel that Mr. Karp gets at the heart of the matter:

It is not to afford the reporter a privilege, but to guarantee the public's right to know that protection is sought for the news gathering process. The argument that the balance has to be struck against news gathering and against the First Amendment concept is a self-defeating and, in fact, a counterproductive approach to the problem.

It is self-defeating because in the long run much of this information which . . . has to

do with corruption in high places and malfeasance by public officials, is given by people who are not lawbreakers themselves but are often involved in the administration or an agency.

Much of that information is just not going to be produced anymore. Grand juries are going to issue subpoenas and find an empty bag. It is going to increase what I call . . . the Genovese effect. It would be helpful to read briefly from a New York Times article which illustrates that people are afraid to get involved. . . . That is the threat that this unlimited subpoena power creates and has created . . . there are just too many people whose information is important who will not give it to the grand juries and will not give it to investigative committees, but will only give it anonymously to reporters as they have in the past and *what the subpoena threat will do is to choke this off completely.* . . .

Mr. Karp recommended that the Federal statute cover both Federal and State agencies and juries, and I agree. His justification is that—

It can be done under the First and 14th Amendments and also because information gathering and distribution is interstate in nature—almost exclusively—and under the commerce clause the Congress could prevent restraints on the process by adopting a shielding statute.

Mr. Karp continues:

In Caldwell, the Government argued that reporters were merely seeking a privilege comparable to the attorney-client or doctor-patient privileges. But that is not a valid analogy. A reporter or author does not secure information by chance as do most witnesses; nor as an incident to his profession, as do doctors or lawyers. *The writer seeks information deliberately, as a fundamental step in the process of informing the public.* And the First Amendment safeguards . . . were intended to enable him to perform the task of informing the public.

The bill which I am cosponsoring has the same purpose. Not to give personal privilege to protect patients or clients, but to prevent restraint on the process of gathering information and informing the public. As Karp says:

The rights they would establish are not for the benefit of the Press so much as for the benefit of all of us.

At the end of last year, there was a news article in the Wall Street Journal from which I should like to excerpt. In my opinion, the quotations from this article are as pertinent today as they were when they were written:

To understand why this is so one must recall the function of a free press in a democracy. The Founding Fathers recognized that a sprawling country like the United States required a strong national government, which is why they abandoned the Articles of Confederation and drafted the Constitution. At the same time, all of them had a fear of despotism, and some of them had a fear of democracy. The best antidote to despotism, they reasoned, was the guarantee of freedom of speech and the press; and the best cure for democracy was the wide diffusion of information. Few themes were more insistently repeated by the statesmen of the early republic than the idea that free government would work only if it were based on an enlightened and informed public opinion.

"A popular Government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it," said James Madison, "is but a prologue to a Farce or a Tragedy; or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own Governors,

must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives."

This has been the theory of the American republic. I don't mean to suggest that the Founding Fathers enjoyed criticism any more than their descendants do. Even the sainted Jefferson had moments of bad temper in which he recommended that state governments prosecute editors for seditious libel. But in their more characteristic moods the Founders saw a free press as absolutely essential in order to arm the people with knowledge and therefore to combat the pretensions of government.

Tocqueville, who visited America in the 1830's and wrote the profoundest work ever written on American society, seized the point: "The more I consider the independence of the press in its principal consequences, the more am I convinced that in the modern world it is the chief and, so to speak, the constitutive element of liberty."

Walter Lippmann has made the point well in our own day: "A free press is not a privilege but an organic necessity." And he adds perceptively that it is a necessity not just for the people but for the government itself. Without criticism and reliable and intelligent reporting the government cannot govern. For there is no adequate way in which it can keep itself informed about what the people of the country are thinking and doing and wanting.

I include a copy of my bill:

H.R. —

A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a person connected with or employed by the news media or press, or who is independently engaged in gathering information for publication or broadcast, shall not be required to disclose before the Congress or any Federal court, grand jury or administrative entity any information or written, oral or pictorial material or the source of that information or material procured for publication or broadcast.

Sec. 2. The first section of this Act shall not apply with respect to the source of any allegedly defamatory information in any case where the defendant in a civil action for defamation asserts a defense based on the source of such information.

Sec. 3. Any person seeking information or the source thereof protected under this Act may apply to the United States District Court for an order divesting such protection. Such application shall be made to the district court in the district wherein the hearing, action, or other proceeding in which the information is sought is pending. The application shall be granted only if the court after hearing the parties determines that the person seeking the information has shown by clear and convincing evidence that (1) there is probable cause to believe that the person from whom the information is sought has information which is clearly relevant to a specific probable violation of law; (2) has demonstrated that the information sought cannot be obtained by alternative means; and (3) has demonstrated a compelling and overriding national interest in the information.

A SECOND O'NEILL IN LEADERSHIP POSITION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House were all person-

ally gratified earlier this month when my colleague from Massachusetts was unanimously elected Majority Leader. But Members of the House only know one-half of the O'Neill story. TIP O'NEILL began his career in public life by serving in the Massachusetts Legislature—of which he was the first Democrat ever to be elected Speaker. Last November, the O'Neill gap that had existed in that body since the Majority Leader succeeded to the Congressional seat of the late President Kennedy was closed with the decisive election of State Representative Thomas P. O'Neill III. And on Tuesday, January 16, Tom O'Neill showed the advantages of growing up in the O'Neill household by winning election as President of the Massachusetts Legislators' freshman class.

Tom has a little way to go before matching his father—he could not quite manage a unanimous election, but he did get an absolute majority from his 66 classmates on the first ballot of a three man contest. So this January, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the election of not one, but two O'Neills to positions of legislative leadership, and those of us who know the O'Neill family expect that future father-son triumphs may well follow.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the Congress has been accused of abdicating its power to the Presidency. In far too many cases, this accusation is accurate—the constitutional powers of the Congress have been eroded.

In the implementation of foreign policy, the Executive appears to have exclusive jurisdiction, with the Congress only serving in the role of the critic.

While the Congress has the responsibility to levy taxes, the administration has interpreted some regulations in a manner inconsistent with the intent of Congress.

The Congress has lawfully appropriated funds to clean up our rivers, harbors, and lakes, yet the administration has refused to spend that money.

The various programs, designed by the Congress to aid rural areas, have been severely curtailed by Executive fiat.

The list of Executive usurpation of congressional powers is long and touches on nearly every facet.

We must ask ourselves the questions: Why? Why has Congress allowed this to happen? What can we do to reassert the power of the legislative branch? What must we do to allow the Congress to effectively carry out its constitutional powers?

In my opinion, one of the solutions which would place the Congress on a more equal footing with the Presidency would be a more rapid rotation in the Members who populate the Congress.

By examining the example of the Presidency, we see that vigorous elec-

tions bring out new ideas and innovative plans to meet the current challenges to our society. With a limit of 8 years in the office of the Presidency, we see an individual who is elected to that office pouring his every effort into implementing his plans within the time allotted by the Constitution.

We see that by limiting presidential tenure to 8 years, there is a constant source of competing ideas that are placed before the public. It is through this process that both the public and the candidate for office are educated, first, on the people's desires and, second, on the candidate's solutions.

It is this constant renewal and competition that brings out the very best in our society. It is through this constant rotation that our country is offered refined, ever-adapting ideas, and solutions. It is through this procedure that the very best that our society can offer is projected into the public eye.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this constant renewal and competition has well served our Nation and could also be applied to the Congress.

If we established a limitation on the number of consecutive years a Member of Congress could serve, we would be following the example set by the Presidency.

We would have a constant demand for innovative ideas and programs to meet the pressing needs of our country. By insuring a reasonable turnover in office, we would have a competitive system by which the country would be assured of the very best in our society.

By insuring a regular turnover, we would see every Member extending all of his or her energies into enacting the program for which they were elected.

In addition, an ever-changing membership in Congress would offer ample opportunities for more of our citizenry to serve in the Congress—bringing their experiences, their knowledge and their particular expertise to this body. And Heaven knows, the country is replete with individuals willing to offer their advice on governmental policy.

Mr. Speaker, Wednesday I offered an amendment, based on the 22d amendment to the Constitution, which would assure a constant change in the membership of the legislative branch. My amendment, House Joint Resolution 236, would limit the service of a Member in the House and the Senate to 12 consecutive years in each body.

The 12-year period, I believe, would offer each incoming Member, assuming he or she is reelected at each election, ample time to learn the rules of the Congress, to gain greater insight on a national scale, and to implement the programs which caused him or her to seek office in the first place.

If, after serving 12 years in the House, a Member was still interested in public office, he could run for office in the Senate, or some other elective office. A Senator, after serving 12 years, could run for office in the House of Representatives and, the people willing, serve another 12 years in that body.

HOUSE CRIME COMMITTEE

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the top issues and problems confronting the Congress and the American people has been curtailed by the signing of the peace agreement last Saturday. This problem will now be supplanted by crime and high taxes as the outstanding issues for the 93d Congress to solve or curtail.

During the last two sessions of Congress the work of the House Crime Committee under the chairmanship of CLAUDE PEPPER has been the only effective medium from the Federal Government angle that has exposed, condemned, and alerted millions of Americans, both elders and youth of the alarming danger of organized crime and their criminal operations on drug marketing and methods used to make crime a multibillion-dollar business in the United States.

Little effective help in combating the crime menace has come from the Federal and State law enforcement officers, judges, and other branches created to curb the crime menace.

The House Crime Committee in the last several years has been very effective in alerting millions, including schools and colleges through their public hearings in dozens of our cities and urban area throughout the Nation. The city of Chicago is but one example. The committee held hearings for approximately 10 days in the Chicagoland area last year. These televised hearings were held in public buildings, schools, and colleges in that area and the hearings were open to the public and given expansive coverage, editorial and otherwise by newspapers, television, and radio throughout the Midwest. Mayor Daley, the chambers of commerce, business organizations, the heads of schools and colleges publicly thanked the House Crime Committee for their great educational knowledge and facts brought in to millions of homes and schools for the enlightenment of all segments of the population—youth and old—as to the dangers and insidious manipulations of the powerful crime syndicates operating in the urban and rural areas of our Nation.

It would be a shocking mistake if the House of Representatives would discontinue the great service that the House Committee on Crime has rendered to aid the law-enforcing officers of our Nation and also in the educational values and knowledge and information extended to the unalerted youth as to the killing dangers of the use of drugs and the methods and precautions against becoming entrapped and enslaved with this devastating human affliction of drug addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the excerpts from an editorial on the "Politics of Crime" in the September 20, 1972, editorial of the New York Times.

THE POLITICS OF CRIME
(By William V. Shannon)

Crime continues to increase. It has risen 32 per cent during the Nixon Administration.

The F.B.I.'s uniform crime reports showed that there were 5,995,200 serious crimes in 1971, an increase of 410,000 over 1970.

Mr. Nixon takes political comfort from the fact that at least the rate of increase has slowed down somewhat this year. But non-partisan experts and ordinary citizens agree that whether the crime figures are trending slightly upward or downward, no real breakthrough has been made on the crime front. Nobody feels any safer.

The murder of policemen is a relatively new and increasingly serious problem. Mr. Nixon held a conference and could come up with no better idea than that policemen's widows should receive an indemnity of \$50,000. The Senate approved his proposal on Monday but no indemnity saves a life. The registration of guns and purging of millions of dangerous, unnecessary weapons in private hands would lower the level of violence in this country and save many policemen's lives. But Mr. Nixon is not about to take the unpopular side of the gun issue and lead a fight for effective control.

The Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1968 which set up the Law-Enforcement Assistance Administration to channel Federal money to states and localities was passed at the behest of President Johnson. But L.E.A.A. has passed most of its existence under the Nixon Administration—and a miserable existence it has been.

The agency has had three different directors, and for one long period of ten months it had none. Political hacks have been appointed to important middle- and upper-level policymaking jobs. The result has been contradictory policies or no policy at all. More than \$2.3 billion have been distributed to the states, much of it wasted on expensive hardware. For example, the Birmingham, Ala., Police Department bought three tanks. Sheriffs in rural counties which are almost free of crime have bought closed-circuit television systems, gas masks, new cars.

According to a House government operations subcommittee chaired by Representative John S. Monagan, Democrat of Connecticut: "Too large a proportion of these funds have been wasted on partisan political purposes, on exorbitant consultants' fees, on equipment and vehicles which are misused or not needed, on excessive payments to equipment suppliers resulting from widespread absence of competitive bidding and unethical relationships between state and local officials and suppliers representatives."

Under Jerris Leonard, the latest L.E.A.A. head, some order is beginning to emerge out of this financial morass, but it will remain an incoherent and ineffectual program until the money is concentrated in those cities and suburbs where crime is worst. Moreover, the money should be spent not on more gadgets—although a few are useful—but on raising the morale, the intellectual horizons and the professional quality of the police themselves. It is on them and their colleagues—the criminal court judges, the probation officers and the prison guards—that law enforcement depends.

What the various branches of the law enforcement profession need in the White House is a leader. What they have is a cheerleader.

NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1973, Mr. Whalen introduced

the Free Flow of Information Act to protect the confidentiality of a newsman's information and the sources of that information. I am proud to be a cosponsor of that important measure. I regard it as crucial to sustain the principle that the first amendment rights of all of us are protected only when the ability of our journalists to provide us with candid and accurate reports is shielded against interference from an overzealous government.

The Free Flow of Information Act provides that a newsman, including one independently engaged in research for publication, may not be compelled to disclose confidential information—or the sources of that information—in any official proceeding except under certain narrowly defined circumstances. Disclosure may be compelled in a defamation suit when the defendant asserts a defense based on the source of the information. Otherwise, disclosure may be ordered by a court only after a hearing in which the person seeking disclosure has demonstrated "by clear and convincing evidence" that the information is clearly tied to a specific crime, that it is unavailable from any other source, and that there is a "compelling and overriding national interest in the information."

It is sad commentary on our society that such legislation is necessary at all. The present circumstances, in which news reporters have continually been subjected to contempt proceedings if they try to protect a confidential source, or information obtained from that source, from demands for disclosure, must be seen as part of a broader picture. The present administration has clearly and consistently shown its bias against independent news media, strong enough to present information of the Government's failings as well as its successes, and to criticize when appropriate.

That bias appears in public outbursts against news media which publish stories that seem to detract from the administration's picture of itself, in veiled threats to use the licensing process to compel the broadcasting of news regarded as more favorable, and in petty actions against particular reporters, or reporters who represent particularly disliked publications. That bias is clearly evident despite the administration's public protestations that it supports a free press—if the press is "responsible."

In all of this, there is little recognition, publicly at least, of the power such statements have when uttered by high officials of government. There is little understanding of the responsibility of high officials to refrain from interfering, even by intimation, with the freedom of our journalists to do their work for the benefit of all of us—a responsibility those same officials say they fail to find in the journalists they attack.

The administration's present posture toward the news media is strangely inconsistent with its professed attitude toward other aspects of our Government. We hear a lot these days about lowering the profile of the Federal Government—diminishing its impact on local decisionmaking and reducing its perva-

sive influence on the private lives of our citizens. Why, then, do we have the bias against independent news reporting. It is not that the administration is against a free press—it is against a press that consistently reports what it sees, and what it sees is not a benevolent and wise administration as we are supposed to believe. If all news stories cast a rosy glow, then we would hear little about the responsibility of the press. Yet it would be at that precise moment that the news media would become truly irresponsible. It would be treating us as the administration sees us—as children, fit only to hear what the Government wants us to hear. I fear that possibility most of all—and that is why the present administration's attitude toward the news media is so insidiously dangerous.

That is not to say that the news media could not improve its news reporting. It could, and one hopeful result that may come of the present situation is an increased awareness by the press of the real responsibility it has. But it is not enough to rely on this, or on the good graces of the Attorney General and his guidelines, to protect newsmen from Government interference with their work. So, I vigorously support the Free Flow of Information Act as a necessary measure to protect the work of the news media and the rights of us all.

CABRAL SLAIN BY RED AIDE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, following the murder of Amílcar Cabral, the self-styled Che Guevara of the African terrorists, the media, in not unusual, explosive manner accused everyone from the Portuguese Premier to the CIA.

Now, in a very minor news story, we are informed by President Toure of Guinea, one of Cabral's comrades, that the great "hate-whitey" leader in Africa was murdered by one of his own blood-thirsty revolutionaries.

But, the African revolution is safe—another terrorist, Vitor Monteiro, trained both in North Korea and in the Soviet Union has been "elected" in Moscow to fill the vacancy.

The Communists are determined, under the cover of self-determination, to block the construction of the Cabora Bassa Dam on the Zambezi River—progress by non-Red governments are labeled imperialism. And Americans must realize that some U.S. church dollars go to support this so-called civil rights movement with the donors thinking they are helping underprivileged people improve civilization.

I submit a related newsclipping in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1973]

CABRAL SLAIN BY AIDE, GUINEAN PRESIDENT SAYS

President Sokou Toure of Guinea announced in a radio broadcast in Conakry

Tuesday that anti-Portuguese nationalist leader Amílcar Cabral was assassinated by a top guerrilla commander in his own movement. Cabral, who led the movement to oust Portugal from its West African colony of Portuguese Guinea, was slain Saturday night in front of his home in the Guinean capital of Conakry.

Toure had said on Monday that Cabral was killed by Portuguese soldiers, Tuesday, however, he identified the assassin as Innocente Camil, whom he described as the naval commander of the African party for the Independence of Guinea-Bissau and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC).

Toure said Camil had confessed that Portuguese authorities had promised to grant independence to Guinea-Bissau on condition that Cabral was killed and the PAIGC destroyed. But the Cape Verde Islands were to remain under Portuguese rule.

Portugal has denied any involvement in Cabral's assassination.

Camil was the head of the group which killed Cabral and kidnapped several top PAIGC leaders, according to Toure.

Camil was captured in one of three boats intercepted about 30 miles from Portuguese Guinea. The boats, belonging to the PAIGC navy which Camil headed, carried the kidnapped guerrilla leaders who were to be turned over to Portuguese authorities, according to Toure.

The Guinean president said that those involved in the plot would be handed over to the PAIGC for trial.

Meanwhile, Radio Conakry announced that Vitor Monteiro, a Cape Verde islander trained in North Korea and the Soviet Union, has been named as successor to Cabral.

CHATTANOOGA MANUFACTURERS WEEK OBSERVED, JANUARY 30-FEBRUARY 4, 1973

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, proclamations will be issued in the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., and in Hamilton County, Tenn., today and tomorrow to designate the week of January 30-February 4, "Chattanooga Manufacturers Week."

I join in taking recognition of this special week for the group of manufacturers in the city of Chattanooga. Their number is large and diversified and altogether they place Chattanooga in 10th position among major metropolitan areas in the entire United States in manufacturing employment as a percent of nonagriculture employment.

These plants and offices employ over 53,000 people, making articles which are used all over the world, and every day the manufacturers of Chattanooga pay approximately, \$1,383,000 into the economy of that area.

It is fitting, therefore, that we recognize the contribution these firms make to the welfare of the city, State, and Nation, and set aside these days in which special note can be made of the important role manufacturing has in the lives of all of us.

The some 190 firms and businesses

have joined together in the Chattanooga Manufacturers Association, which along with the Chattanooga Freight Bureau, Inc., has provided the organizational vehicle to advance their common goal of placing Chattanooga among the leading industrial centers of the South.

I salute the Chattanooga Manufacturers Association and its members during this special week and bring to the attention of my colleagues the history and membership of this organization which has been so successful in supplying goods and services to a nation on the move.

The history of Chattanooga Manufacturers Association follows:

HISTORY OF THE CHATTANOOGA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

The Chattanooga Manufacturers Association was organized in 1902 by a small group of Chattanooga manufacturers, also pioneers in industrial endeavor. This association was brought into being by these industrial pioneers with the hope that through cooperative effort they might not only further their own enterprises, but at the same time, might more rapidly and effectually establish Chattanooga as one of the leading industrial centers of the South.

At that time, there were no other similar associations, at least in the South, and the fact that it has achieved signal success and has been of inestimable benefit to its members, as well as having rendered a distinct public service to the community, is a tribute, not alone to the wisdom of its founders, but as well to the fine spirit of loyalty which has characterized its members throughout its seventy years of existence.

In 1902, the membership numbered 62, and of this number 12 are still in existence and loyal members.

The first year or two of the Association's life was spent in "finding itself" and in shaping and directing its efforts to meet the needs of its members and to lay the foundation for effective cooperative work in later years. By degrees, various departments were established and they have functioned continuously and successfully to the present day.

In 1904, a very important department was inaugurated in the establishment of the Traffic Department (now Chattanooga Freight Bureau, Inc.) This Department was and continues to be invaluable to its members. During the year ending September 1971, 16½ times as many transportation rates and/or routes were quoted as were quoted during the first year of existence. Fifty percent more claims were filed for the period ending September 1971, amounting to five times the amount, or approximately 375,000.

Later a permanent exhibit of manufactured products was inaugurated. The establishment of this department was the outgrowth of a desire to make a collective display of "Chattanooga Made Products", not so much for the purpose of securing direct returns in the way of sales from samples on display, as to demonstrate to our own people, as well as to the outside world, what Chattanooga was accomplishing in an industrial way.

The enterprise was a success from the beginning. The great diversity and the high quality of the articles displayed was a revelation, not only to visitors from abroad, but to our own people as well. This display was confined strictly to products manufactured in Chattanooga, or Chattanooga area. New exhibits were added from time to time, and it became necessary for the Association to erect a duplicate of the original building adjoining it.

This exhibit had a marked effect in stimulating local pride in "home-made" products and it became one of the city's important institutions. As a means of giving publicity and prestige to Chattanooga goods abroad, it has also been of much value.

At the time the Exhibit was in operation, the Association kept a register in the lobby and it has been very interesting to note some of the complimentary comments. Visitors have registered from practically every state in the union and from foreign countries.

MEMBERS, CHATTANOOGA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION AND/OR CHATTANOOGA FREIGHT BUREAU, INC.

A&E Machinery Company, Allied Paper Products, Inc., Alloway Stamping & Machine Co., Inc., Alloy Fabricators, Inc., American Cyanamid Company, American Lava Corporation, American Manufacturing Company, American National Bank, Atlas Paper Box Company, Barry of Chattanooga, Inc.,

Brock & Blevins Company, Inc., Brock Candy Company, Brown Fence Company, CMI Systems, Cavalier Corporation, Central Soya Company, Inc., Chattanooga Armature Works, Chattanooga Bag Company, Chattanooga Bakery, Inc., Chattanooga Boiler & Tank Co.

Chattanooga Coca Cola Bottling Co., Chattanooga Coke and Chemicals Co., Chattanooga Container Corp., Chattanooga Gas Company, Chattanooga Glass Company-Dorsey, Chattanooga Mattress Company, Chattanooga Pharmacal Co., Inc., Chattanooga Sewing and Sales Co., Inc., Chattanooga Warehouse & Cold Storage Company.

Chattem Drug & Chemical Company, Chris-Craft Corporation, Cities Service Company, City Water Company, Cobble-Muse Hosiery Mills, Inc., The Coca Cola Company—Foods Division, Collegedale Distributors, Inc., Combustion Engineering, Inc., Commercial Janitors, Inc.

Concrete Forms Corporation, Consolidated Latex Co., Container Corporation of America, Corley Manufacturing Company, Crane Company, Chattanooga Div., Crystal Springs Textiles, Inc., Cumberland Corporation, Cumberland Machine Co., Inc., Custom Pattern Works, Cutter Laboratories.

Dayton Products Incorporated, Dixie Industries, Inc., Dixie-Portland Flour Mills, Inc., Dixie Sand & Gravel Company, Dixie Yarns, Inc., The Double Cola Company—Div. of Fairmont Foods Company, Duff Brothers, Inc., E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.

E&B Carpet Mills, Inc., The Eclipse Look-out Company, Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Electro-Lite Battery Mfg. Co., Eureka Foundry Company, Fabricators, Inc., Farmers Chemical Association, Inc., Flexible Foam Products Division, Grand Sheet Metal Products Co., Foundry Pattern Service, Inc., GAF Corporation.

General Oils Inc., General Shale Products Corp.—Key James Division, Gilman Paint & Varnish Co., W. R. Grace & Company—Davison Chemical Division, Halls Lifetime Toys, Hamilton Concrete Products Co., Inc., Hamilton National Bank, Hammond Industries, Inc., Happy Valley Farms, Inc., R. K. Haskew & Company, Inc.

Heritage Quilts, Inc., Hite Manufacturing Co., Inc., Ernest Holmes Company, Hulsey Concrete Products, Inc., ICI America Inc., Industrial Plating Co., Inc., Industrial Supply Co., Inc., Interstate Textiles Industries, Inc., W. L. Jackson Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lloyd E. Jones Company.

Jorges Carpet Mills, Inc., Kay's Ice Cream, Inc., Kelley Manufacturing Company, Kenyon Southern, Inc., The Kingston Corporation, Koehring Southern, Div., Koehring Company, Lodge Manufacturing Company,

Lutex Chemical Corporation, Machine Tool Div. of Noland Co.

Mar-Mode Hosiery Mills, Inc., Mayfield Dairy Farms, Inc., Mechanical Industries, Miller Bros. Company, Mississippi Valley Structural Steel Co., Mitchell Industrial Tire Co., Inc., Moccasin Bushing Company, Modern Maid, Inc., Morningside Chemical Company, Inc., Mueller Company.

McKee Baking Company, Nabors Manufacturing Corp., Nation Hosiery Mills, Inc., North American Royalties, Inc., Norton Company, Olin Conductors, Div. of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., Olan Mills Incorporated of Tennessee.

Pepsi Cola-Seven Up Bottling Co., Percy Todd Manufacturing Company, Pioneer Bank, Pittsburg Knitting Mills, Inc., Polaris Industries, Inc., Polysar Latex, Inc., Precision Packaging, Inc., Provident Life & Accident Ins. Co., Quaker Oats Company, Quince Kitchens.

Randolph Manufacturing Co., Inc., Rapro, Inc., The Red Food Stores, Inc., Rock City Paper Box Corp., Roper Corporation, Chatta. Div., Ross-Meehan Foundries, Rossville Yarn Processing Co. & Asso., Roxbury Southern Mills, Inc., Royal Crown Bottling Company, Royal-Desoto.

Division of Desoto, Inc., Robert Scholze Tannery, Seaboard Allied Milling Corp., Seal-test Foods, Div. of Kraftco Corp., Serodino, Inc., Sherman & Rellly, Inc., Signal Knitting Mills, Signal Mountain Division, General Portland Cement Company, SIMCO Leather Company, Inc.

The Singer Company-Cobble Div., Siskin Steel & Supply Co., Inc., Skyland International Corp., Southeastern Farm Supply, Inc., Southern Champion Tray Company, Southern Products Company, Southern Specialty Paper Co., Inc., Southern Wood Piedmont Company, Sovex Incorporated, Stainless Metal Products, Inc.

Standard-Cosco-Thatcher Co., Standard Iron & Wire Works, Inc., Stanley-Judd Div. of the Stanley Wks., Stardust Cruiser Mfg. Co., D. M. Steward Mfg. Co., Tag Container Company, W. C. Teas Company, Tennessee Finishing & Dyeing Co., Tennessee Metallurgical Corporation, Tennessee Paper Mills, Inc.,

Tuftco Corporation, Tennessee Steel Tank Company, Turnbull Cone Baking Company, United States Stove Company, U.S. Pipe & Foundry Co., Soil Pipe Div., Vance Iron & Steel Company, Veliscol Chemical Corp.—Tensyn Div., Vol-State Chemical Corp., Vulcan Iron Works, Inc., Vulcan Materials Co., Chatta. Div.

MEMBERS CHATTANOOGA FREIGHT BUREAU, ONLY

Benham-Deisher Company, Cleveland Milling Company, East Tennessee Shippers Association, Care of Proffitts, Inc., Engineered Products, Inc., J&J Industries, Inc., Lucey Boiler Company, Master Carpet Corporation.

Professional Gold Company, Radio and Appliance Dist., Inc., Siler Bean Company, Inc., Southern Cellulose Products, Inc., Southern Missionary College, Tennessee Alloys Corporation, Porter Warner Industries, Inc.

SPECIAL ORDER ON ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in marking the occasion of the 55th anniversary of Ukraine's independence. As a free Nation, we take this opportunity to extend

our support of the Ukrainian people, victims of Russian imperialism since 1920, when forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. We take this occasion as well, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the famine of 1933 during which 15 million Ukrainians lost their lives.

With deep dismay, we take note here of the current Soviet policy of mass arrests and the repression of cultural, religious, and intellectual expression in Ukraine. But at the same time, we may take heart in the courage and determination of the Ukrainian people not to let up in spirit in their quest for freedom. We honor Ukrainian independence today, and extend our friendship and support to these freedom-loving people.

THREE BROTHERS RECEIVE THEIR EAGLE SCOUT BADGES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to honor three extraordinary young men, R. Case Runolfson, Robert Runolfson, and Randall Runolfson, 4692 Boone Drive, Fremont, Calif.

In December of 1972, these three young men achieved the rank of Eagle Scout. It

is quite an accomplishment for any young man to reach the rank of Eagle Scout, but for three brothers to achieve this goal at the same time is clearly an indication of character.

The rank of Eagle Scout is not easily reached. It requires a great deal of time, effort, and perseverance. These three Scouts were awarded their Eagle Badges in a Court of Honor held on Friday, December 8, 1972, in Fremont, Calif.

Not only do these boys deserve special recognition, but it is truly a tribute to their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Runolfson, and their scoutmaster, Mr. Jerry Nelson, who have given them support, guidance, and encouragement in their efforts to gain this most coveted award.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 30, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. O. H. Bertram, Good Shepherd Lutheran Church, Toledo, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, Heavenly Father, there are times in our lives when we are not able to match the challenge and the problems that confront us with our own strength and mentality. In moments such as these we come to You, seeking guidance and assurance of Your counsel. We ask that You might grant to the Members of Congress direction for the great responsibilities in guiding our national affairs. There is always the danger that we may speak without thinking and make decisions without Your guidance. May all the discussions and decisions made in these hallowed walls reflect Your will.

We thank You for the peace which has been established. We are grateful for having guided our President, his representatives, and the Members of Congress in this longed-for achievement. May we ever seek to please You in order that we might be spared further conflict, not incurring Your wrath but Your favor. We ask this through Jesus Christ, our Savior. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 26) to amend section 1319 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to increase the limitation on the face amount of flood insurance coverage authorized to be outstanding.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Texas give us a little more detail as to what is proposed to be done?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for that purpose.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 26, a resolution which would increase the aggregate limitation on flood insurance in force under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. It is extremely important that this resolution be taken up and passed immediately if any additional flood insurance is to be made available to the American public. I am informed by the Federal Insurance Administration that no new flood insurance policies will be available for purchase by the end of this week unless this resolution is passed to increase the amount of flood insurance available for purchase from \$2.5 to \$4 billion.

The flood insurance program was originally conceived as an experimental program. It was designed through the cooperative efforts of the best available technicians and experts within the Federal Establishment and the far-sighted segments of the private property insurance industry. Long years of study and analysis went into the preparation of the original Flood Insurance Act, but no one could be sure at the outset whether the program was really workable.

No one could predict the rate at which the program would take hold; no one could estimate the overall amount of insurance coverage which might be demanded. For this reason, we established an "initial program limitation"—the words of the statute—of \$2.5 billion in order that we might see how the program developed and what it required.

The strong upsurge in interest in flood insurance has been phenomenal in recent months. Ordinarily, sales of flood insurance policies are low in the winter months; there is no immediate threat of flooding or of hurricanes. This year, the usual trend has been reversed; flood insurance policies are increasing at the rate of \$200 million a month and show every indication of continuing at that rate or a greater one.

The increase from \$2.5 billion to \$4 billion which would be provided in the pending resolution should be sufficient to carry the program at least through the end of the current fiscal year on June 30. The increase is needed to permit the program to continue operations without disruption of the relationships between the Government, the National Flood Insurers Association, local property insurance agents and brokers, and prospective purchasers.

It is my understanding that the administration will be submitting a greatly expanded Federal flood insurance program shortly. It is the intention of the Committee on Banking and Currency to take up these recommendations and act to provide the greatly expanded flood insurance program for the public.

Mr. Speaker, under consent I have obtained I include here additional material on the Federal flood insurance program.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM FEDERAL FINANCIAL INVOLVEMENT

The Federal Government provides financial assistance to the National Flood Insurance Program in two principal ways: (a) through appropriations for the expenses of conducting studies and surveys of flood-prone areas to delineate the areas having special flood hazards to determine the degree of risk and to pay HUD's administrative expenses; and (b) through premium-equalization payments which refund a portion of flood insurance losses and expenses to the flood insurance pool organized by the 100-member National Flood Insurers Association in proportion to the share of risk assumed by the Federal Government in establishing a chargeable rate for the insurance which is lower than the full-cost actuarial rate would be. There is also a catastrophe reinsurance agreement with the reinsurance pool for which an